


Volume XXX
No. 1

Fall 2010

International Journal of
Choice Theory® and
Reality Therapy



**International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy:
An On-Line Journal**

Vol. XXX No. 1

Fall, 2010

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction to the Journal</u>		<u>3</u>
<u>Recognition of the William Glasser Institute International Leadership</u>		<u>5</u>
<u>Thomas S. Parish</u>	<u>Editorial – Readership and Contributor Guidelines for the International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Anthony Cameron</u>	<u>Utilizing Choice Theory and Reality Therapy in Therapeutic Foster Care Homes</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Ernie Perkins</u>	<u>An Idealist on a Ship Named Reality</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Inés Pintos-López</u>	<u>Choices and Responsibility in Counseling: Looking Into Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) and Reality Therapy (RT) for a Common Thread</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Bryan Zeman</u>	<u>Beyond Choice Theory: Using Language to Take Effective Control of Your Life</u>	<u>36</u>
<u>Robert Wubbolding & John Brickell</u>	<u>Resources for Teaching and Learning Choice Theory and Reality Therapy: Part 1</u>	<u>41</u>
<u>Mateja Peršolja & Thomas K. Burdenski</u>	<u>Formative Monitoring of Students’ Progress Based on Choice Theory</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>Elizabeth Villares, Greg Brigman, & Andrew Maier</u>	<u>Student Success Skills: Building Quality Worlds and Advocating for School Counseling Programs</u>	<u>52</u>
<u>W. J. Casstevens</u>	<u>An Example of Choice Theory-Based Change in Small, Non-profit Organizations</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Thomas S. Parish & Joycelyn G. Parish</u>	<u>An Examination of “Connectedness Trends” Across Primary Grade Levels</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>Thomas K. Burdenski & Brenda Faulkner</u>	<u>Empowering College Students to Satisfy Their Basic Needs: Implications for Primary, Secondary, and Post-secondary Educators</u>	<u>73</u>
<u>Sylvie Bilodeau</u>	<u>PROJECT: IMPACT R.T. (PART II)</u>	<u>98</u>
<u>GONE, BUT NOT FORGOTTEN...</u>		<u>100</u>
<u>Eulogies are invited for Dr. Larry Palmatier that will appear in the next issue of the <i>Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy</i>.</u>		

INTRODUCTION to the JOURNAL, ITS EDITOR, and ITS EDITORIAL BOARD

Welcome to the International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. This is Volume XXX, No. 1, FALL 2010.

IJCTRT Editor:

The current editor of *the International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is **Dr. Thomas S. Parish**. Dr. Parish is Professor Emeritus at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas. He earned his Ph.D. in human development/developmental psychology at the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, and subsequently became Reality Therapy Certified (now called CTRTC), specializing in the areas of mental health, educational counseling, and marriage and family counseling. Besides editing the *Journal*, he also currently serves as an advisory board member of the William Glasser Institute in the United States. Dr. Parish has authored or co-authored scores of RT/CT-related articles that have been published in numerous professional journals, including the *Journal of Reality Therapy* and the *International Journal of Reality Therapy*. He also has an extensive background in designing and conducting research studies and developing strategies for the implementation of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy.

Any correspondence, including questions and/or paper submissions, should be sent to Dr. Parish at: parishts@gmail.com You may also call him at (785) 862-1379 or (319) 230-9970. A web-site is also currently operational for the Journal. It is crtjournal.com

IJCTRT Editorial Board:

Besides Dr. Thomas S. Parish, who serves as the editor of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* (IJCTRT), there is also in place an outstanding team of individuals who have agreed to serve on the editorial board of IJCTRT. They are:

Thomas K. Burdenski, Ph.D., Licensed psychologist and Assistant Professor of Counseling Psychology, Tarleton State University, Ft. Worth, TX.

Emerson Capps, Ed. D., Professor Emeritus at Midwestern State University, and serves as a member of The William Glasser Institute Board of Directors and as a faculty member of The William Glasser Institute.

Janet Morgan, Ed. D., Licensed private practice professional counselor in Columbus, GA.

Joycelyn G. Parish, Ph.D., Senior Research Analyst for the Kansas State Department of Education in Topeka, KS.

Jean Seville Suffield, M. A., President and Owner of Choice-Makers of Longueuil, Quebec, Canada.

Robert Wubbolding, Ed. D., Professor Emeritus at Xavier University in Cincinnati, OH, and is currently serving as the Director for the Center of Reality Therapy in Cincinnati, OH.

IJCTRT Technical Advisor:

Finally, since the IJCTRT is an on-line journal, we also have chosen to have a "Technical Advisor" working with the editor and the editorial board. He is **Mr. Glen Gross**, M.Ed., Distance and Distributed Learning Specialist, from Brandon University in Brandon, Manitoba, Canada.

IJCTRT Mission:

The *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is directed toward the study of concepts regarding internal control psychology, with particular emphasis on research, theory development, and/or descriptions of the successful application of internal control systems through the use of choice theory and/or reality therapy.

Publication Schedule:

The *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is published on-line semi-annually in April and October of each year.

Notice to Authors and Readers:

Material published in the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* reflects the views of the authors, and does not necessarily represent the official position of, or endorsement by, The William Glasser Institute. The accuracy of the material published in the *Journal* is solely the responsibility of the authors.

Availability of Previous Issues of the Journal:

All previous issues of the *Journal of Reality Therapy* and/or the *International Journal of Reality Therapy* may be obtained from Dr. Robert Wubbolding, who has in his possession a limited number of back issues. For information regarding how to do so it is recommended that you direct any/all correspondence to Dr. Wubbolding's attention at: wubsrt@fuse.net

Permissions:

Copyright is held by the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*. No part of any article appearing in this issue may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without the expressed written permission of the editor—except in the case of brief quotations embodied within the article or review.

Indices of Previous Authors and/or Titles are Located in the Following Volumes:

Vols. 1-5 in 6-1; 6-10 in Vol. 10-2; 11-15 in Vol. 16-2; 16-20 in Vol. 20-2; 20-25 in Vol. 25.2.

RECOGNITION of THE WILLIAM GLASSER INSTITUTE INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP/INTERIM BOARD

October, 2010

In a recent communiqué from Mr. Brian Lennon, he stated the following:

At a special meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, USA, on Sunday, 11th July 2010, a proposal to create an International Board for Choice Theory was unanimously approved with the full support of Dr. and Mrs. Glasser. In a long meeting the eighty members of WGI discussed possible tasks for such a board and they also established an Interim Board to work for one year with the aim of establishing the basic structures of the International Board a priority being the electoral system we will use to create the International Board. Dr. Glasser invited Brian Lennon from Ireland to chair the International Board and he accepted this honor for a two year term.

The areas represented by each member of the Interim Board are based on a first attempt by those meeting in Nashville to divide up the Choice Theory globe. During this first year of preparatory work we hope to create the most effective representational structures possible for our members. In the near future we also hope to let members know how best to communicate their ideas to the Interim Board. The members of the Interim Board are as follows (they are presented in alphabetical order):

Rolf Ahrens from Canada representing CANADA.

Juan Pablo Aljure from Columbia representing CENTRAL AMERICA and SOUTH AMERICA, as well as newly developing countries in Choice Theory.

Sylvia Habel from Australia representing AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND.

Lucy Billings Robbins from the USA, one of three persons representing the USA.

John Brickell from England, one of two persons representing EUROPE.

Al Katz from the USA, one of three persons representing the USA.

Rose-Inza Kim from South Korea representing ASIA.

Leon Lojk from Slovenia, one of two persons representing EUROPE.

Bob Wubbolding from the USA, one of three persons representing the USA.

In addition, **Brian Lennon**, from Ireland, will oversee the Interim Board as the Chairperson of the International Board.

Linda Harshman, from the USA, is our liaison person with Dr. William Glasser and Carleen Glasser.

Any questions/comments regarding Choice Theory/Reality Therapy, or related concerns, may be directed to the above named individuals, who are all listed in the WGI Directory.

EDITORIAL--

READERSHIP and CONTRIBUTOR GUIDELINES for the INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL of CHOICE THEORY and REALITY THERAPY

Thomas S. Parish, Editor

Abstract

The points (to be described in this brief article) were briefly covered at the William Glasser Institute's annual meeting that was held in Nashville, Tennessee, in July, 2010. Nevertheless, they are also included here for the benefit of those who were unable to attend that important meeting, and/or for those who would like to have more specific directions regarding all of the points that were covered as part of that presentation.

Two-edged Focus of the Journal:

This brief note is intended to familiarize two groups of individuals with the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*. More specifically, the subscribers to this *Journal* (either WGI members and/or those who are nonmembers, but are still truly interested in the various concepts developed by Dr. William Glasser) should gain insightful knowledge regarding the important concepts (e.g., Choice Theory, Reality Therapy, Quality School, Lead Management) that Dr. Glasser pioneered since they will all be routinely focused upon in this *Journal*.

In addition to providing readers with timely information and important "learning opportunities" pertaining to the above mentioned concepts, the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is also committed to providing writers and researchers with an open forum from which they can share important ideas, insights, innovations, and/or research-related results that can be readily and easily taught (hence, provide them with "teaching opportunities") that may be applied in various practical settings (e.g., counseling settings, classrooms, business arenas, home situations). Notably, we all need to keep in mind that our ideas, innovations, and research findings are for naught unless they are shared with others. To this end the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is directed.

Not Like Other Journals:

The *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* seeks to provide articles that fall into one or more of the following areas:

IDEAS/INSIGHTS—the articles in the *Journal* should offer new ideas and/or insights that the readership will find to be of interest to them and/or to those they serve.

INNOVATIONS—the articles in the *Journal* should offer exciting and useful innovations that the readership should be able to readily apply in what they do, and/or in what they would like to do.

RESEARCH FINDINGS—the articles in the *Journal* will seek to report recent research findings that demonstrate how effective Glasser's concepts have been found to be in various settings and for various groups of individuals.

The Spring 2010 issue of the *Journal* showcased these three areas through the inclusions therein:

IDEAS/INSIGHTS: Articles by Burdinski, Glasser, Lennon, Parish, Perkins, and Wubbolding et al.

INNOVATIONS: Articles by Smith and Robey.

RESEARCH: Articles by Casstevens, Misztal and Bilodeau.

The *Journal* will continue to follow this format for articles for the foreseeable future, since such articles seem to be of greatest heuristic value (i.e., hold highest interest) for the *Journal's* readership.

The Editor and the Editorial Board

The Editor and the Editorial Board wish to facilitate this effort to provide articles with strong heuristic value for the readership of the *Journal*. Therefore, our goal will be to "be the wind beneath your wings," by doing all in our power to assist you in your writing and/or research endeavors as each of you seeks to create articles that are timely, well written, and possess strong heuristic value. At the recent WGI annual meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, I alluded to the would-be authors in the audience as being on one side of a seesaw, and the editor and editorial board on the other side of the seesaw. I further suggested that as these two groups work together to produce the best that they can, the readership will benefit greatly too. To this ultimate end the *Journal* is firmly committed.

Subscriptions to the *Journal*

Notably, the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* is currently only available online, but there are various ways to access it. For instance, as a member of the WGI, the *Journal* is posted on the William Glasser Institute website, and it's FREE to any/every dues-paying member. For non-members, they can achieve access to the *Journal*, too, but they will need to contact me (i.e., Tom Parish) at (785) 862-1379, or at parishts@gmail.com in order to ascertain how to do so.

Message to Contributors of the *Journal*:

Submissions procedures are really quite simple, though not totally in accordance with the publication manual of the American Psychological Association. Basically, contributors may use any of the articles from the Spring 2010 issue of the *Journal* as a template for their own writing endeavors. In addition, they should be sure to comply with the following procedures:

1. Submit documents as MS Word documents.
2. Keep text formatting as basic as possible.
3. Avoid using tabs. Paragraphs are generally indicated by a blank line preceding the text.
4. Please use Verdana 10 point type.
5. Limit use of paginated lists unless absolutely necessary.
6. Limit use of tables/figures unless absolutely necessary.
7. Understand that "word wrapping" will occur for users with different size screens.
8. Use underlining on the web for hyperlinks, and avoid using it otherwise.
9. Use bold in regular text for emphasis.
10. Left-justify everything unless absolutely necessary to do otherwise.
11. Assume pictures will appear left-justified below your text.
12. Use the default line and paragraph spacing.
13. All capital letters on the internet indicate that you're shouting. Kindly reserve "all caps"

to appear in Titles at the top of each article.

14. Be sure to include a "Brief Bio" at the end of your submission.

These are the "*Fourteen Suggestions*," and are not to be confused with the "*Ten Commandments*." In other words, exceptions may be made to these suggestions, but in an attempt to maintain some semblance of "order and organization," all are encouraged to following these procedures, if at all possible.

Evaluation Criteria for the Journal:

Regarding "Evaluation Criteria," all submissions to the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* should...

1. Be clearly and concisely written.
2. Provide Choice Theory/Reality Therapy insights.
3. Provide heuristic value.
4. Be broadly applicable.
5. Be recommended for publication by two or more members of the Editorial Board.

Evaluation Criteria for All Research-Based Submissions to the Journal:

1. Study should be deemed to be "internally valid" (i.e., possess solid control of important variables).
2. Study should be deemed to be "externally valid" (i.e., be broadly generalizable).
3. Instrumentation within the study should be "reliable" (i.e., consistent).
4. Instrumentation within the study should be "valid" (i.e., test what it says it's testing).
5. Hypotheses/questions should be directly/completely answered.

Having read over these guidelines for contributors, and having studied the criteria for evaluations of submissions, there are only a few key things that are left to do, i.e., each potential contributor needs to abide by the following three directives, which are as follows:

You/We need to "Write IT!"

You/We need to "Write IT Right!"

You/We need to "Write IT Right NOW!"

And then send me your manuscript, without procrastination or hesitation, to the following e-mail address:

parishts@gmail.com

By the way, please be sure to indicate the type of manuscript that you deem your submission to be, i.e., "an **IDEA/INSIGHT** paper," "an **INNOVATION** paper," or "a **RESEARCH-BASED REPORT**."

A Final Suggestion:

As a final suggestion, I would repeat what someone once told to me many years ago when I was a child. He simply said that "We need to keep things simple, make them fun, and before we know it, our job is done!" So it is for writing for publication, too, as least it seems so as a general rule.

UTILIZING CHOICE THEORY and REALITY THERAPY in THERAPEUTIC FOSTER CARE HOMES

Anthony Cameron, M.A. LAC

Abstract

This article examines how a Choice Theory framework and a Reality Therapy-type approach were implemented in the development of a Therapeutic Foster Care Program. Special emphasis was placed on being relationship-driven with clients (counseling) and Professional Foster Parents (lead management). The following modalities were utilized: co-constructing a Choice Theory culture, using the psychological needs model as a diagnostic tool, as a way to assess communication styles of Professional Foster Parents and clients, and to determine the most effective way to connect and communicate with them.

Introduction

In 2006, I was asked to become the Program Therapist for the Home Care Training to Home Care Client (HCTC) Program at La Paloma Family Services (LPFS) in Tucson, Arizona. HCTC is defined by the Arizona Department of Health Services Division of Behavioral Health (2007) in the following manner,

"Home Care Training to Home Care Client services are delivered by a Department of Economic Security-licensed professional foster home to a child residing in the professional foster home. HCTC services assist and support a child in achieving his/her behavioral health service plan, goals and objectives. HCTC services include supervision and the provision of covered behavioral health support and rehabilitation, skills training and development, behavioral interventions, as well as transportation to behavioral health appointments including counseling and to facilitate participation in treatment and discharge planning" (p. 2).

Professional Foster Parents (PFP's) have additional training beyond regular foster parents and, in order to meet the needs of this acute population, PFP caregivers are not allowed to work another job. In short, the clients are referred by clinicians who have determined that these children have significant mental health issues and behavioral difficulties. All of the clients who have been referred to the program have at least one DSM IV diagnosis and almost all of the clients are prescribed psychotropic medications by their assigned psychiatrists or nurse practitioners. HCTC care is a short term placement to "stabilize" clients and prepare them for the "next step", as well as helping them avoid hospitalizations and residential treatment facilities.

In deciding how to proceed with the clinical design of the program, I asked the first PFP's who had participated in the program to describe their experience at their previous agency. They informed me that the staff came in pairs and sat in the home observing them interacting with the clients and taking notes. After an hour elapsed, the staff would give the PFP's direct feedback regarding what they had witnessed and what they should be doing differently. I was struck by this form of objectification and the absence of any relational context. I believe these types of mechanistic approaches are limited, and was inspired to create a program that would be relationship driven. Thus, the impetus of the LPFS HCTC program would be about developing interpersonal relationships with PFP's and the clients in their homes.

A Choice Theory philosophy was implemented and a Reality Therapy-type approach was utilized because of its emphasis on improving present relationships (Glasser, 2000). This

blueprint was carried out by "The LPFS Team", consisting of a Therapist and Behavior Management Specialist. These teams were assigned to support and guide PFP's in their work with clients and to work with clients therapeutically through offering the following services in a creative and flexible manner: case management (in-office, out of office), counseling (individual and foster family) and consulting (clinical supervision and training), skills training and development (behavior management), crisis intervention and support (24 hour on-call), and educational support services (working with clients and their teachers at school).

I was somewhat naïve in the early juncture of this program, hypothesizing that the staff would be focusing mainly on counseling with clients. However, it soon became apparent that not only was the therapeutic alliance with the clients of paramount importance, but the quality of the relationships co-created with the PFP's was equally important, if not more so. Thus, I found myself not only in a counseling role, but in a lead management role with PFP's. According to the William Glasser Institute (2010), "Lead managers continually work on the system to create a non-coercive environment which encourages employees to self-evaluate and achieve quality work. However, it is essential that the lead manager is able to persuade employees to continually upgrade their system of communicating to one that builds trust" (p. 2).

This article was written to demonstrate how a Choice Theory framework and a Reality Therapy-type approach can be utilized to build professional relationships and therapeutic alliances that lead to PFP's co-creating a need-fulfilling occupation and clients learning how to take effective control of their lives through the behaviors they choose to meet their needs. More specifically, the following modalities were utilized: using Choice Theory in building relationships, co-constructing a culture, as a diagnostic tool, and assessing communication styles and ways to connect with PFP's and clients.

Building Relationships with Professional Foster Parents

According to Glasser (2005), there are seven deadly habits of relationships (criticizing, blaming, complaining, nagging, threatening, punishing, and bribing to reward control) that need to be replaced by the seven helping habits of relationships (supporting, encouraging, listening, accepting, trusting, respecting, and negotiating differences). In orchestrating more egalitarian relationships with foster parents, I ensured that I attended all Child and Family Team meetings to support our children and PFP's, as well as being an advocate for them. I continually focused on strengths (individual, familial, and cultural), and let those involved voice issues, concerns, and frustrations. I practiced accepting that I cannot change things out of my control and assisted them with recognizing this reality with their clients. It is important to believe in their potential and to help them embrace hope in the possibilities with clients. I respected the fact that I was entering their home and engaging them in collaborative problem-solving efforts, as opposed to just talking down to them. By offering PFP's a Choice Theory relationship, free from external control, ideally these helping patterns of interaction have become a template for them to utilize with their clients.

A lead management approach is in opposition to the mental/behavioral health professional acting as an expert who is there to boss others around by telling them exactly what needs to be done. PFP's live with their clients and have an opportunity to get to know these children better than anyone else, whereas the LPFS Team works with them and their clients on a weekly basis. In my experience, avoiding an autocratic management style is of paramount importance because it will rob PFP's of their responsibility in creating a need-fulfilling occupation, and it will damage the professional relationship. Therefore, I have found it more beneficial to offer them a partnership that emphasizes asking questions

(wants and needs), clarifying expectations and perceptions, encouraging professionalism, re-defining success, promoting and role-modeling the ability to self-evaluate and develop plans, as well as having fun and allowing space for creativity.

Choice Theory and Reality Therapy

A PFP provides the following feedback regarding her experience with Choice Theory and Reality Therapy . . . Since starting to understand and apply Choice Theory and Reality Therapy, we have been able to question clients in a way that helps them provide their own answers instead of preaching as many adults in their lives have done. They start realizing that they have answers as well as the power to change their lives if they decide to do so. The success that we have had with the foster children in our home has led us to apply it with our own children. It has been an extremely positive change in our home that makes us, the parents, as well as the children in our home, much happier.

Through a Choice Theory lens, Glasser (1998) postulates that as human beings we are all motivated internally to get the following needs or “genetic instructions” met: survival, love and belonging, power, fun, and freedom. Our survival need is met through obtaining nourishment, shelter, security and safety. One often develops a sense of love and belonging through family, significant others, friends, groups and/or other affiliations. Human beings need for power is about feeling worthwhile, acquiring a sense of accomplishment, and being recognized. We have fun by experiencing pleasure and enjoyment. The need for freedom is often fulfilled through having independence, autonomy, expression, and creativity. Therefore, our behaviors are purposeful and are our best attempt, at that time, to meet one or more of our needs. It is important to point out that although human beings often meet these needs in similar ways, these needs can also be fulfilled in unique and different ways.

According to Glasser (2000), “To satisfy these needs, I believe we create a simulated world in our brain in which we store memories of all our strongly pleasurable experiences, along with the knowledge of additional pleasure we would like to experience” (p. 226). Thus, our “quality world” is filled with specific pictures that drive us to satisfy our needs. It displays how we want things to be ideally and it provides us with a place to start working on ourselves and with others by reframing possibilities.

Our total behaviors are chosen and comprise the following inseparable parts: doing, thinking, feeling, and physiology (Glasser, 2003). Although all of the components are interconnected and a change in any of them will influence the entire behavioral system, the doing and thinking parts are under more of our own control. Therefore, what one is doing and thinking is at the heart of Reality Therapy and will affect how one is feeling as well as one’s physiological states. Most of the client’s treatment plans in the program have focused on “do plans”, since this is the easiest part of total behavior to alter once one makes the inner evaluation that they need to change.

In working with PFP’s as a lead manager and with clients as a therapist, I have made a deliberate effort to build Choice Theory relationships through using a Reality Therapy-type approach, which emphasizes responsibility, self-evaluation, and planning for change (Hoglund, 2007). Wubbolding (2008) sees Reality Therapy as an effective way of delivering Choice Theory ideas and promotes the use of the WDEP system (Wants/quality world), (Doing/total behavior), (Evaluation/value judgment), (Planning/action) as an intervention tool. Therefore, the majority of work that the LPFS Team has done has revolved around using the Reality Therapy-type questioning process to facilitate Choice Theory ideas in creating a culture, as a diagnostic tool, and as a way to connect or communicate more effectively with others.

Culture

In creating a Choice Theory culture, PFP's have been assigned with co-constructing and providing need-fulfilling environments in their homes. Often, this has been facilitated through utilizing the following evaluation questions: What is your plan to meet your clients need for belonging/power/fun/freedom? What need do you do a really good job of meeting for your kids and what need should you focus on more? How would your clients like things to be here if they had things their way? What is your client's behavior telling you? What do you want your clients to get out of being at your HCTC?

The activities that are listed below are just some of the specific ways that PFP's, clients, and HCTC staff have worked collaboratively to design in need-fulfilling HCTC facilities:

Survival

- PFP's ensure that clients always have access to food
- clients are provided with appropriate clothing by their PFP's
- PFP's, clients, and LPFS staff maintain appropriate boundaries and PFP's and LPFS staff are teaching boundary concepts to clients
- PFP's and LPFS staff discuss safety issues and reviewing emergency protocols with clients
- PFP's focus on establishing trust (emotional as well as physical safety) through consistency in the PFP-client relationship

Belonging

- foster families eat meals together, especially dinner
- foster family meetings/counseling sessions are conducted by PFP's and LPFS staff
- clients are able to have friends come over to the HCTC Facility
- PFP's and clients are helping each other (discussing problems, helping with homework or chores)
- PFP's, clients and LPFS staff celebrate culture and diversity
- clients are encouraged to connect with animals in the HCTC
- PFP's and LPFS staff encourage clients to get involved in extracurricular activities (sports, groups, or clubs)

Power

- clients are given additional responsibilities by PFP's (having something that is all their own to be in charge of, e.g., chores and special projects)
- clients are encouraged by PFP's and LPFS staff to focus on academics
- clients are asked by PFP's to run a foster family meeting or to teach other foster family members about something
- clients are verbally praised and recognized for positive behaviors by PFP's and LPFS staff
- clients are able to have a voice that will be listened to by others in all circumstances

Fun

- PFP's, LPFS staff, and clients should joke around and laugh together
- foster families play board games together
- foster families watch movies together
- clients listen to music that they enjoy

- foster families go on outings (e.g., picnic, zoo, out-to-eat)

Freedom

- PFP's give clients their own space (clients being able to go outside or be alone in their rooms, and being able to decorate one's own room)
- PFP's and LPFS staff encourage clients to keep journals
- PFP's and LPFS staff encourage clients to express themselves through arts and crafts
- Clients get to go on vacations with PFP's
- PFP's and LPFS staff encourage clients to make their own choices

Diagnostic Tool

When using Glasser's (1998) psychological needs model (survival, belonging, power, fun, and freedom) as a diagnostic tool, PFP's, staff, and clients have been able to evaluate what needs are currently being met and what needs are not being fulfilled. For PFP's and LPFS staff, self-care has been a must, because one is not likely to be a very effective helper or be able to remain present and supportive if he or she is not—to some degree—currently satisfying one's own needs. Therefore, the LPFS staff members have been encouraged to consistently work on maintaining a sense of balance in their own lives and ask PFP's to regularly assess where they are with regard to meeting their own needs and, when appropriate, to make efforts to correct significant imbalances. This is often difficult to do because of all the responsibilities that we have in our lives and the sometimes personal nature of these difficulties. Nevertheless, priorities have to be established and difficult choices need to be made. The following evaluation questions have often times been utilized: What do you want your job to be like? What are you doing right now to take care of yourself? If you continue to go about things the way you have been, what is going to be different for you? What is your plan to meet your belonging/power/fun/freedom need? How can I help you to achieve your plan?

Utilizing a needs-based framework diagnostically with clients, has allowed our clients, PFP's, and staff to problem-solve by first and foremost ascertaining what need or needs this client is trying to fulfill. After the need or needs have been defined, PFP's and staff members can assist clients in evaluating what direction they want to go and where their level of commitment is at. Next, an action plan is developed and ideally carried out (i.e., a "Treatment Plan"). Wubbolding (2000) recommends the acronym SAMI(2)C(3) as a useful guide to planning, which stands for the plan needing to be simple, attainable, measurable, immediate, independent of others, consistent, committed to, and controlled by the planner.

In my experience, after the planning stage of treatment has been initiated and the plan was unsuccessful, a great deal of therapeutic work and teaching can be done. The PFP or LPFS staff can assist the client in processing what occurred, as well as helping the client come up with other alternatives. This enhances the therapeutic alliance by sending the message that, "I am not going to quit on you". This also increases the probability that the client will learn from the experience and adjust his/her plan accordingly in order to move closer toward the goal. The client also learns an important life lesson, that things don't always go our way, but we can always choose our attitude. Regardless, one is able to come to terms with the fact that we are better off focusing our energy on things that we can have some influence over, no matter how small, rather than factors that are beyond our control.

Another consideration regarding using the psychological needs as a diagnostic system is that it has been a paradigm shift away from the medical model, the DSM IV, and psychopathology. These needs are very straightforward and easily understood by clients

and PFP's as opposed to "medicalized" jargon or clinically obscure language prevalent within the medical and conventional psychotherapy community, which often times alienates clients and leaves them with a sense of hopelessness. In my estimation, it is more humanistic and helpful to talk about helping a client meet his or her need for power as opposed to labeling him or her with having Oppositional Defiant Disorder or Reactive Attachment Disorder. The client needs to remain in the primary role of change agent, as opposed to them being seen as mentally ill and helpless.

Connecting and Communicating

The last benefit from using the psychological needs model, as well as the diagnostic categorization approach (which entails using these Choice Theory needs), is that they both facilitate connecting and/or communicating between/with PFP's and clients. Thus, am I working with a PFP or client who mostly values love and belonging, power, fun, or freedom? Which of these needs is indicative of this individual's communication style? Once these factors have been identified, a lead manager or therapist can connect and communicate with PFP's or clients accordingly. For example, if I was working with a PFP who mostly valued power, I would look for opportunities to put him or her in control by letting this individual lead the conversation, set up an agenda or conduct training. I would make sure to point out what he or she was doing quite well and I would be very focused on staying on task, as well as directly solving problems.

If I were working in counseling with a client who really valued freedom, I would offer him or her many choices, perhaps having three relevant topics prepared and allowing the client to choose what would be focused upon. I would avoid giving directives as much as possible. During each session, I might utilize arts and crafts, as well as play games. I might integrate story-telling into the work or write back and forth with a client through a notebook or journal. It is frequently helpful to get out of the office or out of the HCTC by talking while going for a walk or shooting hoops.

This needs-based typology has been a starting point for assessing how to connect with PFP's and clients, as well as deciding which mode of communication would be most effective in providing a need-fulfilling relationship. Anyone in a lead management or therapist role must guard against stereotyping people or limiting them in any way, as well as being gimmicky. In doing this work, genuineness has been vital, and if a mistake has been made, one must bring it back to the relationship to be worked through. Lead managers' or clinicians' decisions must be constantly re-evaluated and checked out with PFP's and clients. Glasser (1998) proposes the following evaluation question be consistently revisited and permeate all that we do, "Will what I am about to do bring me closer to these people or take me further [away]" (p.7)?

LPFS HCTC Outcome Data

According to the LPFS Quality Assurance Reports from January 1, 2006, through July 30th 2009, the HCTC program served 128 children. Out of these 128 placements, 32 disruptions occurred. Therefore, 75% of the children in the program were successfully discharged in accordance with their case plans of reunification with family, adoption, or stepping down to a lower level of care. The average stay in the HCTC program was right at 7 months.

Interpretation of these data reveals systemic success, as evidenced by 75% of the most "high needs" foster children in the community being enrolled in the HCTC Program, "stabilizing", and getting to the "next step" in an average of 7 months. PFP's and the LPFS Team probably missed some opportunities to be more helpful to some clients who left in a

positive manner and some great work was likely done with children, who unfortunately still disrupted for one reason or another. Due to the fact that I am painfully aware that community mental/behavioral health is not a “politically neutral” zone, an absolute emphasis has thus far been placed on demonstrating to those in more governing positions that this type of program could be effective through an economic lens, meaning that children are avoiding more expensive treatment options (e.g., hospitalizations and residential treatment facilities), and once they leave the program they are not having to return. In addition, the state of Arizona, which has had unbelievable budget cuts, and the agency that I work for are able to see that this type of program can be delivered with fewer expenditures, as evidenced by fewer staff and resources being required, yet quality services are being consistently provided.

These political and economic considerations have forced research efforts to be exclusively about the “big picture” and “bottom line”, meaning that other areas of investigation were often left unexamined. Now that the LPFS HCTC program is beyond the embryonic and initial growing-pain stages, perhaps some future evaluations could focus on clients’ treatment plan goals, self-esteem and perceived locus of control, as well as on ongoing relationships.

In July of 2008, a Professional Foster Parent satisfaction survey was completed by 15 participants. These surveys included the following statements which could be answered by strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree (question 7 utilized a different Likert-type scale, which is noted below).

1. The training that LPFS provides is comprehensive and prepares me to do my job well (Training includes: PS-MAP) Partnering for Safety and Permanence Model Approach to Partnerships in Parenting, Orientation, Non Violent Crisis Intervention, Choice Theory/Reality Therapy, In-Service Trainings, and Monthly Meetings).
2. I am pleased with the way I am treated as a Professional Foster Parent at LPFS.
3. The LPFS Team responds to and follows up on my requests.
4. I feel supported by the LPFS Team.
5. I am treated with respect and feel that my opinions are valued.
6. I feel that the LPFS Team has responded in a timely manner in crisis situations.
7. Overall, I would rate my satisfaction level as a Professional Foster Parent as: strongly satisfied, satisfied, somewhat satisfied, dissatisfied, and extremely dissatisfied.

The results of the survey revealed the following: 58 items (i.e., questions) were answered with strong agreement, 33 of the items were answered with agreement, and 2 items were answered with a response of disagreement. Out of the 15 Professional Foster Parents, 9 reported being strongly satisfied, 5 were satisfied and 1 was somewhat satisfied. It should be recognized that the disagreement response was only utilized on 2 questions in the entire survey and that the strong disagreement, dissatisfied, and extremely dissatisfied responses were not selected at all.

The overwhelming majority of Professional Foster Parents have continued to report that they are engaging in a need-fulfilling job during their clinical supervisions which have occurred on a monthly basis and other existing Professional Foster Parents in the community have expressed interest in the program as evidenced by there being a “waiting list” of individuals wishing to become involved in this program. The LPFS HCTC Program has grown to currently servicing 20 HCTC facilities and 54 clients, as well as employing 10 staff. Perhaps future research efforts need to focus more on relationship factors with the LPFS Team and Professional Foster Parents’ job performance related to client outcomes.

Summary

In summary, I have presented some of the specific ways that Choice Theory and Reality Therapy-type activities have been effectively utilized by the lead manager and therapist in the La Paloma Family Services Home Care Training to Home Care Client Program in Tucson, Arizona. By developing Choice Theory relationships, not only with clients, but also with Professional Foster Parents, 75% of the clients were able to be successfully discharged in accordance with their case plans after relatively short-term placements (7 months), and the vast majority of Professional Foster Parents have reported being "strongly satisfied" or "satisfied" in their job-related estimations, primarily because of the need-fulfilling way that support services have been offered. The conceptualizations presented, included using Choice Theory to co-construct need-fulfilling cultures, as a diagnostic tool, and assessing modes of communication by Professional Foster Parents and clients in an effort to tailor connective interventions.

References

Arizona Department of Health Services Division of Behavioral Health Practice Protocol. (2007). Home Care Training to Home Care Client services for children.

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory*. New York: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (2000). *Reality therapy in action*. New York: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (2003). *Warning: Psychiatry can be hazardous to your mental health*. New York: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (2005). *Defining mental health as a public health problem*. Chatsworth, CA. William Glasser Inc.

Hoglund, R.G. (2007). *Choice theory/reality therapy training manual*. Tempe, AZ: Bob Hoglund Inc.

La Paloma Family Services (2009, 2008, 2007, 2006). *Quality Assurance Reports*. Tucson, AZ.

Wubbolding, R. (2008). More searching for mental health. *International Journal of Choice Theory*, 2 (1), 6-9.

Wubbolding, R. (2000). *Reality therapy for the 21st century*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

William Glasser Institute. (2010). <http://wglasser.com>.

Brief Bio

Anthony Cameron is a program therapist at La Paloma Family Services in Tucson, Arizona, where he has worked for the last twelve years.

AN IDEALIST ON A SHIP NAMED REALITY

Ernie Perkins, Th.D., D.Min., Ed.D., Ph.D. (ABD), and CTRTC

Abstract

Choice Theory and Reality Therapy principles practiced in a business environment produce Lead Management. Lead Management practiced in a business environment produces a good working organization that excels. The on-going problem for many business environments is the problem between those who are satisfied with the manner in which things are done, the direction the business environment is going, and the products/services which the business environment produces versus those who believe the business environment needs to get on the "cutting edge" of change. This article addresses this conflict.

Battles are not only fought on bloody fields of war, the green grass of a football field, or the canvas square of a boxing ring. Sometimes those involved are not easily identified by the color of their uniforms or the style of their weapons. Some conflicts take place in executive offices and business environment board meetings. In these business conflicts, each combatant usually argues that he/she has only the desire for "what's best for the company," camouflaging their hidden desire to do what is best for him or her personally. The battles, however, are for the same reasons and the goals are the same. The reason is control. The goal is victory and the prize that victory brings.

In businesses the combative forces often have different mind-sets or personality temperaments which exist within the framework of the business itself. The opponents in a business conflict may identify themselves with various names or titles. Outsiders have names for them such as "the traditionalists" versus the "non-traditionalists," or the "in-power group" versus the "wanna-be group." However, I believe the best terms for these two groups are "Realists" and "Idealists."

In the language of the philosopher, "realism" and "idealism" are names for the two elements that make up truth in the essentialist's curriculum (Miller, 1985, p. 203). However, I am not using these words philosophically, but as identifiers of the two forces mentioned above. It is my belief that to whatever degree these two temperaments can work together, the success or failure and the quality of the work environment will be determined. There is usually some correspondence between Idealism and younger adults and Realism with older adults. While age can be a factor, we should point out, that Idealists and Realists are found in all age groups. Many times the temperament is formed not by the age of the individual, but by the length of time he or she has been involved in the business environment.

Although I am using generalizations about human nature, remember that few people are "pure" Idealists or "pure" Realists. As one writer has said, "Almost all generalizations about human nature, no matter how common and familiar . . . are not indisputable facts; they are at best hypotheses" (Barnet & Bedau, 1987, p. 87). The hypothesis I hold is that most people will be a combination of the two temperaments. Even so, very few will have equal shares of the two. Most people will be more one than the other, and therefore, can be identifiable as "Idealist" or "Realist." Furthermore, a worker with an Idealistic temperament may be forced to work in Realistic work environments and vice versa. These two temperaments, at their worst, can compete to create conflict within the business environment. At their best, they can cooperate to produce growth and success for the business environment.

The two have different "businessviews" of the business environment. A businessview is the quality world view people have of the business' structural characteristics including its mission, its resource base, its standard operating procedures, its facilities, its flow of communication, and the way its authority is exercised as seen through their own experiences and expectations (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991, p. 29). When different people have different businessviews, those differences are foundational for the unrest, misunderstanding, and hostility that can disrupt the effective working involvement, morale, and effectiveness of the organization. It is the goal of this article to describe those views and their differences, share the nature of the innate conflicts within them as they relate to each other, and share why it will always be hard for them to work together even though to do so is to strengthen each other and the business environment.

Idealists work to turn around an organization, while others are satisfied with how things are going. The Idealist sees the business environment "as it should be." His/Her idealism has been created by books read, seminars attended, and degrees earned. He/She has a quality world picture of a system that the real world is not manifesting. The real world could be more congruent with the quality world if only everyone in the organization were willing to do what was necessary to remold the organization into a more workable and effective unit. To the Idealist, the business environment's organizational structure is not sacred. It can be and should be changed as the times and situations change (Parker, 1968). The motto for the Idealist is "If it's not broken, break it." However, he/she would not suggest the breakage be with no purpose or direction. The purpose and direction in which breakage and reconstruction occur is derived from a thorough evaluation of the organization and the supposed changes are a result of this evaluation (Adams, 1926). Unfortunately, it is the Idealists who do most of the evaluation. The evaluation can be done through a formal study done on business environment time. If it is a formal study, it is usually possible only because the business environment has brought in a new CEO who has the power to order such studies. The business environment has new leadership with the power and authority to take the business environment where "it should be," and those who do not wish to go along with the new management's directives can go alone to another place of employment. In such situations, the suggestions offered in this article will not apply.

There are other situations where such studies will be done because of new leadership, but where the leadership has limited power and must work with shareholders who exercise a great deal of power and influence. If the studies are done primarily by the new Idealistic leader and a handpicked team of follow Idealists, the results will not be as he/she has envisioned (Collins, 1992, p. 232). By all possibilities, a showdown to determine who has the real power is in the future, as Keirsey and Bates (1984) wrote, "A leader is a leader only insofar as he has followers" (p. 129).

In many, if not most, situations the evaluation has a very informal format that has been formulated around the water cooler or during lunch breaks by those Idealists just down the ladder from the executive office. Idealists tend to share their frustrations with one another as they share their perceptions regarding the weaknesses and ineffectiveness of the business environment and its current policies. They yearn for an opportunity to share their ideas and visions with the power holders, and when given the opportunity to do so, feel that their ideas will be seen and accepted as being the great ideas that they are, only to have them rejected. As one Idealist expressed, "I met with my boss, discussed a proposal with her and was basically told (very nicely) that I didn't know what I was talking about. She then explained to me several processes which involve my job which I was not aware of (and truthfully, I am not sure if she is correct in her understanding). I felt my frustrations rise

again. In addition, the administration has made a major decision, despite my expressing my disagreement."

The Idealists are motivated by a desire to change the organization with the perceived goal of making it better and more effective. They agree with Belasco (1991) when he wrote, "If you're really going to survive . . . you've got to change" (p. 50). However, they will find themselves facing a group of Realists who see no need for the change, and who reject the Idealists' picture of the business environment becoming "as it should be."

Why? Because the business environment is a ship named Reality and it is being captained by Realists. Before the Idealists can produce change, they must understand where the Realists are coming from.

The Realists see the business environment "as it is" and they like it that way (Pearl, 1963, p. 141). They have spent their energies, skills, and lives making it that way. The business environment reflects them and their sacrifices and hard work. To suggest that it is not "as it should be" is to suggest that their work and sacrifice have had no meaning. To devalue the business environment as it is, is to devalue them.

The Realists are motivated by two factors. As long as these two factors are indicating success, they do not see the business environment as broken and "if it isn't broken, don't fix it." These two factors are the business environment's bottom line, or profit, and their own illusions concerning the business environment.

The profit motivation speaks for itself. All business environments must create profit else it will not stay in business. The question concerning whether or not a business environment is profitable usually is not a major one. There are exceptions such as Enron where the business environment's leadership can create an image of false profit and success, but usually the bottom line is easily seen. Most of the shareholders within and without the business environment will be satisfied if they can see regular dividend checks that pay a good return on their investment in the business environment. Good dividends prove the business environment is not broken, and that no fixing is necessary.

The illusion motivations are a different story. Funk & Wagnalls College Dictionary (1967) defines illusion as "a false, misleading, or overly optimistic idea; a general impression not consistent with fact."

The illusions are two in number. These are an illusion of quality and an illusion of significance.

Everyone sees the world through their own quality world filter. The drawings of a six year old child as seen by the six year old are beautiful works of art. The same drawings seen through the eyes of a disconnected adult from another community are childish scratches. In much the same manner, the business environment as seen through the eyes of its executive officer is a quality business environment that produces quality products. No executive finds it easy to confess that the products are second rate or substandard in quality. Thus, it is safe to say that if it is not perfect, no one will confess that it is not. To assure that the perceived quality stays high, the business environment will establish "quality controls," whose responsibility is to maintain the quality level. Given enough time, quality control, however, as it is defined, has a tendency to become a unit unto itself and loses its purpose. It becomes more concerned with its own existence than with quality.

This leads to the Diluting Principle. The 1st Law of Thermodynamic argues that unless a garden is worked, the weeds will take over. That same law applies to any business environment. The business environment must work to maintain the quality level. And, the more successful the business environment becomes, the harder it becomes to do so. When growth gets ahead of the quality, the business environment will start diluting the quality to meet the additional demands of the product. For example, a business environment in a major city has a very successful unit entitled the TOPS Unit. This unit is one of the most successful in the business environment, but by the nature of its work it can only handle a few clients at a time. Therefore, the business environment decides to start another TOPS Unit which soon fills with new clients who come because of the high quality of the original unit. Their coming will bring additional revenue into the business environment which immediately starts plans for a third unit. The new units do not have the quality of the first, and in an effort to boost their quality level, employees are moved from the first unit to the new ones. This weakens the first unit and does little to bring up the quality in the new units. This is an example of the "Diluting Principle" at work.

As one of my sons has said, "If you do do do, then everything you do will be do do." This is another way of saying that when a business environment loses sight of what they do well, and start trying to do everything, they lose the ability to do well what they have done well previously. As the growing trend for business environments to diversify continues, we will continue to see business environments that are leaders in their field trying to become involved in fields for which they have no expertise. And, I fear we will see an increase in the "Diluting Principle."

Charles Wilson, CEO of General Motors many years ago is reported to have said, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." His actual statement was a little different, but the reported statement is a good example of the illusion of "significance." When the business environment leadership develops an illusion of significance, the business environment's attitude becomes one of entitlement. A major chain desires a particular location to expand its operation, and finds it hard to understand the reluctance of the community in helping it get the location. "After all," the business environment reasons, "our being here will be good for the community. We are one with the community. The community can not get along without us. It is lucky that we are here." This illusion of significance can produce the attitude that says, "The customer is not always right, in fact, the customer is seldom right, and if the customer doesn't like the way in which we do business, let him/her try to go someplace else." This attitude will catch up with them sooner or later. There is always a new business environment lurking in the background ready to offer the quality service that the illusion of significance has caused the first business environment to forget.

Because Realists see the business environment through these two lenses, profit and the two illusions, they are satisfied with what they see. The Idealists, however, are seeing the business environment through different lens. They are able to see the business environment as it can be and they desire to help take it there.

Unfortunately, Realists and Idealists are usually in competition with each other. To the Realists, Idealists are seen as dreamers with their heads in the clouds. While to the Idealists, Realists are stuck in the traditional, methodical, and conventional.

Of course, this evaluation of each other may not be incorrect. Nevertheless, Idealists and Realists are different from each other. They think differently, and they find their self-worth from two different sources. While both would claim to value experience, they are speaking from two different contexts. The Realists find comfort in old experiences and their stabilities, the Idealists find challenge in new experiences and their changes.

Realists place great significance on their past experiences (Russo & Schoemaker, 1989). They are more comfortable doing something the same way they have done it before than they are with exploring the territory of the unknown (Collins, 1991).

The Idealists, operating from their sphere, find their worth and value in doing those things that create a new world (Parker, 1968). To the Idealists the organization is not what it ought to be, and their energies are invested in trying to develop a plan that will take it to where it should be. They see this work as laborious and hard. It takes more energy to stop a declining business environment than it does to maintain growth. The Idealists believe that since the business environment is not what it should be, it is declining and will continue in its decline unless it can be turned around.

Realists, on the other hand, have seen the dreamers come and go. Their legendary favorite words of encouragement to the Idealist are as follows: "We were here before you came, and we will be here after you are gone." Unfortunately for the organization, with that type of attitude, and lack of willingness to engage in change, many of them will likely be there, long after the Idealists are all gone.

The question now is how can the two conflicting elements be brought together in an organization? The first goal is to keep the solution from becoming worse than the problem. The business situation does not want to become like a little boy who found a dirty spot on the knee of his trousers. Sitting down on the ground he washed the spot off by pouring water over it, but the ground got wet all around him. He got up with his pants muddy all over. The environment determines to a large extent the effectiveness of the "cure."

There is no easy solution that will lead to a relational unification of idealism and realism. For unity to develop there must be some eclectic compromise. Both Idealists and Realists must realize that the business environment is a community, and for that community to work well, its citizens must work together drawing from and adding to each other's strengths.

Realists and Idealists can greatly increase the probability of success when they have a good working relationship (Gifford, Reynolds, & Wootton, 1989). The key to a good working relationship is communication. Yet, this will be the major problem and the main continuing frustration for the Idealist. The Realists feel they have everything under control, and see the Idealist as a mild—but manageable—headache, who may be a good person to have around if only he/she would simply just do his/her job and leave the running of the organization to Realists.

For Idealists to be able to truly change things they must get to the leadership positions. That takes time and will require patience as they slowly, but surely, see the desired changes taking place. Then when at long last they reach the place where they truly have power to change things, they will realize the changes have taken place, the organization is as it should be if only it were not for those newer and mostly younger discontented folks in the organization who keep trying to point out problems and offering suggestions for change.

You see, the situation is actually a cycle: Idealists become Realists over time and find themselves plagued by the next generation of Idealists who, themselves, work up to become the next Realists plagued by the next generation of Idealists. Idealist and Realist—one is not better than the other—they're just different. Fortunate is the business that has both working together in mutual respect for one another as they diligently work together for the common good of the company, and for everyone in it.

References

- Adams, G. P. (1926). Ideas in knowing and willing. In *University of California publications in philosophy, volume 8*. George P. Adams, J. Loewenberg, and Stephen C. Pepper, Editors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barnet, S. & Bedau, H. (1987). *Current issues and enduring questions: Methods and models of argument from Plato to the present*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Belasco, J. A. (1990). *Teaching the elephant to dance: The manager's guide to empowering change*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Collins, G. R. (1992). *You can make a difference: 14 principles for influencing lives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Gifford, C. S., Reynolds, J. C., & Wootton, L. R. (1989). *Contemporary education in perspective*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. (1984). *Please understand me: Character and temperament types*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Merriam, S. B. & Caffarella, R. S. (1991). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miller, M. D. (1985). *Principles and a philosophy for vocational education*. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
- Parker, D. H. (1968). *Experience and substance: An essay in metaphysics*. New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers.
- Pearl, L. (1963). *Four philosophical problems: God, freedom, mind, and perception*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Russo, J. E. & Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1989). *Decision traps: Ten barriers to brilliant decision-making and how to overcome them*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Brief Bio

Ernie Perkins, Th.D., D.Min., Ed.D., Ph.D. (ABD), and CTRTC is a motivational speaker, humorist, educator, author, and counselor working out of Edmond, Oklahoma. His website is www.ernieperkins.org

CHOICES AND RESPONSIBILITY IN COUNSELING: Looking into Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) and Reality Therapy (RT) for a Common Thread.

Inés Pintos-López

Abstract

This is a comparative assessment into the points of convergence between Reality Therapy and Neuro-Linguistic Programming. An Australian Graduate Diploma in Reality Therapy student argues that, having made the choice to live and help others within the framework of Choice Theory, we cannot escape the moral responsibility which goes with our doing. That is, it is our duty of care to search relentlessly for novel strategies to add to our therapist's tool kit. Furthermore, she suggests that our internalized life philosophy - Choice Theory - will instinctively guide us toward those tools that fit our own personal style. Ultimately, she posits that their mere inclusion in our repertoires will guarantee their appropriate use when the precise situation and moment arise.

Introduction

Scientific skepticism has historically challenged the effectiveness of the dialectic psychotherapies. Today, that landscape changes rapidly as technology lends undeniable bio-scientific evidence to the plasticity of our brains (Doidge, 2007). The fact that the brain is capable of changing the most entrenched behaviors by sheer will (Bolte Taylor, 2009) is indisputable. What's more, we now know that: (1) increasing the depth of individual awareness, (2) adopting the belief that we can change, (3) acting on this belief, by consistently adopting a new behavior does, physically, mold new neuro-circuitry. The fact that old habits are displaced by the "use it or lose it" process is now a scientific truth. Moreover, evidence of the speed with which alterations of established pathways occur was verified by the pioneer of brain plasticity, Alvaro Pascual-Leone (Doidge, 2007, p.210). Undoubtedly, science has exonerated our profession!

Research suggests that the most important aspect of therapy is the therapeutic alliance (Assay and Lambert, 1999); the connection between client and psychotherapist. Furthermore, it has also been proposed that who provides the treatment is a much more important determinant of success than what treatment is provided (Miller, Hubble & Duncan, 2007). I will argue that if therapy is defined as an interpersonal activity, socially constructed, markedly inter-subjective, unique, and conversational (Botella, 1998), its success depends largely on the sensitivity of that single human being who is genuinely prepared to help. That is, good skills being a given.

Psychotherapy is like a dance. Each session is about a unique client; it is about finding the client's sense of self (the moral being and his/her values); it is about balancing the client's expectation and interpretation of her/his own experience (her/his quality world); it is about searching and discovering the client's inner life rhythm (respecting it, with empathy, advice or challenge); it is about matching our steps to theirs. Ultimately, it is about our unique skills in the use of appropriate custom-suited techniques to challenge the greatest potential of human experience (Robinson, 2009). It is about trusting; trusting that we, as therapists, do our very best and trusting that the person in front of us is striving to do the same.

I agree with Botella (1998) in that the psychotherapeutic practice calls for an attitude of intellectual, personal, and technical openness. I also accept his view that a random combination of incompatible techniques (eclecticism) would not be appropriate, or desirable. On the other hand, the assimilation of theory-consistent techniques through the study of

contemporary models and practices could be seen as an ethical and responsible pursuit. If the world is richer than we perceive it (O'Connor & Seymour, 1993, p.24) expanding our view of the world would always afford us greater personal growth and the attainment of professional excellence and success.

Wubbolding's train analogy illustrates the relationship between RT and CT with elegant simplicity: a train track needs a train to fulfill its purpose. On the other hand, without the train the track is useless. The reality therapy procedures are the delivery system or train, on the track of choice theory (2010, p.27). The analogy can be extended to illustrate the essence of this argument; if we were to add an 'extra carriage' to that train, the carriage would need to be compatible with the type of track the train travels on. That is, the new carriage (with other procedures and strategies) might look different to the other RT carriages, but it needs to be compatible with the 'rail track' I am using: the beliefs of CT (Glasser, 1998).

Choice Theory (Glasser, 1998) underpins Reality Therapy, the counseling method. The theory rests on self-evident truths declared in 10 axioms. With RT, clients are guided to more effective choices in order to achieve need satisfaction and, therefore, greater happiness. The goal of reality therapy is neither insight about underlying causes of problems nor resolution of unconscious conflicts (Wubbolding, 2000, p.10). It is about honest evaluation of present behaviors, the development of personal insight and, most of all, about helping people make concrete plans to maintain the relationships with the people they need in their lives.

My journey into NLP: rummaging through the outside world; the Real World (Glasser 1998).

Most of us engage in reading naturally. That is, we find what we want from the Real World through our sensory system. Only what is meaningful to us passes through our Perceptual System, first through our personal Total Knowledge Filter and then through our Valuing Filter. Glasser (2002, p.11) states that we compare all we know, or are trying to find out about, with all we want – the need satisfying pictures in our Quality World. As a RT therapist, the philosophy of choice, CT (Glasser, 1998) constitutes the greater part of my Valuing Filter. Therefore, as I read, I find myself critically selecting any hypothesis echoing CT (Glasser, 1998), my frame of reference. Furthermore, the motivation to find the techniques that are most congruent to my personal style is as immediate as is the desire to finally incorporate them into the rest of my professional 'tool box'.

Neuro-Linguistic Programming: A trigger? Or a bait?

The name was, indeed, an object of curiosity. Learning that Virginia Satir, one of the finest family psychologists, had been instrumental in the creation of NLP, persuaded me to read some more. Her words certainly speak the CT language. They were adopted by NLP as one of their presuppositions: 'behind every behavior there is a positive intention.' In Satir's own words:

That a behavior has a positive intention in no way implies that the behavior is the best way of fulfilling the intention.

A positive intention may be only for oneself or a part of oneself - not necessarily for others, all parts of oneself, or oneself as a whole.

Behaviors include conscious and unconscious thoughts, emotions, and responses, as well as symptoms, words and actions which can be observed externally (Hoag, 2010).

These thoughts resonate with my beliefs: all any living creature can do is behave and all behaviors are total. All behaviors are internally motivated, purposeful, flexible and creative. No matter how painful or self-destructive it appears, every behavior is always a person's best attempt to get what s/he wants at that time (Glasser, 2005).

Defined as the art and science of personal excellence (O'Connor & Seymour, 1993, p.21), the main ideas behind the peculiar name, Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP), made sense to me. The controversial story of NLP intrigued me and a comparative analysis of its beliefs and tools against the tenets of CT was, by then, inevitable.

The Oxford English Dictionary (September, 2009) defines NLP as a model of interpersonal communication chiefly concerned with the relationship between successful patterns of behavior and the subjective experiences (esp. patterns of thought) underlying them; a system of alternative therapy based on this which seeks to educate people in self-awareness and effective communication, and to change their patterns of mental and emotional behavior (under 'neuro-linguistic programming').

NLP was the outcome of an investigation by John Grinder (a linguist) and Richard Bandler (a student of psychology) back in 1972. They had studied the fundamental patterns underlying the successful therapeutic methods used by three outstanding therapists: Fritz Perls (Gestalt therapist), Virginia Satir (family therapist) and Milton Erickson (hypnotherapist), each, working within very different frameworks. Grinder and Bandler departed from a single belief: if one human has done it, that means it is humanly possible – and if it is humanly possible any human can learn to do it. A theory was not of concern to the creators of NLP; what was important was to produce a model of successful therapy.

NLP is defined by each term in its name (appropriately enough from a linguistic angle!): "neuro" refers to their fundamental belief that behavior is neurologically initiated by our 5 senses; "linguistic" recognizes the part that language plays in communication with others and the organization of our thoughts. Finally, "programming" refers to the human ability to organize thoughts and actions to produce outcomes. In the words of Bandler (2008, p.5): we are meta-programmable. In a nutshell, NLP declares its métier in its title: how we organize what we see, hear and feel, how we edit and filter the outside world through our senses, and how we describe it in language. Most importantly, how we act to produce results (O'Connor & Seymour, 1993, p.23).

Looking for a common thread:

Issues of insufficient scientific basis (mainly little experimental/ empirical research) have plagued the NLP's approach. Originally, in 1970, NLP was promoted as an effective and rapid form of psychological therapy (for the treatment of phobias, depression, psychosomatic illness and learning disorders). It quickly developed in two directions; as a process to discover patterns responsible for excellence and as an effective way of communicating and thinking. The model focuses on how we send and receive messages, how we process them and how the information puts us in a particular state which, ultimately, influences our outcomes (NLP-Mentor.com). Not surprisingly, NLP's greatest influence is in management and training, life coaching, and in the self-help industry. The developers of NLP declare that research, to prove that what they offer works, is not needed since the evidence is in the result. The main criticism of NLP today is their lack of professional training standards (Schütz, 2006).

Similarly, since its beginnings in 1965, RT has had a fair share of reproach. Not being scientific enough, too simplistic and therefore not a legitimate modality of treatment, were some of the claims leveled against it. It serves to point out that criticism and controversy have, historically, been part and parcel of the introduction of novel ideas or systems of therapy. Furthermore, it is common for their creators to be ostracized by peers (Rosenthal, 2006). Dr. Glasser's biggest 'sin' was (as a traditionally-trained psychiatrist) to openly challenge the medical model with his approach of intrinsic motivation and control. In his book *Warning: Psychiatry Can be Hazardous to your Mental Health* (Glasser, 2003) he says: none of the people described in the DSM-IV, the official diagnostic and statistical manual of mental illness published by the American Psychological Association, are mentally ill. I do not deny the reality of their symptoms;... I do not see their symptoms as mental illness but as an indication that they are not nearly as mentally healthy as they could learn to be (Preface p.xxv).

At odds with mainstream psychiatry, RT has come a long way. As CT became its backbone, RT pushed forward and expanded throughout the world as a psycho-therapy of internal control. In June 2008, matching rigorous criteria for the scientific validation established by the European Association for Psychotherapy (EAP), RT was recognized, as a scientific psychotherapeutic method. In Australia, in June 2009, the William Glasser Institute South Australia, gained recognition from the Psychotherapy and Counseling Federation of Australia Inc. (PACFA) for their Graduate Diploma in RT. Today, under the banner of choice and responsibility, contemporary RT fits the systemic evolutionary approach to human behavior. Meanwhile, CT remains internally consistent and open to constant growth (Lojk, 2008; Wubbolding, 2009).

Comparing Axioms and presuppositions

The self-evident truths declared in 10 axioms, together with the complete body of Choice Theory (Glasser, 1998), serve me as a torch light and a compass (valuing filters) in my search for new professional tools in the outside world (the Real World). These are:

1. The only person whose behavior we can control is our own.
2. All we can give another person is information.
3. All long-lasting psychological problems are relationship problems.
4. The problem relationship is always part of our present life.
5. What happened in the past has everything to do with what we are today, but we can only satisfy our basic needs right now and plan to continue satisfying them in the future.
6. We are driven by five genetic needs: survival, love and belonging, power, freedom and fun.
7. We can only satisfy our needs by satisfying the pictures in our Quality World.
8. All any living creature can do is behave. All behavior is Total Behavior -made up of four components: acting, thinking, feeling and physiology. All behavior is internally motivated, purposeful, flexible and creative. Our behavior is always our best attempt to get what we want.
9. All Total Behavior is chosen, but we only have direct control over the acting and thinking components. We can only control our feeling and physiology indirectly through how we choose to act and think.
10. All Total Behavior is designated by verbs and named by the part that is the most recognizable.

In contrast, as a model devoid of any particular theory, NLP deals with "what works," rather than "why it works." It builds up a case on 'presuppositions'. These principles are regarded

not so much as true, but useful. NLP developers assert that by living our lives by them, personal change is possible and a successful existence is a consequence. O'Connor & Seymour (1993) enumerate these presuppositions in their seminal work, *Introducing Neuro-Linguistic Programming*. Since then, others have contributed to the NLP literature by expressing the same beliefs in their own words. Below, I will examine each presupposition in turn. I will then evaluate it against my philosophy of choice; CT.

The map is not the territory it describes. Each one of us interprets what is going on around us through our five senses. Our unique interpretation of everything we perceive is based on our own lifetime experience and builds a personal mental map of reality. This personal mental 'map' is our reality and since each one of us sees things differently, an objective reality of the world ('the territory') does not exist. When we understand this simple metaphor much of the misery and wars in the world can be explained. More importantly, our behavior, however inappropriate, bizarre, or irrational may seem to others, always "makes sense" in the context of our own "mental map." We always do what seems best from our limited view of reality (Alder, 1994). NLP is the art of changing these maps so we have greater freedom of action.

Similar concepts are part of Choice Theory. Our "Perceptual System" explains how we use our 5 senses to extract what we want from the Real World. The NLP "lifetime experience" could be closely matched to the "Knowledge and Valuing filters" (Glasser, 2005). The concept of "unbiased objectivity" is also challenged by CT since it could only exist if we all had the same "Quality Worlds" guiding our "Perceptual Systems." Aside from the shared notion, the NLP map/territory in itself offers a powerful metaphor to illustrate the uniqueness of our "Perceived Worlds." It also paints a clear picture of the reasons for our individual behavioral choices – i.e. CT Axiom # 8.

Every behavior serves a positive intention – NLP separates the intention (or purpose behind the action) from the action (the doing). The purpose of all our actions is to achieve something we value and benefits us. The person is not their behavior. The person will always choose a better behavior if it also achieves their positive intention.

CT declares that all behavior is internally motivated, purposeful, flexible and creative. It is always our best attempt to get what we want (Axiom #8). Moreover, it adds, that no matter how painful or self-destructive it appears, every total behavior is always our best attempt to get what we want. So, once again, a clear presuppositions/axioms match.

Choice is better than no choice. NLP is concerned with more options. They propose that having more choices amount to having more freedom to act. "One option is no option; two options may be a dilemma; three or more options give you the freedom to best achieve your goals" is the way NLP express the point (Alder, 1995, p.16).

One of the principal beliefs in CT is that behavior is always a choice (Axiom 9). RT guides the client towards the discovery of this fact. Awareness of this fact brings forth self-evaluation and hence the exploring of other available options to get what we want.

All genius, excellence and amazing achievement, has a structure and a strategy, and for this reason it can be learned. Possible in the world, possible for me. Models were created by observing people who are experts in their field. It was soon found that successful people use challenges, failures, negative circumstances and events in their lives (positive or negative ones) to bring about mastery. Furthermore, their feelings, their attitudes, their values, their beliefs and their vision, are the building blocks of their effective

and creative behavior. Those skills, abilities, and thinking strategies can provide the framework for copying human excellence.

In a similar way, modeling from experts is an all important part of RT training. The William Glasser Institute (WGI) faculty members demonstrate psychotherapy strategies, to students or their peers, by way of role playing. The life-modeling training strategy is also made available in DVD and CD forms. Moreover, the use vignettes, to illustrate the language of the RT therapist, is used in the works of William Glasser (2001), and Robert Wubbolding (2000). I would dare argue that NLP Modeling (codifying and mapping the art of the doing) of our most successful RT therapists would be an interesting future undertaking. Furthermore, it could make the learning process more effective!

Body and mind form an inseparable unity. Each affects the other. All behavior stems from our neurological processes of sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch and feeling. We experience the world through our five senses; we make 'sense' of the information and then act on it. Just as our behavioral cues reflect our mind, accessing a particular behavioral cue can affect the functioning of our mind.

This idea is close to CT's 'Total Behavior ' (Axiom #8 and #9). Both perspectives affirm that we are internally motivated to act on what we perceive. Mind and body become one in the pursuit of what we want.

The filters we put on our perception determine what sort of world we live in. By changing your filters, you can change your world.

Language and beliefs are powerful filters. CT considers personal knowledge, beliefs and values as the main filters ('Total Knowledge filter' and 'Valuing Filter') in the act of perceiving. NLP points to language as the most powerful one. Language (or the absence of it) is seen as a tool to change human experience. With these following words, NLP comes close to the idea in CT Axiom #2.

Words have no inbuilt meaning. The meaning of communication is the response it produces. A good communicator is someone who gets a desired response. The same is declared in CT Axiom 2: all we can give another person is information. This concept takes the emotion out of the situation/relationship. NLP links the common misunderstandings to the differences in our individual "mental maps." It proposes to use the response to our message to guide our effort in avoiding a communication breakdown. The process of communication becomes a means to an end. In this way it can be changed or terminated as required. Communication, from the CT (1998) perspective, is essential within the act of connecting with others (and forming relationships) too. Language would be motivated by our desire to connect with others (satisfying our need of 'love and belonging'). Thus, the use of language and CT connective behaviors could be regarded as a way of getting the outcome we want.

There is no failure, only feedback. What happens is neither good nor bad, but merely information. Alder says (1995, p.17): "if you crunched the gears when learning to drive, it did not mean that you failed as a driver--just that you learned the results of changing gear in that particular way, changed behavior and benefitted accordingly. You used information, or feedback, to improve." And, "when the very concept of failure is eliminated from your map, all kinds of possibilities open up."

This process of "re-framing" in NLP is equivalent to that of "flipping" or "turning the statement around" in Reality Therapy –the process of shifting the perspective from which

the situation is being looked at or showing the same situation in a positive way. The idea that the words we use change our thinking is primordial to the neuro-linguistic model. I think that we are shaped by our thoughts and, in my experience, affirmations (words) affect "Total Behavior."

The difference lies not in the world, but in the filters through which we perceive it.

Narrow beliefs, interests, and perceptions will make the world impoverished, predictable, and dull. The very same world can be rich and exciting for the curious and open-minded.

Subjective perception is at the base of ineffective behavior. Automatic ineffective behavior is related to perceiving inadequately; our filters have missed important information. The process of unlearning can create a new, more effective behavior to replace the bad habit.

The RT process of self-evaluation assists people to challenge their ineffective thinking/behavior. The role of the therapist is to help them become aware when their behavior choices are not leading to the results they are looking for and to encourage them to consider other options.

Four stages of learning are connected to all new behavior. The learning ladder starts at unconscious incompetence (we do not know and we are unaware of the skill) which is followed by conscious incompetence (we realize we do not have the skill), and then by conscious competence (we practice the skill long enough) to finally reach unconscious competence (it becomes automatic, a habit). The notion of conscious and unconscious is central to NLP's model of how we learn. When it becomes necessary to unlearn something in order to correct it; relearning involves moving on from the point of conscious incompetence.

The NLP four learning stages provide us with another way to explain the process of replacing ineffective habits to our clients. Any of our automatic learned behaviors can illustrate the sequence and demonstrate that the skills we master take some conscious effort and practice first!

At this point in my personal journey, those broken lines at the other side of the "Valuing filter" in the CT Chart (Glasser, 2005) showed solid for me; NLP fits with my beliefs, it is useful and applicable. Moreover, the following presuppositions made me think: 'this is CT in its purest form!'

If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you've always gotten. If what you are doing is not working do something else.

Successful outcomes involve things over which we have control. We do not have control over what other people think, say, do, or feel.

We create our own experience and therefore, we are responsible for what happens to us.

Ultimately, H. Alder (1995, p.10). attests: "There are four steps to success: know what you want, take action , learn to notice the results of what you do, be prepared to change your behavior until you get the result you are after. Deciding means committing." These words could easily be translated to the RT (Glasser, 2001) mantra: "What you do you want?" "Is that realistic and responsible?" "If it is, are you getting it?" "If you are not, what else can you do to get it?" And throughout it all the idea of responsibility and that of Axiom # 1: "The only person whose behavior we can control is our own!"

Common threads in models, strategies, techniques, outcomes

There is definitely a common thread linking axioms and presuppositions. It would seem logical that these core ideas would permeate the methods used by both, i.e., RT and the art of NLP. Now, if how I feel is my best indicator of getting what I want (Glasser, 1998, 2001) and what I am looking for, the ratification of some valuable NLP tools for my kit should be straightforward. My "scales" (Glasser, 2005) have indeed begun to balance!

In an attempt to garner support for my argument I will describe the NLP strategies and the techniques that fit with the RT WDEP therapy structure (Wubbolding, 2000) – What do you Want, what are you Doing, Evaluation (Is it working? What else can you do?) and Plan. I will select the ones that could, potentially, enrich and enlarge the skills I offer as a counselor.

Many of these tools for change originate from modeling the behavioral patterns identified by Bandler and Grinder while observing those outstanding therapists around 1972; Perl, Satir and Erickson. Their personal "strategies" (also called "mental syntax")—"what they did inside their heads when they did what they did" (James,1999), were compiled into an elegant model: the NLP Model.

The models presented a set of specific actions which Bandler and Grinder deemed implicit in the outstanding outcomes obtained by these therapists. They claimed that the magic they performed --psychotherapy--like any other complex human activity such as painting, composing music, or placing a man on the moon--has a structure which is learnable (Bandler & Grinder, 1975). Different sets of tools were provided by the next two NLP models: The Milton Model--inspired by Milton H. Erickson, the pioneer of medical hypnosis--and the Meta-Model, a language model. A set of questions designed to find explicit meaning in a person's communication is presented with a view to changing our "maps of the world."

I will select a few from a myriad of strategies and therapeutic intervention techniques derived from these models.

Strategies

We all use strategies for everything we do; for learning, for parenting, to show hate or love, for playing sports, for communication, in sales, to obtain happiness, health or wealth, or simply to have fun. Generally, we tend to use the same strategy if it has delivered good results before. When the strategy does not produce the result we expect or like, we try to do what others do to get what we desire. So, the idea of modeling "tried and tested" successful strategies makes good sense! Furthermore, the RT model supports the therapist's direct input as the client searches for behavioral options to come to a "plan of action" (Glasser, 2002, 2005).

The NLP argument is that in order to help modify someone's unsuccessful strategy, we need to discover its structure. That is, how people organize their thinking, how they manage their internal and external resources--the sequences of images, sounds, sensations' internal dialogue, tastes and smells (mental representations). The NLP recipe for eliciting a strategy is "to ask" (**formal elicitation** with a series of steps) or, use the steps in a relaxed conversation (**informal elicitation**) while listening, watching their eyes (eye cues), attending to the order and sequence the modalities--visual (pictures), auditory (sounds), kinesthetic (feelings), olfactory (smells), or gustatory (tastes), also "talking to self." Everyone has a modality preference (or two) for taking the world in (James, 1999).

Example of an informal elicitation (James, 1999).

We can elicit someone's decision-making strategy just by saying. 'Hey, love your shirt, how did you decide to buy it?' and then just listen and watch. Listen for the phrases words, watch the eye movement patterns, and attend to the other nonverbal cues.

James (1999) states that the strategy elicitation from eye movements ("eye cues" technique) is extremely powerful, but training and practice, to use it correctly, is necessary. Once we discover someone's strategy (their thinking, preference) we can choose the same sensory preference to communicate with that person. That is, we can choose to if your own preference is different, knowing about the other person's preference, and understanding how this knowledge can be used to achieve rapport, can help you become very influential in your dealings with others. Enlightening, motivating, persuading and influencing other people becomes easier when we convey new information in the order and manner they naturally process it.

Techniques

Rapport is an extremely powerful NLP technique for its implications and effects. There is no doubt that establishing rapport is also essential to the client/counselor connection within the RT session. The process of the personal strategy elicitation could become one more way of establishing rapport. Other key technique to establish it, is "**matching**" (also called "**mirroring**" or "**pacing**"). This requires adopting similar body language first, then matching voice pitch and tone, and finally using the person's words (the same words to describe things and processes). The procedure is carried out subtly and without haste. There are two extensions to this technique, "**Cross-Over Matching**" and "**Mismatching**," which are deemed useful with someone who is depressing seriously. The first suggests that, instead of matching their behavior you adopt the person's rhythm by moving your foot or finger at the same time. "Mismatching," on the other hand, looks like a very useful skill to master. It is used to break rapport and find some space to think. It is done in a variety of ways; breaking eye contact by looking at your watch, brushing an imaginary piece of fluff off your arm or standing up. You may also choose to mismatch with your voice by speaking faster or louder.

Creating Metaphors for Change is an NLP technique used for suggesting the use of new strategies and resources, indirectly, to get the desired outcomes. An "NPL metaphor" includes analogies, similes, jokes, stories, parables and allegories. Because a metaphor can create graphic and memorable images in the mind, its use is also favored in RT. Metaphors can motivate or undermine a person since it can leave a lasting image in one's mind. Mostly, they can be used to instigate creativity and solve complex problems and to deliver profound truths. In fact, metaphors are used in everyday conversations for conveying ideas without causing offense or instilling hostility and for inspiring and motivating people. NLP offers a method for their creation and their usage in communication. It is important to point out that there are some NLP metaphors which are used for inducing a trance or communicating with a person in a trance which, after a very broad superficial investigation, were filtered out by one's "Perceptual System" (Glasser, 2005).

NLP Anchoring is a powerful process that, whether we are aware of it or not, is constantly affecting us. We respond quickly to the sound of a bell, a red or green light, a melody, a siren, a cry, a certain smell or a certain activity. These anchors (triggers) are similar to those used by advertisers – brand names, catchy tunes or images- to lure us to their products. Anchors can, instantly, change our state of mind no matter how busy we are. Many of them help us survive but some are no longer useful to us. NLP provides us with a method to create new anchors to replace those and, in turn, facilitate the management of our mind state.

In this sense an anchor is set up to be triggered by a consciously chosen stimulus, deliberately linked by practice to a known useful state in order to provide reflexive access to that state at will. Here is an example:

If, I asked, "Is this why you got married? So you could argue? Is that what you were thinking about at the time?" Then I looked at him. I said, "When you first decided you wanted to spend your life with your wife, what was on your mind then?" Talk about something worth anchoring! Chheeeeeessshhhh! Because I wanted that glow in his face, I anchored it. Then, every time she started to bring up a subject, I fired off [re-triggered] the anchor. He'd look at her with that look of passion. That will re-anchor the crap out of a relationship. I like that maneuver. As I did this, the husband kept saying "I know you're anchoring me and it's not working." And she kept saying "It is working! It is working!" It's fun. [...] It wasn't about lost control. He was such a [control freak](#) he couldn't have some kinds of experiences he wanted. (Bandler, 1993, pp.133 - 134)

NLP Reframing is not unlike the RT technique. It is based on the idea that the meaning of a situation depends on our own point of view. It follows that if we are successful in changing the setting of this situation, we can change its meaning, its context and our reaction to it. For example, when we perceive something as 'a liability,' the message we deliver to our brain is exactly that. In turn, the brain will prepare us for that 'liability'— our reality— through physical states (fear, panic, anxiety, etc). If, instead, we paused and looked at the same situation from a different point of view (a change in our frame of reference) we can change the way we respond. The belief is: "change your representation or perception about anything and your states and behaviors will instantly change" (Robbins, 1987, p.291).

From the various reframing techniques NLP offers "Points of View" and "Sleigh of Mouth" seem fitting and useful within my CT/RT frameworks. **Points of View** (Alder, 1994, p.143) opens up the problems we have involving a second person, which are usually expressed as beliefs —"She does not understand me," or "He will never change his ways." The process uses the following trigger words: 'good, bad, right, wrong, stupid, smart, better, worse' to elicit new points of view in the format "**It's smart that** he won't change **because it** requires less effort than a change." Far from solving "the problem" the technique flexibility of thought is developed and the emotive reaction to it is lessened.

Sleigh of Mouth, another NLP re-framing technique that generates an answer from a different angle to each complaint. It requires some skill and creativity. It can be easily used on ourselves as well as on others. As an example adapted from Alder's book (1994, p.145), if I were to say 'I'll never finish this essay', the possible angles for a response would include:

- positive outcomes – 'if you keep at it, you will'
- negative ones – 'it would be such a shame not to see it finished after so much work'
- different outcome – 'you chose the challenge, you can also choose to walk away from it'
- a metaphor – 'if you believe you can you will'
- a different timeframe – 'when it is finished it won't feel so bad'
- a model of the world – 'in a race, the winner is never one of those who have given up'
- personal values – 'is this essay important in your scheme of things?'
- redefinition – 'would a rest and a new deadline help?'
- chunk up – 'print it, do a final edit and submit it'
- chunk down – 'leaving it for a day might give you a breather'
- counter-examples – 'not everything we set out to do is perfect' and
- positive intention – 'you are doing great, in no time you'll have it ready'

Conclusion

I have taken you along my journey into the outside world ("Real World"). This time, guided by my principles, values and knowledge, I searched for new and compatible tools to add to my professional kit. Motivated by my needs of power (excellence, achievement and personal growth), fun (learning), and freedom (trying something new), I attempted to become the best psychotherapist I can be (in my "Quality World"). I found myself embracing the principles and some of the techniques presented by NLP which echoed the experience of my initial encounter with CT (Glasser, 1998). I surrendered once more to this "fire-in-the-belly" research (Wubbolding, R., 2000, p.203) process. The language of NLP matched my own language. It became an all-absorbing critical reading pursuit. At the end, I selected a few of these new ideas and techniques to ride, on a separate carriage, as part of my "RT train on the CT rail track!" (Wubbolding, Robey, & Brickell, 2010).

I discovered that NLP is a huge resource for how to do things more effectively. The map of human behavior that it offers differs from that of CT in the massive importance given to communication and language. That issue aside, I found that choice, trust, and commitment reek from each of their strategies and techniques. NLP empowers and teaches: we are told we can make changes in the way we feel, think and behave and that all the resources are within us. We are told that we can learn to be better communicators, better observers, and/or better listeners. Ultimately, we are shown how to do it. I have no doubt that I found a storehouse of powerful tools. Notwithstanding, a meticulous study and consideration of individual techniques would be crucial if their final integration into our toolbox is the aim.

Finally, a concluding quote which comes very close to the core of this essay: the issue of comparing different approaches - the sum of our experiences, actions and observations, that very process that Karl R. Popper (1979) calls "horizon of expectations."

"Observations have a peculiar function within this frame. They can, in certain circumstances, destroy even the frame itself if they clash with certain expectations. In such cases they can have an effect upon our horizon of expectation like a bombshell. This bombshell may force us to reconstruct, or rebuild, our whole horizon of expectations; that is to say, we may have to correct our expectations and fit them together again into something like a consistent whole. We can say that in this way our horizon of expectations is raised to and reconstructed on a higher level, and that we reach in this way a new stage in the evolution of our experience; a stage in which those expectations which have not been hit by the bomb are somehow incorporated into the horizon, while those parts of the horizon which have suffered damage are repaired and rebuilt. This has to be done in such a manner that the damaging observations are no longer felt as disruptive, but are integrated with the rest of our expectations" (Popper, 1979, p.34).

References

Alder, H. (1995). *NLP -the new art and science of getting what you want*. London: Judy Piatkus Ltd.

Assay, T. P., & Lambert, M. J. (1999). The empirical case for the common factors in therapy: Quantitative findings. In M. A. Hubble, B. L. Duncan, & S. D. Miller (Eds.), *The heart and soul of change: What works in therapy* (p.33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1975). *The Structure of Magic, Vol. I: A Book About Language and Therapy*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Bandler, R. (1993). *Time for a change*. Cupertino, CA: Meta Publications

Bandler, R. (2008). *Richard Bandler's Guide to Trance-formation: How to Harness the Power of Hypnosis to Ignite Effortless and Lasting Changes*. FL: Health Communications Inc.

Botella, L. (1998a). Clinical Psychology, Psychotherapy, and Mental Health: Contemporary Issues and Future Dilemmas. *International Journal of Psychotherapy*, 3, 255-263. (a copy can be read online: <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/virtual/Clinical.htm>)

Bolte, Taylor, Jill, PhD. (2009). *My Stroke of Insight –A Brain Scientist's Personal Journey*. London: Plume, a member of Penguin Group (USA) Inc.

Doidge, Norman, M.D. (2007). *The Brain that Changes Itself: stories of personal triumph from the frontiers of brain science*, NY: Penguin Group USA.

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice Theory: a new psychology for personal freedom*. NY: Harper Collins.

Glasser, W. (2001). *Counseling with Choice Theory: The New Reality Therapy*. NY: Harper Collins.

Glasser, W. (2002). *Chart Talk – A Choice Theory Chart Workbook*. (Rev. C. Glasser).

Glasser, W. (2003). *Warning: psychiatry can be hazardous to your mental health*. NY: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.

Glasser, W. (2005). *Choice Theory – Why and how we behave- A diagram of the brain as a control system*.

Hoag, J. D. (website) retrieved 04 Mar 2010 from <http://www.nlpls.com/articles/positiveIntent.php>

James, T. (1999), NLP Strategies – The mind-Body Connection to Behavior. Retrieved 20 Jan 2010 from <http://www.nlpcoaching.com>

Lojk, L. (2008). Answer to question. Retrieved 18/01/2010 from http://www.udrugahurt.hr/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/leon_lojks_answer_about_rt_eng.pdf

Miller, S. Hubble, M. A., & Duncan, B. L. (2007). Supershrinks: What is the secret of their success? Retrieved 10 Feb 2010 from http://www.psychotherapy.net/article/Scott_Miller_Supershrinks#bio

O'Connor, J. & Seymour, J. (1993). *Introducing NLP, Psychological Skills for Understanding and Influencing People*. London, UK: Thorsons.

Oxford English Dictionary. (2009). *Draft Revision*. Retrieved Jan, 2010 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neurolinguistic_programming

Popper K. R. (1979). *Objective Knowledge, An Evolutionary Approach*. (Rev Ed.). NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Robbin, A. (1987). *Unlimited Power*. NY: Ballantine.

Robinson, B. (2009). When therapist variables and the client's theory of change meet. *Psychotherapy in Australia*, 15 (4). VIC: PsychOz Publications.

Rosenthal, H. (2006). *Therapy's Best: Practical Advice and Gems of Wisdom from Twenty Accomplished Counselors and Therapists*. NY: Haworth Press Inc.

Schütz, P. (2006). A consumer guide through the multiplicity of NLP certification training: A European perspective. Retrieved Jan, 2010 from <http://www.nlpzentrum.at/institutsvgl-english.htm>

Wubbolding, R. E. (2000). *Reality Therapy for the 21st Century*. Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge

Wubbolding, R. E. (2009). 2029: Headline or Footnote? Mainstream or Backwater? Cutting Edge or Trailing Edge? Included or Excluded from the Professional World? *International Journal of Reality Therapy*. 29(1), 27.

Wubbolding, Robert E., Robey, P., & Brickell, J. (2010). A Partial and Tentative Look at the Future of Choice Theory, Reality Therapy and Lead Management. *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, 29 (2), 25.

Brief Bio

Ines Pintos-López discovered Reality Therapy and Choice Theory after completing a bachelor's degree in psychology, as a mature-age student, at the Australian National University in 2005. She gained WGI Certification in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in 2008 and she is currently completing the WGI/South Australia Grad Dip. Her goal is to work as a counselor where she lives now--on the Gold Coast (Queensland, Australia)--and to teach Choice Theory in Argentina, her home country. She can be contacted at inespintoslopezrt@gmail.com

BEYOND CHOICE THEORY: USING LANGUAGE TO TAKE EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF YOUR LIFE

Bryan Zeman, B.A., B.Ed., PGD., CTRTC

Abstract

People use language every day to create, think about, and express their views of their lives. They use their language as they have learned it without much awareness or thought about the life problems they create for themselves. They give up effective control of their lives through using language in disowning and irresponsible ways. They simply don't know how they could reclaim control of their lives if they learned to take control of their language. When people are aware of choosing to use language responsibly, they are more able to accept ownership for how their lives turn out. They are less likely to blame other people, events, or situations for how they feel, how they think, or how they behave. By gaining a better understanding of words, structure, and semantics, they can more likely become fully responsible for and take control of their lives.

Things happen in our lives that we notice, but don't pay attention to in terms of the effects and the costs. In a relatively short period of time, we have gone from having one land line in our homes to communication devices that are now fully mobile and constantly with us. Studies on how people use cell phones and PDAs in their lives indicate that the majority of users have lost sight of the number of times they check their devices, the amount of time they spend on them, and how their lives revolve around them. Blackberries are not nicknamed "crackberries" for nothing.

Just as we may take our communication device behaviors for granted, without critical examination as to what we are doing and what it is costing us, we can easily get into habits of language use without conscious awareness of the connection between the way we use language and how we can either defeat or enhance the outcomes we aspire to achieve in our lives.

Not all people know about—or relate positively to—the concept of claiming control of their lives through the effective use of language. How we came to this level of oblivion about how we function has a number of sources. An interesting speculation is how our language and, therefore, our thinking, behaviors and feelings might be quite different today if Alfred Korzybski, the founder of General Semantics, had become popular (and understood), rather than one of his contemporaries, i.e., Sigmund Freud.

Even though Freud said that "Sometimes a cigar is just a cigar," much of what he created was a system in which most of our miseries and dysfunctions are the result of someone in our past, events that we haven't dealt with, and our feelings are created by these past situations. Korzybski (1994) developed a comprehensive understanding for the language of ownership and responsibility. He showed how we can let words control us, as though they were the actual things or events, or we can claim our lives and chose our words and expressions with attention. Aristotelian logic is based on yes/no, cause/effect thinking. It works well with some of the sciences (and certainly computer languages), but not with people. Korzybski applied non-Aristotelian thinking to the use of language and how people could exercise choice and take control of their lives. However, Freud became popular and Korzybski didn't.

This was at a time in history when psychiatry and psychology were fledgling activities and it seems that those involved wanted to legitimize and elevate these fields as sciences. People believed in sciences because the scientific method was used to prove the theories. Science was based in facts. So psychiatry, and later psychology, adopted the scientific method as a way to become "real" sciences. Once mental conditions and various syndromes were labeled and described, then they must exist. If there was no directly observable causative factor, then one had to be created. Treatments abounded from long-term analysis to tortuous actions. Finally, pharmaceuticals became available and the answer to all the questions had been found.

This reliance on the so-called "medical/pharmaceutical model" continues and expands today. The DSM V will be ready for publication by 2013. From what I have read in a variety of sources there are a number of changes coming. For one thing, there are going to be considerably more disorders in the volume. As a result, the amount of psychotropic drugs prescribed will continue to increase well beyond the current levels. While there have been no identifiable causative factors or physical evidence for all these "disorders", the medical community believes in the descriptions and treats (or masks) the symptoms with pharmacological products. One of the new disorders being considered for inclusion, Embitterment Syndrome, might be interesting in workplaces. It says that poor workplace management systems and toxicity in the work environment will make people stressed and mentally ill. Their work will make them bitter and twisted. (These affected people will probably need drugs and considerable time off to not get any better.) The medical community supports mental disorders as conditions that inflict themselves on people through no fault or involvement of their own. The pharmaceutical industry funds research that supports this view and continues to thrive on the industry. They perpetuate each other. (The medical community often ignores current research which shows that placebos and name brand antidepressants achieve similar results. The placebos also have no side-effects.)

This is a lot of history and momentum to confront. Many people have invested their careers to support and benefit from maintaining and advancing the status quo of External Control Psychology. Many people who have been given diagnostic labels find a bit of status and notoriety in their symptoms. To challenge this entrenched view of things will be hard and worth the effort. I suggest there are everyday things that can be questioned that will eventually create a clearer perspective on how humans can gain effective control of their lives.

"When I use a word, "Humpty Dumpty said . . ." in rather a scornful tone, it means just what I choose it to mean -- neither more nor less. We give words their meanings. We don't often appreciate that we then allow the words to control or impact our lives in ways we don't notice, but fully experience to our detriment. Take for example, when someone says "I can't...." to something they are biologically and physically able to do. What does that statement mean? It could mean, "I could but I don't want to", "I would like to do that but don't want to put in the work required", or "I don't do it well, so it is easier for me to say I am incapable". Seldom does it really mean, "I am unable".

Try this little experiment by yourself or better yet with someone else doing the experiment with you. Think of something that other people can do well and you, for whatever reasons, don't do. It could be something like playing a musical instrument, playing a sport, or making a presentation in public. Write down your statement- "I can't play the piano." Say it out loud to your partner (or yourself). Now repeat your statement with one change. Instead of saying "can't", replace it with "won't" and repeat your sentence, "I won't play the piano".

Now ask yourself or your partner, "Which is more true, I can't or I won't?" Using "won't" makes a clear choice. There is no hiding or pretense. With which word do you feel stronger?

We have a number of words that we use and oblige ourselves without wanting to be obliged. "I should...", "I have to", "I must..." are all used to respond to conditions we really don't want to do but think/feel we ought to. Write down some of your shoulds, musts, have tos, and oughts. "I should join a gym someday." Now again, alone or with a partner, say your sentence out loud. Repeat it, only this time decide whether this is something you will do or won't do and say your sentence using "will" or "won't" instead of "should". With which sentence do you feel more in control of what you are doing? Saying "I will, or I won't, or I choose ..." claims possession of your decisions and subsequent actions.

Teaching people to "reframe" what they are saying so they claim more ownership of their reality is a powerful way to help people become more effective and responsible in their lives. People who refer to themselves as "you", "we", "one" or in the third person rather than "I" are avoiding ownership or distancing themselves from the parts they refuse to own or embrace. When I am working with someone and he/she says "You feel embarrassed when", I will ask "Who are you?" or I will ask the person to reframe the statement by speaking personally. "I feel embarrassed when....."

One of the most damaging phrases in language creates the illusion that a person, an event, or a situation is in control of how people think, feel, behave, and manifest their bodily systems. Any sentence that has a component of something or someone outside of ourselves "**making**" us something we wouldn't be by our own choice is a disowning way of experiencing the world. More importantly, "You turn me on" or "You turn me off" are popular ways of looking at relationships. (Another person is in charge of your desire or lack of it.) People "fall in love" without any apparent volition or choice on their part. "I need you to motivate me." "You (or the traffic, the news, the weather ...) are driving me crazy!" "It's your fault I never became Prime Minister (or something equally stupid)". "That sickens me!" "You inspire me." As W.C. Fields said, "A woman drove me to drink. I never had the courtesy to thank her"

In Counseling with Choice Theory, Dr. Glasser discusses how nourishing relationships are key to becoming responsible and effective in our lives. He uses the Marvin Udell character, played by Jack Nicholson, in the movie *As Good As It Gets* to illustrate how a person can reclaim his life. Marvin has been diagnosed as OCD. He does have a lot of habits that interfere in how he lives. He lets a couple of people—and a dog—enter his life and through the course of the movie, he manifests some major changes in his behaviors and beliefs. Even though he created the changes, as he builds a blossoming relationship with the Carol Connelly character, played by Helen Hunt, he still uses the words of External Control Psychology and says, "You made me want to become a better man."

Our popular culture is full of disowning, irresponsible language. Most of the songs about love or painful relationships have a recurring theme of how other people are responsible for 'making' others feel and behave- "You Light Up My Life" was very popular at weddings a few years ago. Many songs suggest ownership or possession of others. "You Belong To Me" is an old example. Listen to interviews on TV or radio. "How did that make you feel?" is a very common and disowning way for asking "How did you feel when happened?" The latter sentence invites people to be aware that they create the meaning they give their lives and to claim ownership for what they are experiencing. The former encourages people to disclaim ownership.

"A mistake was made" is a popular way to weaseling out of saying "I messed up". "The talks broke down" suggests that when people are apparently unwilling to communicate and negotiate . . . say it was the 'talks' fault. "We had a failure to communicate" often stands for people who don't express themselves well or for people who refuse to listen to what others have to say. The "marriage broke down" (and the couple, individually or collectively, had nothing to do with it). "Mondays make me sad". "I can't be human until I have had my morning coffee." The list can go on and unless we take the time to be aware of what we are saying and how we are allowing the expressions to shape our lives, we are more out of control than in control.

As people who apply RT/CT in our work and our lives, we never need to ask a "Why?" question when referring to a human behavior. The answer to any "Why" question ultimately comes down to "Because." If we want to encourage people to seek excuses, rationalizations, or justifications to excuse their choices then "why?" is a great question. If you ask a driver "Why did you drive in the wrong lane?" the answer will probably be something like, "That idiot was going too slow," "Didn't you see that? He cut me off!" or "This traffic is driving me crazy!"

We know people always are behaving and attempting to satisfy their needs as they have learned to do it. They behave as they do because they thought it might work. It was the best they could think of at the time. So a better question is "Which of the basic needs is this person trying to meet and how can I help him find a better way to achieve it?"

When I conduct seminars or workshops concerning language, I often hear comments such as "Why weren't we ever taught this information at home or in school?" The answer, of course, is that most people haven't considered the ideas about "who" or "what" controls their lives. (Instead, they have learned language which supports "External Control Psychology" and they accept it as "true". As you know, External Control Psychology is predicated on the idea that external events, people, and ideas control our lives.) By contrast, Choice Theory explains how meaning is in us, not in the world around us. We use our filters, perceptual and valuing, to process the sensory input we take in. The information we pay attention to is simply information. There is nothing outside of us that controls how we think, act, and feel. Based on the meaning we give to the input, as we think we received it, we evaluate it to decide whether we like it or not. We then choose our behavioral response to the incoming information. We also decide how we feel about our personal version of reality and choose an emotion to represent our experience. Our physiology system simply supplies the chemicals we need to behave how we choose at each moment. In Choice Theory terms, every behavior is a Total Behavior and ends in an 'ing' to show it is what we are choosing to do.

Dr. Glasser's goal has consistently been "Teaching the world Choice Theory". If we truly want to promote the concepts of Choice Theory, then I suggest we would want to re-examine the words, expressions, and structure of the language we use in teaching and training. In other words, unless we choose language which fully supports the concepts of Choice Theory, then there will always be a disconnect between what people attempt to learn so they can gain more effective control in their lives and the language for learning how they can actually do so.

References

Carroll, Lewis. (1865). *Alice in wonderland*- McMillan.

Glasser, William. (1999). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: Harper Collins, Publishers.

Glasser, William. (2001). *Counseling with choice theory*. New York: Harper Collins, Publishers.

Korzybski, Alfred. (1994). *Science and sanity- An introduction to non-Aristotelian systems and general semantics*- Institute of General Semantics.

Hayakawa, S. I., and Hayakawa, A. R. (1990). *Language in thought and action*. Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, Publishers.

Brief Bio

Bryan Zeman, B.A., B.Ed., PGD, is Reality Therapy Certified and a Level I Practicum Supervisor. He is a Teacher/Therapist in the Saskatoon Correctional Centre. He also offers training programs in Communication Skills, Facilitation Skills, and Program Development.

RESOURCES for TEACHING and LEARNING CHOICE THEORY and REALITY THERAPY, Part I

Robert E. Wubbolding, Ed.D. Director of Training, The William Glasser Institute Director of the Center for Reality Therapy Professor Emeritus, Xavier University

John Brickell, DC

Director of Training, Institute for Reality Therapy, United Kingdom

Director, Centre for Reality Therapy, United Kingdom

Abstract

This article is the first of a series reviewing various publications that apply choice theory and reality therapy. Most are self-published and some are teacher-made materials for use in classrooms. These authors have expended energy and resources, tested their efforts and are willing to share the fruits of their work. They utilize the work of William Glasser and others in order to enrich the lives of their students and clients. Other individuals wishing to have their work reviewed should mail a copy to Robert E. Wubbolding at 7672 Montgomery Road #383, Cincinnati OH 45236, USA.

History

William Glasser developed reality therapy in a correctional institution and a mental hospital and published his seminal book Reality Therapy in 1965. The ideas spread to schools (1968, 1990, 1993), marriage relationships (Glasser, 2007), and management (Wubbolding, 1996). Others have further extended these ideas (Wubbolding & Brickell, 1999), and have researched the effectiveness of reality therapy procedures (Lojk, 1986; Parish & Parish, 1999; Passarro, Moon, Wiest, & Wong, 2004). A vast number of training DVDs are now available from a variety of publishers. Books have been translated into Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Croatian, Hebrew and other languages to serve populations around the world.

Because the materials reviewed below are, for the most part, privately published they have not received the notoriety they deserve. These reviews attempt to acknowledge the contributions of authors who have developed tools for a wide range of consumers.

Pete's Pathogram: Pathway to Success, (2008). Arlin V. Peterson

Publisher: Action Printing.

Intended audience: Adult professionals.

This compact book presents the rationale, suggestions for use, instructions for completing the pathogram and a summary of several research projects as well as an overview of choice theory/reality therapy. Although there are many derivations, Peterson is the originator of instruments for measuring the perceived need strength, time invested and success achieved. He demonstrates his contributions with research dating from 1988 and continuing until the late 1990's. Anyone interested in research related to need strength will benefit from this readable and handy book written by the originator of this instrument.

The Art of Promoting Choice, (2010). Lucy Billings Robbins

Publisher: lucybillings@earthlink.net

Intended audience: Inexperienced counselors.

Written for neophyte counselors Billings Robbins presents specific and useable tools for implementing choice theory and practicing reality therapy. She clearly presents 10 techniques for assisting counselors who wish to increase their skill levels. The first,

"question in an answer" aims at enhancing counselors' "fluency." She states, "In every answer is another question . . . each word of any answer gives an opportunity for the next question" (p. 1). Other techniques include:

- How to respond to "I don't know"
- The use of "if"
- Reframing
- The presence of a third person
- Quality world questions
- Asking specific questions
- Using the "have • do • be" technique
- Choosing the caring habits
- Role-playing

These techniques are explained in detail with sample dialogues. Though primarily for beginning counselors, this beautifully designed 52-page booklet contains practice sections and reproducible worksheets useable by anyone wishing to increase his/her skill in applying reality therapy procedures. A true contribution to the profession!

A Choice Theory Approach to Drug and Alcohol Abuse, (2009). Michael Rice

Publisher: Madeira publishing Company, www.madeirapublishing.com

Intended audience: Substance abuse workers.

This book by Michael Rice is a very practical, easy-to-read book on the topic of addiction recovery that combines both Michael's personal and professional experience with the practice of reality therapy and, in particular, the underlying concepts of choice theory. Through the lens of choice theory, Michael addresses some challenging questions in the alcohol and addictions field including addiction as a disease, addiction as a choice, the causes of addiction, and God and a Higher Power. Additionally, among many other practical ideas and suggestions, the book contains very valuable information on low self-esteem, guilt-and-shame, pleasure-versus-happiness, self-forgiveness, controlling urges and emotions, what substance abusers can expect when quitting, and finally, how to deal with relapse. The book is written in a very straight-forward and jargon-free style with numerous examples, case studies, and opportunities for self-reflection.

Choice Theory: Using Choice Theory and Reality Therapy to Enhance Student Achievement and Responsibility, (2009). Sylinda Gilchrist Banks

Publisher: American School Counselor Associates. www.schoolcounselor.org

Intended audience: School counselors and counselors in training.

This excellent workbook and resource is designed to help school counselors teach students about responsibility and choices, based on the principles of choice theory and reality therapy.

It provides a very concise, but clear explanation of choice theory, summarized by Glasser's ten axioms and, thereafter, an equally clear explanation of how the school counselor can implement choice theory concepts in practice, i.e., through the WDEP procedures of reality therapy.

Additionally, there are seven worksheets each focusing on a particular choice theory concept and providing clear directions, ideas, and processing questions that school counselors or teachers could utilize to help students internalize the concepts, identify healthy ways to satisfy their wants and needs, and self-evaluate their behavior to make better choices.

There is also a very useful chapter on teaching choice theory and reality therapy to teachers and parents that provides 22 very practically useable PowerPoint slides. Banks has provided a very well-written, practical, and easily-implemented workbook and resource for school counselors and teachers.

My Quality World Workbook, (1996). Carleen Glasser

Publisher: William Glasser Inc.

Intended audience: Grades 2 – 5.

An eminently useful resource for teaching choice theory and the WDEP system to grade school students (grades 2 – 5), this book contains practical exercises that encourage students to review their needs, wants, and/or behaviors. Students color pictures and behaviors red, green or yellow and learn the WDEP formulation (altered for primary school to WDHP). Carleen emphasizes the self-evaluation component, H = help or hurt, plans for dealing with excuses and encourages students to look closely at the consequences of their choices. Along with her other uniquely creative resources, Carleen has provided tools for use at every level of elementary and junior high school.

The Quality World Activity Set, (1996). Carleen Glasser

Publisher: William Glasser Inc www.wglasser.com or E-Mail: wglasserinc@gmail.com

Intended audience: Grades 6 – 9.

The author has granted to the user of this excellent resource the right to duplicate pages as needed for classroom instruction. For maximum benefit from the activities and worksheets she suggests placing the students in dyads or groups of 3 – 4 to discuss such ideas as basic human needs, the behavioral car, "What's it like when you don't get what you want?" (out of balance scales), choices, dealing with excuses and problem-solving, i.e., getting what you want, with the WDH(E)P system. The activities are developmental in that they can be revisited throughout the year and as children progress and mature.

How the Brain Works – Jigsaw Puzzle, (2006). Rose In-za Kim

Publisher: Korea Counseling Center, www.kccrose.com

Intended audience: Anyone wishing to learn choice theory and reality therapy.

Kim has created a jigsaw puzzle which facilitates learning the various components of choice theory and the connections between needs, quality world, comparing place, total behavior, perceptual filters and perceived world. This innovative approach dismantles the choice theory chart of the same name developed by William Glasser and is an encouragement for learners to reassemble it and therefore to understand the theory behind reality therapy.

The Lion and the Coconut, (2010). Denyse O'Connor, Illustrator: Shana Baird

Publisher: D. O'Connor, doconnor@stpcs.org or www.lionandcoconut.com

Intended audience: Pre-kindergarten through grade 4.

This book introduces the basic concepts of choice theory and reality therapy to young children. Written in an imaginative, creative style, children will learn how Lion fails to get what he wants because he chooses ineffective behaviors. With the help of his jungle friends, Lion learns, as will the children reading this book, that almost all behavior is a choice. And, that the only behavior we can control is our own. Lion discovers that what he is doing and thinking are directly related to how he will feel (total behavior). He begins to make a plan to bring him closer to his quality world picture (the coconut) and to satisfy his genetically encoded needs of survival, love & belonging, power, freedom, and fun. He finally learns to meet his needs by choosing responsible behaviors that do not keep others from having their own needs met and finding happiness. Lion vows to begin to replace his disconnecting habits with caring habits which will improve the quality of his life and enhance all of his

relationships. (This description is re-printed with permission from the back cover of the book).

The beautifully and artistically illustrated book is part of a teacher kit containing lesson plans, character cards for role play, as well as other materials. It can be read aloud for pre-K through grade 2. Children in grades 3 & 4 should be able to read the book on their own.

References

Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality therapy*. NY: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1968). *Schools without failure*. NY: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school*. NY: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (1993). *The quality school teacher*. NY: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (2007). *Eight lessons for a happier marriage*. NY: HarperCollins.

Lojk, L. (1986). My experiences using reality therapy. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 5(2), 28-35.

Parish, J., & Parish, T. (1999). An examination of teacher caring, underachievement, and at risk behaviors. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 19(1), 27-31.

Passaro, P., Moon, M., Wiest, D., & Wong, E. (2004). A model for school psychology practice: Addressing the needs of students with emotional and behavioral challenges through the use of an in-school support room and reality therapy. *Adolescence*, 39(155), 503-517.

Wubbolding, R. (1996). *Employee motivation*. Knoxville, TN: SPC Press.

Wubbolding, R., & Brickell, J. (1999). *Counseling with reality therapy*. Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Speechmark Publishing.

Wubbolding, R., & Brickell, J. (2001). *A set of directions for putting and keeping yourself together*. Minneapolis: Educational Media Corporation.

FORMATIVE MONITORING of STUDENTS' PROGRESS BASED ON CHOICE THEORY

Mateja Peršolja

Preserje pri Radomljah Primary School, Slovenia, Europe

A Glasser Quality School (the first in Europe)

Thomas Burdenski, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Psychology and Counseling

Tarleton State University—Stephenville, TX

Abstract

The method of formative assessment of students' progress from the point of view of Choice Theory is presented in this article. The process of formative monitoring is presented in detail and it is supported by Choice Theory, the principles of Lead Management vs. authoritarian "boss" management, and the principles of a Glasser Quality School. This article focuses on the process of altering teachers' behavior away from the use of coercion and authoritarian practices (i.e., external control psychology), to promoting internal control within students based on facilitating self-evaluation and incorporating feedback from parents and teachers.

The first author has noticed in recent years more and more parents coming to school professionals wishing to express their frustration or looking for help with their seeming inability to teach and/or rear their children. Teachers also seek help with identifying alternative ways to solve classroom and learning problems on a daily basis. Together with colleagues and school counselors, she strives to find ways to deal effectively with students. Despite being professional educators in the first Glasser Quality School in Europe, they do not always find (at least not right away) the ideal solution. That is why both parents and teachers are in this boat together, especially when addressing complex educational problems that can be seen from multiple points of view.

As Glasser (1998a) has noted, the human race has experienced rapid changes in technology in the last several decades. Unfortunately, we cannot claim the same for progress connected with human relationships, such as effectively parenting children and/or solving conflicts between individuals and conflicts between groups and nations. When observing teachers, students, and their parents interacting with one another, the first author has noticed many repetitive patterns. Accusations are often followed by bitter exchanges of past experiences and unsolved problems, without even trying to find any common ground, which makes the whole situation even worse. But we all, more or less, expect that others will change their behavior, but not ourselves. What we experience as parents and teachers is a consequence of poor relationships and lack of knowledge regarding how to solve conflicts, frustrations, stressors, and unsatisfied needs. In her experience, none of the children, parents, or teachers set out to hurt one another, however, it is often hard to avoid hurting someone in such situations. Teachers and parents also want children to learn from their mistakes and not repeat them. The most frequent response to school problems is for teachers to put pressure on children in the form of low marks, punishments and "threats" (especially toward the end of a school year). Unfortunately, the outcome is frequently quite the opposite from the intended effect—i.e., the problem behavior often continues and the student-teacher relationship deteriorates, resulting in more tension.

During the first author's beginning days as a teacher at the beginning of her career, she spent a lot of time reflecting on what kind of a teacher she wanted to be. Her "Quality World" pictures were based on her first-hand experience as a pupil. Her expectations did not change during her teacher education studies, nor during her four weeks of working practice. In her mind's eye, she pictured herself standing in front of the board while students, eager to learn, listened and wrote. If students did not have inner motivation, they would at least engage in learning to avoid bad marks and other sanctions, she thought. Her first few hours of teaching forced her to abandon her faulty preconceptions. Children were chatting and were not listening to her, they did not care about what she was trying to teach them, they did not show respect for their "elder" (the teacher), and they did not learn or work very hard. In her dilemma she fell back on already familiar "solutions"— marks, signs (pluses and minuses-i.e., minor marks), informing parents, threats, negative marks, which all led to a vicious circle of worsening attitudes, trying to "break" poor work habits and engaging in a "war" with pupils. She felt powerless and sometimes even angry and sad. She was constantly in a bad mood while stubbornly clinging to the belief that she could make students do what she wanted them to do and she felt obligated to convince students to learn no matter which method of teaching she was using. She relied on persuading and coercing students to learn and thought that the appropriate stimulus would trigger the desired reaction—she was championing external control psychology.

After a few years of frustration, the first author realized that she wasn't getting the results she wanted so she began searching for new teaching methods. She began to do research on her own teaching and started to change her approach. She also began to learn about Glasser's (1998a, 1998b) Choice Theory, which emphasizes that we choose our behavior and we are responsible for what consequences those choices bring forth. Information is what we receive from the environment, what we do with it, however, depends on us as individuals. She became aware that the only person who can control her behavior is herself. We cannot control students' behavior, but we can send them useful information and create an environment where they are able to learn, have new experiences and satisfy their needs for power, freedom, belonging, and fun. Consequently, she now focuses on cultivating support, trust, acceptance, and motivation with her students.

The first author found herself in Karpman's (1968) drama triangle in the role of a "persecutor" (a person who gets what he or she wants by persecuting, coercing, or pressuring others), a "victim" (a person who is treated as, or accepts the role of, a victim), and a "rescuer" (one who intervenes out of an ostensible wish to help the situation or the underdog). She was in the role of a persecutor when she punished students with low marks, threatening them by giving them negative marks and "snitching" to parents; a victim when students sabotaged the lessons she prepared to teach; and a rescuer when she offered students help with studying, or gave them the chance to improve their marks, etc. From the point of view of Total Behavior, the emotional component of her behavior was the most salient as she indulged in whining, being in a bad mood, and feeling generally dissatisfied with teaching. Her emotional state and dissatisfaction with student relationships in the classroom were signs that she was not on the right path to success. She knew she had to make some changes. While taking part in the innovative project "Ways to a better and lasting lesson/knowledge and initiation of self regulation of learning," she included active learning components and started researching and changing her approach to teaching, lessons, and consequently her point of view regarding students and teaching. Then her mood and classroom atmosphere began to change. She stepped out of the vicious cycle she was in and has become a classroom leader, a supportive co-worker, and a professional. The biggest shift has been her approach to monitoring students' progress and knowledge acquisition.

Formative Monitoring of Students' Progress

Based on this new way of teaching, a student is included in the planning of goals and lessons. She enables them to participate actively during the lesson itself, which is adjusted to each individual. This is done in order for students to be more involved in the process of self-evaluation and self-regulation so that students can take more responsibility for their learning and marks. All in all, she give students more opportunities to shape their own learning and marks and to become more active and engaged in the entire learning process. Previously, testing and evaluating knowledge in Slovenia took place immediately before a test or after the end of a certain academic unit. Testing was usually before the evaluation (test/exam), which included written and oral examinations. We were continuously wondering why students started learning after the testing (just before the examination). However, that was the first and only time that they received feedback about their current knowledge and they did not receive feedback from the teacher on how to enhance their learning.

The following is an example of a survey for self-evaluation of a student or a student and a teacher that used a computer program for formative assessment (NEI, 2007).

Your strong predispositions/ What do you know?	Your weak predispositions/ What would you like to learn?
The content of leaning/What? /Goals?	The process of teaching/ How would you like to learn?
A collection of achievements/ What do you already know? / What is in your file?	Presentation of your collection of achievements/evaluate your work.

Formative monitoring of knowledge enables monitoring of students' progress simultaneously. In this way, a student receives positive feedback and a word of advice on how to improve. It monitors the entire process and allows insight into the learning process and knowledge acquisition, as assessment is not limited to the examination. It finds the gaps and traps of campaign learning over time. Formative monitoring also improves the teacher-student relationship, introduces inner-control, self-criticism, self-evaluation, and sets new measures for success by having the student set the standard for success. Since the student can influence her/his own knowledge and marks, there is no more forcing and controlling. Such methods give students confidence that they can improve their marks. By following such methods, the vicious cycle of parents and teachers exerting external control over their children/students is ended.

The formative monitoring of the learning process allows teachers and students to quickly identify the reasons for failures and allows them to make quick, corrective responses. This benefit is clearly displayed in the following self-evaluative comments by students:

Example 1: "I would like to learn so I have the satisfaction that I know something."

Example 2: "I learn a lot, but I don't remember anything."

Example 3: "Even though I was studying hard for math (contractions), I got a bad mark and I lost my will for studying."

Example 4: "I would like that marks wouldn't mean everything."

Example 5: "I am not satisfied with my work and marks. I think that I chat with friends too much and I don't do homework regularly. I'll try to improve my learning habits."

Example 6: "I do my homework regularly. If I don't know something, my parents help me. I am satisfied with my knowledge, marks and working habits. I wouldn't change anything."

The above mentioned examples of student self-evaluations often help teachers to identify possible reasons for failures, disappointments, and despair of individual students and provide an opportunity for the teacher to discuss the problem from the student's point of view and offer suggestions for help.

Example of Self-Evaluations by Students

Your strong predispositions (what do you know?) "I can calculate only easier calculations of all mathematical (+, -, x, ÷) operations and some written assignments."	Your weak predispositions/What would you like to learn? "More difficult calculations and written assignments (in student's book colored red and blue), be better and faster at calculating." How would you like to learn that? How can I help you?
The content of learning (what are you learning or what were you learning?- the content) "Multi articles."	The process of learning/How would you like to learn? "It's good that you can improve your mark. I wouldn't change that. It's also good that you solve 'problems' simultaneously." "Nice! I'm pleased that you like it."
A collection of achievements/what do you know? (What can you put in your file to show what you really know?) "I know fractions, exponents, roots, because I was learning a lot."	Presentation of collection of your achievements./ Evaluate your work so far "I am satisfied with my work and marks. I have to learn what I have written in the space: What do you have to learn?" "Even though I am satisfied, I know I could do more." "Successfully caught up in March. Well done! To be satisfied with your own work is the most that you can accomplish."

Example of Self-Evaluation of Students (Translation).

Formative monitoring includes diagnosis of prior knowledge; setting and following goals, and evaluating the results. Planning takes place at the beginning of the school year and at the beginning of every new unit, when goals are set. The starting point is the question: "What do I already know?" and "What don't I know?" or "What do I want to learn?" The first question helps the teacher to find out the strengths and prior knowledge of each student and the second question identifies the weakest areas. Teachers set goals jointly with the class. Goals are also adjusted and changed to meet the needs of individual students. Students were engaged in the process with questions such as, "How will I achieve the goal?" "What is the easiest and quickest way of learning?" "How do I want to learn?" The answers

are based on students' individual interests and wishes (such as learning outdoors, working on the computer, writing seminar papers, conducting research, authentic assignments, etc.). The teacher then attempts to accommodate students as much as possible in the learning process to facilitate reaching goals. "Lessons become more dynamic, creative, and powerful because the emphasis is on the individual's needs. Creativity, however, is restricted due to regulations of content and teaching standards required by the school plan since formative monitoring is not compatible with national testing and standards of knowledge" (see OECD, 2005, p. 2).

Initiating the planning of the lesson in the classroom and monitoring knowledge acquisition is especially noticeable when testing, valuing and estimating students' knowledge. It has been demonstrated that students are more aware of which goals they have achieved, and which they haven't achieved, when they engage in self-evaluation (see Fontana & Fernandes, 1994; Frederiksen & White, 1997). In the first author's school in Slovenia, this is evident when students are given oral examinations since what the student actually knows becomes very evident to the student and to the teacher, but also during written examinations (tests) and making joint plans for improvement.

The first author has routinely asked students to create a written improvement plan after the test, which includes answers to the following questions: "What do I know?" "What do I want to learn?" "Until when?" "Is my current way of working leading me to success?" "If not, am I ready to change that?" If necessary, students make a new plan with exercises planned according to the school schedule. When a student thinks that he or she has achieved a goal, he or she can demonstrate content knowledge and evaluates it. On the basis of evaluating knowledge regarding the criteria, the student and a teacher jointly suggest a mark (i.e. a grade). The purpose of all these efforts is to encourage students to evaluate their own work and then to try to improve it (Glasser, 1998b).

The first author strives to set an atmosphere in the classroom that stimulates responsibility ("what I agree to do, I will do"), independence (no need for external control), self-initiative (solving one's own problems when assistance is not required and building initiative), self-trust, self-image, creativity (new ideas), sensibility (minding others), the ability to look for solutions (not mistakes, excuses and culprits); feeling connected with others, and encouragement. What is more, an open dialogue is established that makes discussing weak and strong areas, gaps and learning lapses, all safe to discuss. Stimulating such an environment is easier, because the first author has wonderful role models at her school and a supportive working environment given the school-wide commitment to being a Glasser Quality School (1998b).

In such an environment every student can be successful. In the beginning, the first author misinterpreted the word "successful" because she defined "success" from her own perspective. It implied high marks, etc. When she talked to students, she realized that they have their own goals for their lives, they know what they want for themselves and for some of them, mastering mathematics is not a high priority. Consequently, such students were satisfied when they received a good (but not the highest) mark. When she accepted this truth, it changed how she interpreted "success"—it is up to the individual student to determine it, rather than leaving it up to the teacher.

In order for students to feel successful when they notice improvement in their studies, the first author sent 13-year-old students to tutor six and seven-year-old children. She worked with them to prepare the lesson, talked about math and the knowledge the younger children needed to acquire it, and how to work with them. They jointly prepared handouts, developed explicit explanations of mathematical concepts, and other pedagogical materials.

During the lesson, the older students (who were not very interested in math), surprised her as they helped the younger students, approached them considerately, and really tried to understand and assist them. When self-evaluating their effectiveness as teachers, the older students said it was easier to work with the children who were well-behaved, motivated, and who were actively participating. She then encouraged them to apply what they valued in their roles of "teachers" to their own learning experience and lessons as learners and students. This was a valuable learning experience for the older (not so motivated) students because they were better able to define what student behaviors promoted student success and also evaluate their fitness for working with children as a teacher or in other helping roles as a possible career.

In her new approach to teaching, the first author tries to prepare quality lessons, but instead of evaluating students, they evaluate themselves; punishments and coercion are replaced by collaboration and setting goals and agreements; cooperation with others is encouraged instead of competition; and we search for success and acquiring new knowledge rather than highlighting failures; teacher demands are replaced by encouragement and guidance; and individual effort is supplemented by group learning and teamwork.

Conclusion

Since her early days as a struggling new teacher, the first author has learned that the best way to improve her teaching is to actively research her own teaching practices, which she has come to understand is an essential element of Choice Theory and building a Quality School (Glasser, 1998a, 1998b). The path of continual self-evaluation is not an easy one, however, since it forces her to stay open to new ideas about the nature of learning, the nature of students, and effective teacher-student relationships. The path is full of dilemmas, fears, struggling to find a balance between the old and the new, and most critically, letting go of the need to control the learning goals set by students. But the path itself is full of enthusiasm, challenges and joy and that is why she knows she needs to continue down this road . . . for that is her choice!

After seven years of teaching and four years of studying and applying Choice Theory in the classroom, she has succeeded at largely eliminating fear among her students. She encourages students to give their best, to be as active as possible with their own learning, and spend their time on actions that will lead to results that they value. As a teacher in a public school in Slovenia, she has a 100% school plan and teachers there do not have complete freedom to set their own academic goals. However, applying Choice Theory and Glasser's (1998a, 1998b) Quality School principles give meaning to everything she and her colleagues do. Through collaboration she gets to know how her colleagues work. She has learned a great deal from them and respects them now more than ever before. This way of working has contributed greatly to her personal and professional growth and to her satisfaction as an educator.

References

- Fontana, D. & Fernandes, M. (1994). Improvements in mathematics performance as a consequence of self-assessment in Portuguese primary school pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 64(3), 407-417.
- Frederiksen, J. R., & White, B. J. (1997). Reflective assessment of students' research within an inquiry-based middle school science curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Glasser, W. (1998a). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: Harper Collins.

Glasser, W. (1998b). *The quality school: Managing students without coercion*. New York: Harper Collins.

Karpman, S. (1968). Fairy tales and script drama analysis. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 7(26), 39-43.

NEI (2007). The National Education Institute (Slovenia). Retrieved from: <http://www.zrss.si/default.asp?link=predmet&tip=92&pID=199>

OECD (2005). *Formative assessment: Improving learning in secondary classrooms*. OECD Observer, 2005.

Brief Bio

Mateja Peršolja is a teacher of Mathematics at the lower secondary level of education at a primary school in Slovenia. She is Choice Theory/Reality Therapy Certified and the leader of a research group for formative assessment at her school. She is also a consultant to the National Education Institute for Formative Assessment.

Thomas Burdenski, Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist, marriage and family therapist, and professional counselor who teaches Choice Theory/Reality Therapy to counselors-in-training. He is Choice Theory/Reality Therapy Certified and an approved practicum supervisor. He is also on the editorial board of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*.

STUDENT SUCCESS SKILLS: BUILDING QUALITY WORLDS AND ADVOCATING FOR SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAMS

Elizabeth Villares and Greg Brigman
Florida Atlantic University

Andrew Maier
Internationella Engelska Gymnasiet Södermalm, Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

This article presents a school counselor-led, evidence-based program and Student Success Skills (SSS) that supports the American School Counseling Association's National Model, Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy principles. SSS is a holistic approach focused on the development of essential cognitive, social, and self-management skills for academic and social success. The SSS approach emphasizes creating a Quality World and satisfying the basic needs of survival and health, belonging, power/achievement, freedom/independence, and fun. Implications for school counselors are discussed.

Helping all students develop the skills and attitudes they need to successfully navigate their developmental milestones is the basis for developmental counseling and the American School Counseling Association's (ASCA) national model. Promoting positive mental health and enhancing academic achievement for all students is the hallmark of the professional school counselor. This article presents (a) a brief overview of the ASCA model, (b) the call for more research linking school counselor-led programs with student achievement, (c) a description of the SSS program and its supporting research, (d) the connection between the SSS program and the Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy principles, and (e) their combined implications for school counselors.

ASCA National Model

The ASCA National Model (2005) is a structured framework for comprehensive school counseling programs, including four critical elements: (1) Foundation, (2) Delivery System, (3) Management System, and (4) Accountability System. Implementing this preventive and developmental model is expected to ensure that the needs of every child are addressed at every grade level (i.e., K-12).

Student developmental needs are then divided into three key domains: academic, career, and personal/social. Embedded within each domain are the ASCA National Standards (ASCA, 2004). Each standard includes specific competencies and indicators that are reflective of the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that students gain as a result of their participation in a school counseling service, activity, and/or intervention. The ASCA National Standards are designed as guidelines that can be aligned to individual states, school districts, and local school counseling programs. School counseling classroom curricula and response services, such as small group counseling implemented through the delivery system, should be tailored to support student learning gains in at least one domain area. The data that were collected and analyzed through the management and accountability systems, created the opportunity for school counselors to demonstrate how their school counseling interventions and/or services directly impacted students' academic, career, and personal/social development.

The Student Success Skills (SSS) program addresses all three domains of the ASCA National Standards (ASCA, 2004). In the academic domain, Standard A of the SSS program helps students acquire the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that contribute to effective learning in school and across the lifespan through activities tied to creating caring, supportive and encouraging climates, memory skills, and anxiety management skills. In the personal/social domain, Standard A of the SSS program helps students acquire the attitudes, knowledge, and interpersonal skills to help them understand and respect themselves and others through activities tied to empathy, listening skills, social problem-solving skills, and through stories about diversity. In the personal/social domain, Standard B of the SSS program helps students make decisions, set goals, and take necessary action to achieve goals through weekly goal setting and progress monitoring around wellness and school success. In the career domain, Standard B of the SSS program helps students employ strategies to achieve future career success and satisfaction through activities tied to goal setting, healthy optimism, interpersonal and decision-making skills, as well as building caring communities.

Call for More School Counseling Outcome Research

According to several reviews of research, the current state of outcome research regarding the relationship between school counseling and student achievement is thin. Whiston and Sexton (1998) completed a review of 50 school counseling outcome studies published between 1988 and 1995. They found positive program findings in each of the ASCA domains of academic, personal/social, and career awareness with the weakest area being the academic domain. Regarding the effect that a school counselor intervention program had on standardized test scores, the Whiston and Sexton review found only one such study (Carns & Carns, 1991). In this study, skills intervention was shown to enhance grade 4 academic achievement as measured by the California Test of Basic Skills. No effect sizes were reported. Whiston and Sexton (1998) concluded in their review, as did Dimmitt, Carey, McGannon, and Henningson (2005), that a call for more research connecting school counselors and student academic achievement was still needed.

Dimmitt, Carey, and Hatch (2007) subsequently reviewed 13 individual studies and 10 reviews of research all related to school counselors and academic achievement. Similar to conclusions reached by Whiston and Sexton (1998), and Dimmt, et al. (1998), they found that very limited research related to school counselors and student achievement existed. The only three studies reviewed that used standardized achievement scores in reading and math were Carns and Carns (1991), Brigman and Campbell (2003), and Sink and Stroh (2003).

SSS: An Example of School Counselor-led, Evidence-based Programs

Notably, evidence-based programs are built upon a solid foundation of prior research and theory, and are supported by outcome research (Dimmitt et al., 2007). The SSS program was developed around academic, social, and self-management skill sets including: goal setting and progress monitoring, creating a supportive and encouraging environment, cognitive and memory skills, skills for performing under pressure, including managing test anxiety and building healthy optimism. The skill sets were chosen based on extensive reviews of research identifying skills found to be critical in improving academic and social outcomes for students (Hattie, Biggs, & Purdie, 1996; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1994). More recent literature continues to point to the importance of teaching these critical academic and social skills if students are to be successful (Elias et al., 2003; Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; Payton et al., 2008; Zins, Weissberg, Wang, & Walberg, 2004). Five recent SSS studies have consistently found significant student improvement in reading and math scores on standardized tests (Brigman & Campbell, 2003;

Brigman, Webb, & Campbell, 2007; Campbell & Brigman, 2005; León, Villares, Brigman, Webb, & Peluso, 2010; Webb, Brigman, & Campbell, 2005). Details on SSS research are included later in this article.

SSS Program Description and Matching Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy Principles

The SSS program for students in grades 4-10 includes classroom and small group components. Reviews of research over the last two decades have identified the academic and social competence skills considered critically important for school success. The SSS approach is to teach these skills in a community of caring, supportiveness, and encouragement so students learn to interact more constructively and sustains their motivation to succeed. As students begin to see improvements in their schoolwork and daily lives, and realize these improvements are the result of the choices and actions they made, their confidence in their ability increases. This process helps them develop what Glasser (1969) calls a "success identity."

Choice theory considers the following to be basic needs that all humans possess: survival and health, love and belonging, power/achievement, freedom/independence, and fun (Glasser, 1998a). The SSS program addresses these five needs within the classroom and small group components of the program. The SSS approach also utilizes the WDEP system (Wubbolding, 2000) by helping students identify goals (W or wants), look at what they are currently doing to reach those goals/wants (D or doing and direction), evaluate if what they are doing is helpful in reaching their goals/wants (E or self-evaluation), and develop a plan to reaching their goals/wants (P or plan).

School counselors work with students in classrooms to facilitate five 45-minute lessons spaced a week apart using a structured classroom manual (Brigman & Webb, 2004/2007/2010). During these five lessons students are introduced to success skills in five areas that have alignment to key Reality Therapy principles: 1) goal setting and progress monitoring (freedom and independence; power and achievement), 2) building a community of caring, support, and encouragement (love & belonging), 3) building cognition and memory skills (power & achievement), 4) performing under pressure and managing test anxiety (psychological health & survival), and 5) building healthy optimism (psychological health, survival, power & achievement).

Each lesson follows a beginning, middle, and end format. In the beginning, students set goals and monitor progress toward five life skill areas (see figure 1): nutrition, exercise, fun, rest, and social support (10 minutes). New concepts and strategies are introduced and practiced in the middle of each lesson (20-25 minutes). At the end of each lesson, students set goals and monitor progress related specifically to cognitive, social, and/or self-management skills that are associated with the development of academic and social competence. During this end portion, students also participate in activities that reinforce the importance of staying encouraged and optimistic (10-15 minutes). The five lessons are designed to be active and engage all eight of Gardner's (1993; 1999) multiple intelligences.

Figure 1. Student Success Skills Looking Good/Feeling Good Life Skills Chart

LOOKING GOOD / FEELING GOOD								
	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8
1. Nutrition <small>Liquids: ▲ water & milk & juice ▼ sodas Solids: ▲ fruits & veggies ▼ sweets & chips</small>	1 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
2. Fun <small>Little joys, big fun - it all counts, read, listen to music, play, create, hangout, explore.</small>	2 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
3. Exercise <small>Walk, run, dance, pedal, move it - 30 minutes or more a day</small>	3 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
4. Social Support <small>Hanging out with people you like and who like you. Family and friends you can count on.</small>	4 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
5. Rest <small>8-9 hours - naps count. Recharge, renew, relax</small>	5 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
Making even small improvements in these 5 items lead to higher energy and mood.								
6. Energy	6 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼
7. Mood	7 ▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼	▲▼

Student Success Life Skills

Circle the up triangle (▲) if you rate the Life Skill as in a good range or showing improvement for this past week.
Circle the down triangle (▼) if you rate the Life Skill as not in a good range this past week.

When students set goals at both the beginning and end of each lesson, they are in charge of choosing their goals and developing their strategies to help them reach it. Each week students report in pairs how their plan went, sharing successes and if not successful, brainstorming how to adjust the strategy or choose another strategy. While sharing their goals and progress each week, students practice listening with eyes, ears, and heart. Students are taught listening with: (a) eyes-means having eye contact and facing the person squarely; (b) ears-means summarizing the key points; and (c) heart-means listening for the feeling connected with the behavior (empathy) and saying encouraging things about this week's plan to reach a goal. This type of coaching in effective interpersonal skills is another way the SSS program encourages a caring community within the classroom and reinforces the building of healthy friendships. A recent article provides a more detailed description of the SSS classroom program (see Webb & Brigman, 2006).

After the completion of the five classroom lessons, the counselor works in collaboration with the teacher to identify students who need additional support and practice through the structured SSS small group intervention (Brigman, Campbell, & Webb, 2004, 2007). The eight 45-minute small group sessions focus on the skills and strategies introduced in the classroom lessons and add a social problem-solving-student-peer-coaching component. The small group sessions also follow a beginning, middle, and end format. In the beginning and at the end, students continue to set goals and monitor progress towards life skills and academic goals while practicing the use of encouragement and healthy optimistic thinking. In the middle of each group session, students share real life conflicts in a safe, supportive

environment and have an opportunity to receive support and feedback as they brainstorm strategies leading to more positive outcomes. Modeling role-play and coaching are also used to help students build skills in managing social conflict in healthy ways and thus gain more control over their lives. At the conclusion of the eight weekly sessions, students attend monthly booster sessions to share successes, brainstorm solutions to conflicts that remain a challenge, and continue to set and monitor progress toward academic and social goals. A review of outcome research on group psychotherapy with children found that in order to improve achievement it is important to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of students (Shechtman, 2002). Thus, the SSS intervention was developed to include activities and strategies aimed at each of these needs. Once again, a recent article provides a detailed description of the SSS small group program (see Webb & Brigman, 2007).

Parallels between SSS and Recent Examples of Reality Therapy in Schools

One of the authors is Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy Certified, currently a school counselor in Sweden, and also a certified school counselor in Florida. When using SSS in his school counseling positions, he first teaches Choice Theory including the concepts of Quality World and basic needs, and then uses the SSS program to emphasize the key concepts. The idea of Quality World is that when one or more of our basic needs are satisfied we take a mental picture of that person, place, idea, or experience and put it into our "Quality World."

For example, when he uses SSS to teach students about creating a caring, supportive, and encouraging classroom community, he then connects this to sharing with each other what their Quality World pictures are of their classroom community. By asking students to share what this kind of Quality World classroom would "Look Like, Sound Like, and Feel Like." A poster is made of the specifics that students agree upon and is subsequently posted in the classroom. It is then referred to weekly, and students are asked to provide examples of caring, supportive, or encouraging actions they have noticed by other students during the week. This helps students become aware of and develop more concrete examples of how to use some of Glasser's seven caring habits which assist people to better connect with one another in a caring, supporting, listening, encouraging, respecting, negotiating differences, trusting manner (Glasser, 1998b).

Mason and Duba (2009) examined the application of Reality Therapy in schools to promote school counseling and the ASCA National Model. Mason and Duba (p.8) provided examples of suggested activities tied to the five basic human needs identified by Reality Therapy (i.e., survival and health, love and belonging, self-worth/power, freedom/independence, and fun). The next section draws parallels between these five human needs and how the SSS program addresses them.

Under survival and health (physiological needs) the examples Mason and Duba (2009) provided included teaching students stress and relaxation coping mechanisms, leading students through brief relaxation techniques prior to all examinations, and teaching appropriate thought reframing and cognitive restructuring. (The SSS classroom program teaches each of these as well.) Under love and belonging, Mason and Duba's (2009) examples included teaching students basic counseling skills (listening, attending, and empathy skills) so they are better able to relate to others and develop partnerships among students to support accountability and studying. Under self-worth/power the SSS program uses examples from Banks (2009) who associated this need with achievement, competence, and accomplishments. Students gain a sense of empowerment by focusing on small improvements and reframing negative thoughts that can lead to dissatisfaction in the school and home environment. Under freedom, Banks (2009) stresses providing opportunities for students to make choices, evaluating their behaviors, and teaching students that being

accountable means taking personal responsibility. The SSS program provides multiple opportunities each week for students to choose goals, develop plans, monitor their progress, and finally, report on their challenges, progress, and/or successes. If not, successful students are encouraged to work with a partner to brainstorm new strategies to help them better meet their needs in the future on their chosen goal. Under fun, according to Glasser (1998a), fun is wired into humans genetically and is generally associated with learning new things. In the SSS program one of the key graphics discussed in each meeting draws the connection between practice and persistence which leads to mastery, confidence, and culminates in fun and joy. Students are taught that the human brain is set up to provide joy when we practice and persist in learning new things and becoming competent in them. Fun and joy are also built into the teaching process where movement, sharing successes, role-play, creating stories, and cooperative learning are used to improve the learning environment and increase motivation to learn.

Implementing evidence-based interventions, such as the SSS program, embeds principles of Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy, and optimizes the potential for students' academic, social/personal, and career development. When the school counselor is connected, in the view of administrators, teachers and parents, to increased student performance, the counselor is in a better position to assist them in winning and maintaining support for their counseling programs. By designing counseling programs to follow the ASCA comprehensive model, including evidence-based components, school counselors place themselves in the best position to demonstrate effectiveness and to advocate for all students (Dimmitt et al., 2007).

SSS Research

Five SSS studies conducted in 39 schools, in two large school districts located in south Florida, have provided evidence that the SSS program is linked to improved academic and social outcomes (Brigman & Campbell, 2003; Brigman et al., 2007; Campbell & Brigman, 2005; León et al., 2010; Webb et al., 2005). Students from rural, suburban, and urban settings were similarly represented. The combined total of participants was 1,279 in grades 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. The ethnic composition of the total sample included 718 (56%) White, 279 (22%) African Americans, and 282 (22%) Hispanic students. In each study, except León et al. (2010), school counselors facilitated the SSS program with five weekly 45-minute classroom lessons and eight weekly 45-minute small group sessions, each followed by three booster sessions spaced one month apart. In the León study, only the five classroom SSS lessons were used. The first four studies were all conducted in English, while León et al. (2010) used a Spanish cultural translation of the SSS classroom lessons delivered in Spanish to limited English-proficient students. Students who participated in the SSS intervention showed significant gains in math and reading achievement scores as measured by the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (Florida Department of Education, 2005), a state-mandated achievement test (see Table 1). In all five studies, students receiving the intervention significantly outperformed comparison students in math. In three studies, students receiving the intervention also significantly outperformed comparison students in reading. A recent article by the National Panel for Evidence Based School Counseling (Carey, Dimmitt, Hatch, Lapan, & Whiston, 2008) provided an external review of three of the five studies (Brigman & Campbell, 2003; Campbell & Brigman, 2005; Webb et al., 2005) and found evidence supporting the effectiveness of the SSS intervention across multiple domains. These results are examples of how consistently applying the principles of Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy in the SSS program empowers students to make positive choices on a daily basis and increases their confidence in performing at their best on the state-mandated tests.

Table 1. Treatment and Comparison Group Means and Standard Deviations for FCAT Student Success Skills (SSS) Studies

Study	Group	N	Subject	Pre-test (SD)	Post-test (SD)	Mean Score Differences
A	T	97	Math	640.4 (44.17)	662.46 (44.8)	+22.1
	Co	125	Math	647.8 (24.31)	656.7 (28.7)	+8.9
A	T	97	Reading	652.6 (42.72)	664.8 (44.57)	+12.2
	Co	125	Reading	654.1 (35.1)	656.3 (33.32)	+2.2
B	T	153	Math	623.75 (20.575)	649.05 (24.153)	+25.30
	Co	153	Math	631.23 (27.400)	645.04 (21.196)	+13.80
B	T	154	Reading	631.43 (20.270)	646.45 (24.364)	+15.02
	Co	154	Reading	633.50 (23.830)	643.05 (23.429)	+9.55
C	T	207	Math	628.11 (34.268)	648.79 (34.607)	+20.68
	Co	211	Math	639.16 (25.943)	650.50 (7.981)	+11.34
C	T	207	Reading	633.65 (34.065)	649.82 (35.417)	+16.17
	Co	211	Reading	633.85 (13.763)	646.77 (24.775)	+12.92
D	T	110	Math	632.54 (26.488)	659.06 (29.676)	+26.52
	Co	110	Math	653.08 (28.823)	666.06 (30.975)	+12.98
D	T	110	Reading	643.69 (27.906)	653.75 (30.401)	+10.06
	Co	110	Reading	655.07 (24.247)	666.15 (28.338)	+11.08
E	T	62	Math	1480.90 (282.94)	1704.89 (220.81)	+223.99
	Co	94	Math	1528.95 (292.79)	1664.54 (251.41)	+135.59
E	T	62	Reading	1366.27 (413.07)	1586.29 (293.36)	+220.02
	Co	94	Reading	1407.22 (348.70)	1520.40 (287.38)	+113.18

Note. A = Brigman & Campbell (2003). B = Campbell & Brigman (2005). C= Webb, Brigman & Campbell (2005). D= Brigman, Webb & Campbell (2007). E= León, Villares, Brigman, Webb & Peluso (2010). N= number. ES= effect size. SD= standard deviation. T = Treatment group. Co = Comparison group.

SSS Practical Significance

In a recent SSS meta-analysis, the intervention effect size (ES) was determined by using a standardized differences index (Cohen's d). For instance, a sample ES for each dependent variable was obtained by calculating the post-test mean score difference of the treatment group minus the post-test mean score difference of the comparison group divided by the pooled standard deviation. Unbiased estimates of the population ES were then corrected for the bias in d by using Hedges g (Hedges & Olkin, 1985). In order to account for the variance more accurately, a pooled standardized deviation was used in calculating the ESs (Hedges & Olkin, 1985; Sink & Stroh, 2006). This resulted in an overall ES of .29 for the

five SSS studies, a .41 ES for math, and a .17 ES for reading (see Table 2) (Villares, Frain, Brigman, Webb, & Peluso, 2010).

Table 2. Summary of Participants and Overall Effect Sizes for Individual Student Success Skills (SSS) Studies

Study	N	Math ES	Reading ES	Overall ES
A	222	.36	.26	.31
B	307	.51	.23	.36
C	418	.37	.11	.24
D	220	.45	-.03	.20
E	156	.37	.37	.37
Overall		.41	.17	.29

Note. A = Brigman & Campbell (2003). B = Campbell & Brigman (2005). C= Webb, Brigman & Campbell (2005). D= Brigman, Webb & Campbell (2007). E= Leon, Villares, Brigman, Webb & Peluso (2010). N= number. ES= effect size.

Cohen (1988) developed general guidelines to interpret the magnitude of standardized difference ESs. In general, the higher the ES the more compelling the case is for the results being useful. These guidelines suggested an ES of 0.80 as having a large effect, 0.50 having a medium effect, and 0.20 having a small effect.

Using Cohen's guidelines the present SSS program ES of 0.29 would be classified as a medium to small effect; however, Sink and Stroh (2006) point out that any ES should be considered within the context of previous related research. Since the context of the SSS research used standardized test scores in reading and math, a recent review by Hill, Bloom, Black, and Lipsey (2008) of dozens of meta-analyses studies that evaluated the impact of a wide range of educational interventions and programs on reading and math standardized test scores provides an appropriate context for comparison. Hill et al. (2008) found overall ESs for students in grades K-12 of 0.23, 0.27, and 0.24 for elementary, middle, and high school students, respectively. Payton et al. (2008) found a similar ES of .28 when they examined 29 studies focused on improving academic achievement. Vernez and Zimmer (2007) concluded, after reviewing the Hill et al. study, that "relative to the experience gained so far with education interventions designed to increase student achievement, the interpretation of their ESs should be interpreted differently from those suggested by Cohen (1988) for the social sciences" (p.2). Accordingly, Vernez and Zimmer (2007) recommended .25 to be considered a large effect, .15 a medium effect, and .05 to .10 a small effect. Therefore, using Vernez and Zimmer's rubric to interpret effect sizes, the SSS program appears to have had a large effect for math (.41) and a medium effect for reading (.17).

Implications for School Counselors

School counselors are being asked to show their impact on student performance. In this age of accountability and standards-driven programs, school counselors need to identify, implement, evaluate, and report the effects of evidence-based programs on student performance. This article makes a case for school counselors to use programs that incorporate Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy principles to advocate for their programs and the growth and development of all students. The ASCA model is a framework to help

achieve this goal. SSS is an evidence-based program that incorporates many Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy principles and has been found to improve student achievement and behavior. More research is needed that connects school counselor interventions to Choice Theory® and Reality Therapy and increased student academic achievement and behavior.

References

- American School Counseling Association. (2004). *ASCA national standards for students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs (2nd ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Banks, S. G. (2009). *Choice theory: Using choice theory and reality therapy to enhance student achievement and responsibility*. Alexandria, VA: The American School Counselor Association.
- Brigman, G., & Campbell, C. (2003). Helping students improve academic achievement and school success behavior. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 91-98.
- Brigman, G., Campbell, C., & Webb, L. (2004). *Student success skills: Group counseling manual*. Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.
- Brigman, G., & Webb, L. (2004). *Student success skills: Classroom manual*. Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.
- Brigman, G., & Webb, L. (2007). *Student success skills: Classroom manual (2nd ed.)*. Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.
- Brigman, G., Campbell, C., & Webb, L. (2007). *Student success skills: Group counseling manual (2nd ed.)*. Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.
- Brigman, G., & Webb, L. (2010). *Student success skills: Classroom manual (3rd ed.)*. Boca Raton, FL: Atlantic Education Consultants.
- Brigman, G., & Webb, L., & Campbell, C. (2007). Building skills for school success: Improving the academic and social competence of students. *Professional School Counseling, 10*, 279-288.
- Campbell, C., & Brigman, G. (2005). Closing the achievement gap: A structured approach to group counseling. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 30*, 67-82.
- Carey, J. C, Dimmitt, C., Hatch, T. A, Lapan, R. T., & Whiston, S. C. (2008). Report of the national panel for evidence-based school counseling: Outcome research coding protocol and evaluation of student success skills and second step. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 197-204.
- Carns, A. W., & Carns, M. R. (1991). Teaching study skills, cognitive strategies, and metacognitive skills through self-diagnosed learning styles. *ASCA School Counselor, 38*, 341-346.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dimmitt, C., Carey, J.C., & Hatch, T. (2007). *Evidence-based school counseling: Making a difference with data-driven practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dimmitt, C., Carey, J.C., McGannon, W., & Henningson, I. (2005). Identifying a school counseling research agenda: A delphi study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 214-228

Elias, M, Fredricks, L., Greenberg, M., O'Brian, M., Resnick, H., Weissberg, R. et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466-474.

Florida Department of Education (2005). *FCAT handbook - A resource for educators*. Tallahassee, FL: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2010 from <http://fcats.fldoe.org/handbk/complete.pdf>

Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st century*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Glasser, W. (1969). *Schools without failure*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1998a). *Choice theory*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Glasser, W. (1998b). *The quality school teacher*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Hattie, J., Briggs, J., & Purdie, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills interventions on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 99-130.

Hedges, L.V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Hill, C., Bloom, H., Black, A., & Lipsey, M. (2008). Empirical benchmarks for interpreting effect sizes in research. *Child Development Perspectives, 2*, 172-177. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2008.00061.x

León, A., Villares, E., Brigman, G., Webb, L., & Peluso, P. (2010). Closing the achievement gap of hispanic students: A school counseling response. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollack, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mason, C. P. & Duba, J. D. (2009). Using reality therapy in schools: Its potential impact on the effectiveness of the ASCA national model. *International Journal of Reality Therapy, 29*, 5-12.

Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist, 53*, 205-220.

Payton, J., Weissberg, R., Durlak, J., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., Schellinger, K., & Pachan, M. (2008). The positive impact of social and emotional learning for kindergarten to eight grade student: Finding from three scientific reviews. Retrieved July 11, 2010 from <http://www.casel.org/downloads/PackardES.pdf>

Shechtman, Z. (2002). Child group psychotherapy in the school at the threshold of a new millennium. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80, 293-299.

Sink, C. A., & Stroh, H. R. (2003). Raising achievement test scores of early elementary school students through comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 6, 350-364.

Sink, C. A., & Stroh, H. R. (2006). Practical significance: The use of effect sizes in school counseling research. *Professional School Counseling*, 9, 401-411.

Vernez, G., & Zimmer, R. (2007). Interpreting the effects of Title 1 supplemental educational services. Retrieved July 11, 2010 from <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/implementation/achievementanalysis-sizes.doc>

Villares, E., Frain, M., Brigman, G., Webb, L., & Peluso, P. (2010). The impact of student success skills on standardized tests: A meta-analysis. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership*, 51, 74-79.

Webb, L., & Brigman, G. (2006). Student success skills: Tools and strategies for improved academic and social outcomes. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 112-120.

Webb, L., & Brigman, G. (2007). Student success skills: A structured group intervention for school counselors. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 32, 190-201.

Webb, L., Brigman, G., & Campbell, C. (2005). Linking school counselors and student success: A replication of the student success skills approach targeting the academic and social competence of students. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 407-411.

Whiston & Sexton (1998). A review of school counseling outcome research: Implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 76, 412-426.

Wubbolding, R. (2000). Reality therapy for the 21st century. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C. & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Building academic success on school social and emotional learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Brief Bios

Dr. Elizabeth Villares is an assistant professor in the Department of Counselor Education at Florida Atlantic University, FL. She has worked as a teacher, school counselor, and guidance director at the secondary level. Her area of specialization includes counseling children and adolescents, integrating technology in school counseling programs to improve data driven practices, and collaborating with school counselors to develop action research and program evaluation studies. Dr. Villares is also interested in the implementation of school-counselor-led-evidence-based programs that improve student achievement.

Dr. Greg Brigman is a professor of Counselor Education and coordinator of the school-counseling program at Florida Atlantic University, FL. He has been a high school teacher and national award winning middle school counselor. Dr. Brigman's main research interests are related to outcome research that ties school counselor interventions to student improvement. He regularly consults with school districts on implementing evidence-based programs and developing an action research agenda that shows school counselor impact.

Andrew Maier, M.Ed., is a school counselor at Internationella Engelska Gymnasiet Sodermalm, in Stockholm Sweden and is certified in Choice Theory & Reality Therapy. He is also a certified school counselor in Florida and has used the ASCA model in developing the Student Development Program at his current school. Mr. Maier has developed a leadership course at his school that combines Choice Theory and the WDEP model for personal and social problem solving with the Student Success Skills model.

AN EXAMPLE of CHOICE THEORY-BASED CHANGE in SMALL NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

W. J. Casstevens, PhD, LCSW/MSW¹

North Carolina State University

Abstract

This article examines organizational change using Lead Management and Choice Theory in small non-profit organizations, with an example from the Clubhouse model of psychosocial rehabilitation. A series of focus groups addressing questions based on the WDEP approach to Reality Therapy laid the groundwork for sustainable program development (i.e., organizational change) within Clubhouses. Focus group and subsequent task group facilitation modeled Lead Management, while emphasizing Glasser's seven caring habits. Positive responses to follow-up surveys at the first two (of four) Clubhouses indicate that Choice Theory may, indeed, be a successful vehicle of organizational change.

In 2008, an administrator at a psychiatric Clubhouse in North Carolina consulted this author about developing a health and wellness program for the Clubhouse, because previous attempts to develop such a program at the Clubhouse had been unsuccessful in generating sustained organizational change. Clubhouses are small community-based non-profit organizations for adults who have had a history of psychiatric diagnosis with a major mental disorder, e.g., schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. These Clubhouses are not social clubs, although adults apply for membership, are called members instead of clients, and once they become members may choose whether or not to attend the Clubhouse during the week. The Clubhouse model of psycho-social rehabilitation began in New York City in 1948, and now exists worldwide. Its international accrediting body is the International Center for Clubhouse Development (see www.iccd.org); the Clubhouse model emphasizes community and what is called a work-ordered day, which is a structured day of meaningful tasks and activities that range from doing necessary cleaning for the Clubhouse building, to making lunch for members and staff or running a Clubhouse snack bar. This milieu seemed to invite both Glasser's (1998, 2000) Lead Management style in administration, and a Choice Theory approach to organizational change (Casstevens, 2010).

Choice Theory and Reality Therapy

Choice Theory (Glasser, 1998, 2000) centers on the premise that an individual can only control her or his own behavior – and that no one can control the behavioral choices of another individual. The four components of thoughts, actions, feelings and physiology comprise what choice theorists call "Total Behavior," the classic metaphor for which is a front wheel drive vehicle, where thoughts and actions are the front wheels and feelings and physiology the back wheels (Glasser, 1986, revised 2002). To continue this metaphor, when in motion, the vehicle's back wheels follow its front wheels, and the front wheels are the only ones directly under driver control. Glasser (1965, 2000) applied Choice Theory to mental health using Reality Therapy, a therapeutic modality with cross-cultural applicability known and in use around the globe (see www.wglasser.com; Wubbolding, 2000). Wubbolding (2000) presented a formalized system of Reality Therapy, using the acronym "WDEP." In the WDEP system, an initial examination of an individual's wants (W) is followed

by exploration of what the individual is doing and the direction (D) this is taking the individual, and a thorough, honest evaluation (E) of the results of this. Finally, the P in WDEP involves generating a positive plan of action that includes the individual's Total Behavior. It was this Choice Theory and Reality Therapy based WDEP system that the author applied to organizational change at the Clubhouse, using a series of focus groups and focus group questions.

Choice Theory and Management Style

The administrators at the consulting Clubhouse normally used an approach to management that incorporated Lead Management style characteristics. Lead Management applies Choice Theory to the administration of organizations, and is a management style that falls on a continuum between the extremes of "Boss" and "Laissez-faire" management (Glasser, 1998). Lead Management is characterized by: support, transparency, group input and feedback, providing many options, and uses Glasser's seven caring habits. It is also strengths-based. A great deal of support is necessary within Lead Management, and using the seven caring habits of supporting, encouraging, listening, accepting, trusting, respecting, and negotiating differences is central to its success (N. Herrick, personal communication). Although normally using the Lead Management approach, in the previous attempts at implementing a health and wellness program at the Clubhouse, administrators had previously allowed staff to use an approach more reminiscent of "Boss" management. For example, at one point candy bars were arbitrarily removed from items available at the Clubhouse snack bar, without transparency or input from members. Thus, to succeed in launching sustainable organizational change, the focus group process needed to be strengths-based, and provide transparency, in addition to being a vehicle for both member and staff input and feedback.

Clubhouse administrators and staff had persisted in their pursuit of a health and wellness program at the Clubhouse despite the failure of previous implementation attempts, because health and wellness issues are a serious concern for this population (see Hutchinson, Gagne, Bowers, Russinova, Skrinar, & Anthony, 2006; Pelletier, Nguyen, Bradley, Johnsen, & McKay, 2005). High carbohydrate and high calorie diets, along with common psychotropic medication side-effects that include weight gain, and that inhibit regular outdoor activities and exercise due to heat and light sensitivity (Cohen, 1997, 2002; Torrey, 1995), contribute to the health and wellness concerns with this population.

This Choice Theory-based attempt at change hoped to generate internal motivation, develop multiple programming options, and improve the overall structure of the system by infusing health and wellness choices throughout the organization. Further, this focus group approach was based on the strength of community relationships already present at the Clubhouse. In sum, while Choice theory driven, it modeled characteristics of Lead Management and applied the WDEP system of Reality Therapy through focus group questions (Casstevens, 2010).

Focus Groups and Group Facilitation

It is important to recognize that "focus group" as used here does not refer to Glasser's focus groups on Choice Theory. Rather, this focus group concept comes from a business background and emphasizes information gathering. Traditionally, these groups avoid sensitive topics and their facilitators maintain a detached, impersonal, and non-responsive approach, although a shift toward a more empathetic facilitation and engagement style can be helpful in eliciting input, and was used in this context (Cohen & Garrett, 1999). As per Cohen and Garrett's recommendations, these focus groups revised traditional focus group

facilitation rules, and the facilitator used group work skills that included: Using empathy and being personal and responsive, being sensitive to group members' needs, encouraging participants to support one another when personal concerns arose, and building on relationships and commonalities among group members. This approach to group facilitation reflected Glasser's seven caring habits, which were also critical for the facilitator in modeling a Lead Management style at the Clubhouse.

As previously noted, the three questions that each focus group addressed were all Choice Theory-based and/or WDEP-based (see Casstevens, 2010). Using a series of focus groups to present and discuss the WDEP question sets, rather than a single group, occurred in part because of the population—many Clubhouse members might be experiencing psychiatric symptoms and/or taking medications that could slow cognitive processing. In addition, having a series of groups allowed input from a larger number of participants than a single group would have permitted.

Once each group was completed, the facilitator summarized the focus group's input. The accuracy of these summaries was checked at each subsequent group, and an overall summary of recommendations was written up. This overall summary was then checked for accuracy at a follow-up task group meeting to which members, staff and administrators were invited, prior to implementation. The focus group series explored participants' thoughts on health and wellness to help participants formulate their own ideas, and generate preferences. These preferences then helped the group to develop a framework that could be used for health and wellness program development within the Clubhouse.

Organizational Change, Sustainability and Response

Thanks to grant funding from the North Carolina State University Office of Extension, Engagement and Economic Development, this program development process has occurred at four Clubhouses in central North Carolina. The focus groups at each Clubhouse developed program specific goals for their Clubhouses, and Clubhouse administrations supported these goals insofar as funding and resources permitted. All steps of the change process were transparent, and staff and member input and feedback occurred during development, prior to implementation, and post-implementation of the multiple programming options. As previously noted, focus group facilitators modeled the seven caring habits during the focus and task groups, and the process was based on community strengths and overall involvement.

Responses to follow-up surveys on the Health and Wellness programming components developed during focus groups at the first two Clubhouses are generally quite positive. The follow-up surveys are from the two Clubhouses in which administrators incorporated a predominantly Lead Management approach. Sustainable change occurred in both of these organizations, and it will be interesting to see whether responses will be as positive at the other two Clubhouses, one of which tends toward a more "Laissez-faire" and the other toward a more "Boss" management style. At present, survey responses seem to indicate that administrators can successfully encourage organizational change at small non-profit agencies when they: (a) use a Lead Management style and (b) involve clients together with employees in a Choice Theory driven change process that uses (c) focus groups which include empathic facilitation and the seven caring habits, in addition to (d) questions developed based on Choice Theory and the WDEP system.

References

- Casstevens, W. J. (2010). Using Reality Therapy and Choice Theory in health and wellness program development at psychiatric psychosocial rehabilitation agencies. *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, 29(2), 55-58.
- Cohen, D. (1997). A critique of the use of neuroleptic drugs in psychiatry. In S. Fisher & R. P. Greenberg (eds.), *From placebo to panacea: Putting psychiatric drugs to the test* (pp. 173-228). New York: Wiley.
- Cohen, D. (2002). Research on drug treatment of schizophrenia: A critical appraisal and implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38, 217-239.
- Cohen, M. B., & Garrett, K. J. (1999). Breaking the rules: A group work perspective on focus group research. *British Journal of Social Work*, 29(3), 359-372.
- Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality therapy: A new approach to psychiatry*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1986, revised 2002). *Chart talk: The choice theory chart workbook, revised by Carleen Glasser*. Available from William Glasser, Inc. at www.wglasserbooks.com.
- Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Glasser, W. (2000). *Counseling with choice theory: The new reality therapy*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Hutchinson, D. S., Gagne, C., Bowers, A., Russinova, C., Skrinar, G. S., & Anthony, W. A. (2006). A framework for health promotion services for people with psychiatric disabilities. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 29(4), 241-250.
- Pelletier, J. R., Nguyen, M., Bradley, K., Johnsen, M., & McKay, C. (2005). A study of a structured exercise program with members of an ICCD certified clubhouse: Program design, benefits, and implications for feasibility. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 29(2), 89-96.
- Torrey, E. F. (1995). *Surviving schizophrenia: A manual for families, consumers and providers* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Wubbolding, R. E. (2000). *Reality therapy for the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.

¹ An earlier version of this material was presented at the 2010 William Glasser Institute International Conference, in Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

¹ The author would like to thank all participating Clubhouses; Health and Wellness Program Developers J. M. Spellmeyer, MS, MSW, and K. Swann, BA; N. Herrick, MEd, DCC, Senior Faculty WGI; and to acknowledge the North Carolina State University Office of Extension, Engagement and Economic Development, for the funding that made the project possible.

Short Bio

Dr. Casstevens is a Glasser Scholar, and completed Reality Therapy Certification through The William Glasser Institute in 2009. She is a Licensed Clinical Social Worker in both Florida and North Carolina with over fifteen years of practice experience. Her Ph.D. from

Florida International University is in Social Welfare, and she now teaches in the Department of Social Work at North Carolina State University. Her first book, *A Mentored Self-Help Intervention for Psychotic Symptom Management*, was published by VDM Verlag.

AN EXAMINATION of "CONNECTEDNESS TRENDS" ACROSS PRIMARY GRADE LEVELS

Thomas S. Parish, Ph.D., CTRTC
Joycelyn G. Parish, Ph.D., CTRTC

Abstract:

While it has been reported that primary grade children like school, and older children tend not to (see Basic, Balaza, Uzelac, & Jugovac, 1997), no one has actually sought to examine when this shift occurs across grade levels. Therefore, the present study was conducted in a cross-sectional fashion so that first, second, and third grade students would be rated by their teachers in an effort to get a sense as to how these students would be rated by grade—from first to third grade—in terms of how they were doing social-emotionally at school. For example, did students across these grade levels vary in terms of their being happy at school? Well, the results from the present study indicated that by third grade students were already significantly more negatively perceived by their teachers across all five social-emotionally-related areas surveyed compared to their second grade counterparts, and that second grade students, in turn, were found to be significantly more negatively perceived by their teachers across all five areas surveyed compared to their first grade counterparts. Teachers certainly need to be alerted to these unsettling results that were found to exist within primary grade levels so that they might implement various pro-social strategies (e.g., employ Dr. Glasser's [1990] "Quality School" model) that might serve to reverse this disturbing trend which apparently becomes even more exaggerated in the later grades.

Why do students almost always do better in the classes they like? Well, based upon various reports of research (see Blum, 2004, 2005; Niemiec & Ryan, 2009; Parish & Parish, 1999, 2000, 2005; Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994) it appears that those who like their classes tend to be better "connected" to them, to their teachers, and to their fellow students too. That is, students who like their classes better have been generally found to be better "connected" to them and all that is associated with them. In contrast, according to Klem and Connell (2004), "By high school, as many as 40 to 60 percent of all students—urban, suburban, and rural—are chronically disengaged from school" (p. 262). In addition, it truly is little wonder that a high correlation has often been reported between "connectedness" and school success, reflecting the fact that students will care more about their performance in school if, and when, they believe that they are cared for by others, be they teachers, fellow students, and/or school administrators. For instance, Basic, et al. (1997) reported that students in the first four grades placed greater importance on school than their counterparts that were surveyed in middle school or high school. There doesn't seem to be any big surprise in such results, but what about within the primary grades themselves? Might there also occur within the primary grades a shift away from being "connected" with school, teachers, fellow students, etc.? To determine if this is so was the central focus of the present study.

Method

Sixty (60) teachers were randomly selected from the first, second, and third grades of a large Midwestern school district. They were asked to rate each of their current students on a five-point Likert-type scale on a continuum ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always), regarding the following questions:

Does this student treat his/her teachers with respect? Is this student happy while s/he is at school? Does this student do his/her best to learn? Does this student work cooperatively with other students while at school? Does this student treat classmates in a caring and respectful manner?

Results

As is shown in Table 1, the survey items noted above are listed along with the percent of students (as reported by their teachers) who exhibited the surveyed behavior. Category A refers to the percent of the students at each grade level who were thought to exhibit this particular behavior most of the time or more often (i.e., teachers assigned a score of 4 or 5 to them). In contrast, the Category B refers to the percent of students at each grade level who were thought to engage in this particular behavior only some of the time or less often (i.e., the teachers assigned a score of 2 or 1 to them). Notably, students who were assigned a score of "3" on these items (i.e., a "middle score") were not included in either the "high" group (i.e., Category A), or in the "low" group (i.e., Category B), and were therefore not included in any of the statistical analyses performed in the present study.

Survey item:	A: Percent of students (as reported by their teachers) who exhibit this behavior most of the time or more.			B: Percent of students (as reported by their teachers) who exhibit this behavior some of the time or less.		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
Treats teachers with respect	90.8 %	86.3 %	84.1 %	9.2 %	13.7 %	15.9 %
Is happy at school	90.6 %	86.9 %	79.2 %	9.4 %	13.1 %	20.8 %
Does his/her best	82.7 %	74.1 %	68.0 %	17.3 %	25.9 %	32.0 %
Works cooperatively with other students	82.6 %	77.0 %	70.2 %	17.4 %	23.0 %	29.8 %
Treats classmates in a caring and respectful manner	85.0 %	77.8 %	73.5 %	15.0 %	22.2 %	26.7 %

Table 1: "Connectedness Trends" Across Primary Grade Levels

Discussion

Briefly stated, for each item noted above, it was generally found that fewer students at each succeeding grade level were found to exhibit the desired behaviors.

More specifically, while the trend was found that students at each succeeding grade level did, indeed, exhibit fewer "connectedness"-like behaviors, at least according to the reports of their teachers, the magnitude of this shift seems to be quite noteworthy. For example, in first grade 91% of the students were reported by their teachers to be "happy at school" most of the time or all of the time. However, by third grade this percentage was only found to be 79%! For teachers who are aware of this apparent "drop" in how happy students are believed to be between first to third grade, some concern should be expressed, immediately followed by focused efforts to ameliorate this problem by teachers and administrators alike who are aware of the existence of this problem.

In another example, 83% of the first graders were reported by their teachers as "doing their best to learn" most of the time or more often. Unfortunately, by third grade about 15% fewer students responded similarly, since only 68% of them were perceived by their

teachers as doing their best to learn in school. The situation appears even more alarming, however, when one notices that almost a third of third graders (i.e., 32%) were actually perceived by their teachers as only doing their best some of the time or not at all, while first graders were only placed in that category (i.e., sometimes doing their best or not doing their best at all) only about 17% of the time.

As these data—reported here—clearly indicate, for nearly every question addressed above, the occurrence of the positive, “connectedness” actions by students were found to lessen at each successive grade level, and these differences between grade levels were found to be statistically significant, too, and occurred across gender, socioeconomic level, and ethnicity. These findings should certainly serve as a “wake-up call” for everyone “connected” with these grade levels in any way, and every effort should be expended in order to foster within each classroom a “Quality School”-type environment (see Glasser, 1990) where students, regardless of grade level, are greatly valued and encouraged to achieve success, rather than have these students discover that schools are simply a place that they are expected to go to fail.

References

- Basic, J., Balaza, S., Uzelac, S., & Jugovac, G. (1997). School in the students’ quality world. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 17(1), 46-49.
- Blum, R. (2004). School connectedness—Strengthening health and education outcomes for teenagers: An executive summary. *Journal of School Health*, 74 (7) 231-233.
- Blum, R. (2005). A case for school connectedness. *The Adolescent Learner*, 62(7), 16-20.
- Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Klem, A., & Connell, J. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 262-273.
- Niemiec, C., & Ryan, R. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133-144.
- Parish, J. G., & Parish, T. S. (1999). An examination of teacher caring, underachievement, and at-risk behaviors. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 19(1), 27-31.
- Parish, T. S., & Parish, J. G. (2000). Determining the profile of disconnected students. Paper presented at the 2000 Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association held in Chicago, Illinois.
- Parish, T. S., & Parish, J. G. (2005). Comparing students’ classroom-related behaviors across grade levels and happiness levels. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 25(1), 24-25.
- Ryan, R., Stiller, J., & Lynch, J. (1994). Representations of relationships to teachers, parents and friends as predictors of academic motivation and self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14, 226-249.

Brief Bios

Thomas S. Parish is an emeritus professor at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas. Currently, he is serving as a research consultant for Kansas State Department of Education in Topeka, Kansas, and is also the editor of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*.

Joycelyn Gay Parish is a senior education research analyst for the Kansas State Department of Education in Topeka, Kansas, and is also a member of the editorial board of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*.

Empowering College Students to Satisfy Their Basic Needs: Implications for Primary, Secondary, and Post-secondary Educators

Thomas K. Burdenski, Jr., Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Psychology and Counseling
Tarleton State University—Stephenville, TX

Brenda Faulkner, M.Ed.
Director of Student Success Programs
Tarleton State University—Stephenville, TX

Note: The authors would like to thank Dale M. Johnson, Ph.D., Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies at Tarleton State University—Stephenville, TX for his invaluable assistance with the research design and data analysis in the present study. We are also grateful for Dr. Byron Loyd's permission to use his *Choice Connections Manual* as part of this study.

Abstract

This study investigated the extent to which exposure to choice theory increased provisionally admitted freshmen college students' perceived satisfaction of their five basic needs of belonging, power, freedom, fun, and survival; their composite need satisfaction (all five needs summed); their self-esteem; and their inner locus of control. A quasi-experimental, nonrandomized pretest/posttest design was used. For five weeks, the treatment group received exposure to choice theory principles. The results suggested that teaching college freshmen to evaluate and better meet their basic needs had a positive sustaining effect on their perception of satisfaction of the belonging need, their composite need satisfaction, and their self-esteem. This study could prove beneficial to postsecondary educators, particularly those invested in the academic success and retention of provisionally admitted freshmen students. Teaching students to identify and take action on their levels of need satisfaction may help them increase their academic motivation, facilitate their adjustment to college, promote academic success, increase retention rates, and decrease ineffective behaviors. This article concludes with a list of recommendations for elementary, secondary, and post-secondary educators on how to maximize the satisfaction of students' needs based on the vast number of empirical studies on self-determination theory (SDT), which the authors argue is conceptually very closely aligned with choice theory.

According to William Glasser's choice theory (1998), there exists an interconnection between one's needs satisfaction and his/her behavior: "For all practical purposes, we choose everything we do, including the misery we feel. Other people can make us neither miserable nor make us happy. All we can get from them is information. But by itself, information cannot make us do or feel anything. It goes into our brains, where we process it and then decide what to do...we choose all our actions and thoughts and, indirectly, almost all our feelings and much of our physiology. As bad as you may feel, much of what goes on in your body when you are in pain or sick is the indirect result of the actions and thoughts you choose or have chosen every day of your life" (pp. 3-4).

Glasser (1998) states while our need for survival depends a lot on our physiology, we are genetically programmed to try to satisfy the four psychological needs of love and belonging, power, freedom, and fun. He said: "All our behavior is always our best choice, at the time we make the choice, to satisfy one or more of these needs" (p. 28). In his "Ten Axioms of

Choice Theory," Glasser clearly points to the love and belonging need as the most salient of the psychological needs: "All long-lasting problems are relationship problems. A partial cause of many other problems, such as pain, fatigue, weakness, and some chronic diseases—commonly called autoimmune diseases—is relationship problems" (p. 333).

Glasser (1998) points to evolutionary processes as driving and shaping the formation of human needs: "In our prehistoric past, survival was the basic need, as it is with almost all animals today. But gradually, those who loved gained a survival advantage and, as this advantage continued, love began to separate from survival and became a basic need on its own. The same happened with power. As time went on, those who succeeded in achieving power had a much better chance of surviving than did those with little power, so the need for power also became a separate need. To escape from the domination of others so we could more easily survive, we needed freedom; thus it, too, became a separate need and served as a buffer against power. Fun, which is the genetic reward for learning, also became a separate need as we began to learn new things that were unrelated to survival, but closely related to how to gain more love, power, and freedom" (p. 33).

Many current researchers agree with the concept of basic human needs and the consequences of not having those needs met. For example, Baumeister and Leary (1995) pointed to belongingness as the fundamental evolutionary force that propelled humans, as a social species, to stay in the good graces of others to ensure their survival. They enumerated a set of nine stringent criteria for identifying fundamental human needs and they claimed that the need for belongingness met all nine criteria. Self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985, Ryan & Deci, 2000), a macro-theory of human motivation, emotion, and development, postulates three basic psychological needs which are strikingly similar to Glasser's basic psychological needs for belongingness, power, and freedom, respectively. These are: a) the need for relatedness (i.e. to feel close and accepted by important others and with important groups of others); b) the need for competence (i.e. to feel effective, skillful and able to master the challenges of life); and c) the need for autonomy (i.e. to feel that one causes, identifies with, and endorses one's own behavior). Sheldon and Gunz (2009) assert that the relatedness need is conceptually very similar to Baumeister and Leary's "belongingness" need. While Ryan and Deci (2000) did not explicitly name "learning" and "fun" as a basic human need, Niemiec and Ryan (2009) stated later that: "Inherent in human nature is the proactive tendency to engage one's physical and social surroundings and to assimilate ambient values and cultural practices. That is, people are innately curious, interested creatures who possess a natural love of learning and who desire to internalize the knowledge, customs, and values that surround them" (p. 133).

Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 69), have determined that there are "innate psychological needs that are the basis for self-motivation and personality integration," and that the meeting of those needs "appears to be essential for facilitating optimal functioning of the natural propensities for growth and integration, as well as for constructive social development and personal well-being" (p. 69). Ryan and Deci (2000) defined a psychological need as "an energizing state that, if satisfied, is conducive to health and well-being but, if not satisfied, contributes to pathology and ill-being." They added that specific psychological needs are "essential nutrients that individuals cannot thrive without satisfying all of them, any more than people can thrive with water, but without food" (p. 76).

Dozens of empirical studies have been conducted that support the idea that relatedness, competence, and autonomy each make unique predictive outcomes to many kinds of thriving and well-being outcomes, including daily well-being (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000), secure relationship attachments (La Guardia, Ryan, Couchman, & Deci,

2000), "most satisfying events" (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim, & Kasser, 2001), positive teacher course evaluations (Filak & Sheldon, 2003; see Niemiec & Ryan, 2009, for a thorough review of studies applying SDT to educational settings), and effective work performance and satisfaction (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004). Sheldon and Gunz (2009) have also demonstrated that deficits in one's needs satisfaction in any of the three needs, leads to increased motivation to acquire greater need satisfaction. To support the universality of the three needs, effects have been demonstrated in a wide variety of cultural contexts (Chirkov, Ryan, & Willness, 2005; Deci et al., 2001, Sheldon et al., 2001) and in longitudinal studies, accumulative satisfaction of the three needs over time leads to a wide variety of positive outcomes (La Guardia et al., 2000; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Sheldon & Krieger, 2007)

In choice theory literature, these genetically programmed needs are also referred to as "genetic instructions," and "internal instructions" that are biologically encoded (Buck, 2002, p. 7). Wubbolding refers to these innate human needs as "internal forces or internal motivations" (2000, p. 10). Based on the choice theory premise that human needs are genetically encoded, it should be kept in mind that the five basic needs are considered universal and common to every human being, while specific behaviors that each person will choose to satisfy those needs will be unique to each individual. The universal observation is that humans will feel pleasure when a need is met and frustration when a need goes unsatisfied; there is a constant urge to satisfy unmet needs. People who are not experiencing pleasure are unhappy and they need to replace their ineffective behaviors with more effective ones in order to feel more pleasure and experience greater happiness (Glasser, 1998). As noted previously, the motivation to fulfill basic psychological needs when they are frustrated has been empirically supported (Sheldon & Gunz, 2009).

Locus of Control and Self-Esteem

Locus of control is a psychological construct developed from Julian Rotter's social learning theory (1966). Rotter theorized that one's sense of control can be viewed along a continuum—on the internal end, reinforcements or events are perceived as contingent upon the individual's own behavior and on the external end, reinforcements and events are perceived as the result of forces beyond one's immediate control. Individuals are said to be internal if they perceive themselves to be better able to exercise some control over the events in their lives and individuals with an external orientation perceive the events in their lives as largely determined by luck, fate, or powerful others. Major literature reviews (see for example, Hattie, 1992; Lefcourt, 1976; Phares, 1976) showed that internals differ from externals in many ways, particularly in terms of their cognitive activity and environmental mastery. Because they are more perceptive of their environments, internals tend to exert more control over their lives by more readily acquiring and using information that is relevant to their goals, even when the information does not appear relevant initially (Phares, 1976, p. 78). The superiority of internals over externals is particularly evident with the ability to pick up on environmental cues and engage in incidental learning. Externals require more explicit cuing than do internals and internals outperform externals in the arena of incidental learning because they are better able to see the purpose behind less structured learning activities, such as group discussions, participating in an individual or group task, or engaging in trial-and-error experimentation (Marsick & Watkins, 2001).

Psychologists are ambivalent about the meaning and importance of self-esteem. On the one hand, it is clear that a sense of worth and confidence can yield many benefits in terms of motivation and mental health. On the other hand, there is suspicion that too often self-esteem is misplaced, exaggerated, or vulnerable. Many people have an inflated sense of self-worth, out of line with their actual merits and accomplishments. Others, particularly

narcissists, may well have high self-esteem, but nonetheless are insensitive, self-centered and have low regard of others (Ryan & Brown, 2003). There is also something troubling about encouraging persons to esteem themselves at the expense of developing humility and grace. To address these concerns, self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) distinguishes contingent self-esteem from true self-esteem, which is considered "optimal" (Deci & Ryan, 1995). Contingent self-esteem involves feelings of self-worth that are dependent on matching external standards of excellence or expectations (i.e., ego involvement) motivated by a lack of fulfillment of basic needs (relatedness, competence, and autonomy). It is thought to be associated with various narcissistic and defensive processes that reveal less-than-optimal psychological well-being.

The degree to which a person's self-esteem is true is contingent upon satisfying basic needs and nourishing the growth-oriented processes that create true self-esteem. For instance, Moller, Friedman, and Deci (2006) stated that: "If, developmentally, people experience ongoing satisfaction of the basic needs, they tend to become secure within themselves and to experience a sense of self-worth that is relatively stable and is not a source of focus or concern. True self-esteem is thus generated by an inherently active, growth-oriented tendency that flourishes under conditions of basic need satisfaction" (p. 189).

If, on the other hand, children experience frustration of their basic needs beginning at early ages, their sense of self will be less secure and it is far more likely that they would forever strive for extrinsic goals or standards that would signal significance or worth. Thus contingent self-esteem is motivated by unmet basic needs and it is more defensive in nature—"I will be okay when...." With basic needs unmet, this form of self-esteem is driven by the need to prove one's worth, to feel a sense of pride, and to avoid guilt and shame (Moller et al., 2006). Deficits in self-esteem have been associated with a wide variety of psychological problems including depression and suicidal ideation (Harter, 1993; Rosenberg, 1985), loneliness and peer rejection (Ammerman, Kazdin, & Van Hasselt, 1993; East, Hess, & Lerner, 1987); low academic achievement (Hattie, 1992) low satisfaction with life (Huebner, 1991); and a large number of DSM-IV-TR diagnoses (Silverstone, 1991).

Rationale for the Study

Research has shown that a lack of needs satisfaction in college students generally contributes to self-destructive behaviors, low academic motivation and performance, and unsatisfying social relationships. College students may choose ineffective behaviors due to a lack of understanding of the connection between their basic needs and their behaviors; they may also lack knowledge about what strategies can be used to effectively satisfy their needs. The *Choice Connections Manual* (Loyd, 2003) was used as the primary intervention in this study. The manual was developed to help high school students make more effective choices using empirically validated principles. The manual was adapted for first-semester college students and the intervention emphasized teaching students about total behavior using the car metaphor, the "WDEP" (wants, doing, evaluation, plan) procedures for change (Wubbolding, 2000), and Glasser's (2000) "seven deadly habits." The present study is essentially a replication of Loyd's (2005) study, except that a refined version of Pete's Pathogram was used as the dependent measure, along with Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965) and Rotter's (1966) I-E Locus of Control Scale. The refined Pete's Pathogram measure included Glasser's (1998) Survival need and also encouraged the respondents to reflect only on how well their basic needs were satisfied in the college environment instead of in their lives generally. Demonstrating that college freshman could learn and apply choice theory to their daily lives could aid them in moving toward taking more responsibility for satisfying their personal needs, thereby encouraging more effective personal choices. In the

current literature, needs satisfaction is linked to positive coping skills, an internal locus of control, academic motivation and success, and greater personal responsibility. In contrast, ineffectively meeting these needs leads to frustration, higher levels of anger intensity, a lack of motivation and performance, personal relationship dissatisfaction, and an external locus of control (Jang, Reeve, Ryan, & Kim, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Eight research questions, each with a corresponding hypothesis, were addressed in this study:

Research Question #1. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the Choice Connections Manual (Loyd, 2003), increase perceived need satisfaction for Belonging in first semester college students?

Hypothesis #1. The treatment group #1 is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived need satisfaction for Belonging after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the Choice Connections Manual (CCM; Loyd, 2003), for five weeks of class when compared with the control group who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #2. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived need satisfaction for Power for first semester college students?

Hypothesis #2. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived need satisfaction for Power after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #3. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived need satisfaction for Freedom for first semester college students?

Hypothesis #3. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived need satisfaction for Freedom after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #4. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived need satisfaction for Fun in first semester college students?

Hypothesis #4. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived need satisfaction for Fun after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #5. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived need satisfaction for Survival in first semester college students?

Hypothesis #5. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived need satisfaction for Survival after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #6. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived total need satisfaction (sum of Belonging, Power, Freedom, Fun, and Survival need scores) for first semester college students?

Hypothesis #6. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived total need satisfaction (sum of Belonging, Power, Freedom, Fun, and Survival need scores) after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no such exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #7. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived self-esteem for first semester college students?

Hypothesis #7. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

Research Question #8. To what extent will exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, increase perceived locus of control for first semester college students?

Hypothesis #8. The treatment group is hypothesized to show an increase in perceived internal locus of control (i.e. lower scores on the Rotter I-E Locus of Control Scale) after exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the CCM, for five weeks of class when compared with the control groups who will receive no exposure (instruction, discussion, application) to these principles during five weeks of the semester.

METHOD

Participants

We implemented elements of Dr. William Glasser's choice theory as a teaching and coaching tool for newly admitted freshman taking a university seminar course provided by the Division of General Studies during the fall semester of 2008 and 2009, at a rural regional university in the southwestern United States. These students were admitted conditionally because they did not have sufficiently high SAT or ACT scores and they were in the bottom 50% of their graduating high school classes. Given their admission status, these students

were required to take this course in the fall of their first year on campus. In an attempt to answer the research questions, the following quantitative study was conducted with 12 classes of at-risk college students. Due to the structure and constraints of the college classroom environment, randomly assigned participants were not possible. Pre-formed classroom student assignments could not be disrupted and had to remain intact. The classes that represented the treatment and control groups were randomly chosen from a pool of classes offered during the fall semester of 2008 and 2009. The instructor who taught choice theory principles randomly selected two of her three sections of the university seminar course each semester to represent the treatment groups. Her remaining section served as the control group. Two additional sections taught by another instructor participated in the study during the fall of 2008 and the fall of 2009. A total pool of 12 classes was used in this study over the course of two fall semesters, with four of the 12 classes serving as treatment group and eight classes serving as the control group. The total treatment group included 67 participants and the total control group included 109 participants. This study was a quasi-experimental study, a design that Babbie (2001), referred to as "the non-equivalent control group design" (p. 341). He gave the example of a school classroom being appropriate for this type of design. Due to the nature of the school setting, this was a "sample of convenience" (Triola, 2002, p. 20).

Materials

The chosen instrument used to measure the perceived level of needs satisfaction was Pete's Pathogram (Peterson, 2008; Peterson & Parr, 1982; Peterson & Truscott, 1988), a very practical and effective assessment tool used by choice theory/reality therapy counselors and researchers, originally developed by Arlin Peterson and Gerald Parr (1982). One rationale behind this decision was that Pete's Pathogram is the only instrument that measures the specific aspects of the five psychological needs of choice theory needed for this project. Another rationale was that a substantial amount of empirical research has been conducted using Pete's Pathogram, as opposed to a limited amount of empirical research conducted with other available instruments (Loyd, 2005; Peterson & Parr, 1982; Peterson & Truscott, 1988; Peterson, Chang, & Collins, 1998; Peterson, Woodward, & Kissko, 1991). As recommended by Loyd (2003), participants were asked to focus their assessment of need intensity, willingness to work, and satisfaction of these five needs in the specific context of their transition experience to college, not at home or with family members, so that basic needs assessment was focused on the college transition experience.

Pete's Pathogram (Peterson, 2008; Peterson & Truscott, 1988) assesses the self-perceived (a) interest, strength, or intensity of each of Glasser's five basic human needs, (b) the time and effort invested in satisfying each need, and (c) the success attained in satisfying each need. This instrument was originally designed to be a clinical instrument to provide a graphic illustration for clients to measure the perceived intensity of their basic needs as explained by Glasser, the time and effort the students were investing in attempting to satisfy their needs, and the success attained in satisfying each need (Peterson, et al., 1998). Notably, the rating is subjective, but it is consistent with the choice theory concept of self-evaluation (Sullo, 1997).

Pete's Pathogram revised (Peterson, 2008; Peterson & Truscott, 1988) is designed to maintain the clinical utility of the original pathogram (Peterson & Parr, 1982), while adding a consistent numerical scale (1-9), with a mean score of 5, and a standard deviation of 1. The pathogram is designed to measure quantitatively, various dimensions of the psychological needs of belonging, power, freedom, and fun as well as the physiological need for survival. The pathogram is utilized to compare the profiles in regard to perceived needs,

time/effort invested, and success achieved in satisfying each psychological need. Also, the interrelationships of each need to each of the other needs have been reported. It has been shown to be an effective tool for discovering the internal world of students, as well as an effective tool for counseling (Loyd, 2005; Peterson & Parr, 1982; Peterson & Truscott, 1988; Peterson, Woodward, & Kissko, 1991). Peterson et al. (1998) demonstrated that teaching choice theory principles and using choice theory principles in group counseling with 217 Taiwanese university students was effective in altering both their attitudes and behaviors so that they were better able to meet their five basic needs. Pete's Pathogram was used to measure the dependent variable used in that study.

The other dependent measures have long standing usage in the social sciences too. They are the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965) and the Rotter I-E Locus of Control Scale (1966). Self-esteem has been a widely studied trait in psychology and education. Self-esteem refers to an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes him or herself (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). Rosenberg describes self-esteem as a favorable vs. an unfavorable attitude toward the self. Self-esteem is considered to be the evaluative component of self-concept, which is a broader representation of the self that includes cognitive and behavioral aspects, as well as evaluative or affective ones (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991).

Rotter (1966) developed a social learning theory that distinguishes individuals who attribute success or failure to internal vs. external factors. A person with high internal locus of control believes he or she can control what happens to him or her. High external locus of control refers to believing that fate, luck, or powerful others largely control one's life. Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Scale (1966) is a widely used measure of locus of control and it was included in this study. Research on the relationship between self-esteem and locus of control has determined that high self-esteem is significantly related to internal locus of control (Abdallah, 1989). Research on exposing choice theory to adolescents (Thatcher, 1983; Yarish, 1986) suggests that it has a positive effect on developing internal locus of control.

According to a recent study (Stoeber, 2002), college success, as defined by adjustment to college and academic performance, is multi-determined with a number of contributing influences, including academic factors, personality variables, family characteristics, and environmental factors. Specifically, academic performance was predicted by a combination of academic factors (SAT score and class rank) and academic adjustment. In turn, academic adjustment was predicted by locus of control, perceived social support, and high school class rank. Personal adjustment was predicted by coping strategies employed, parents who fostered autonomy, locus of control, self-esteem, and high school class rank. Finally, social adjustment was predicted by optimism, coping strategies employed, and locus of control. A high internal locus of control contributes to both personal and social adjustment and high self-esteem was related to personal adjustment.

Procedures

Each group was given several pretest instruments, consisting of Pete's Pathogram and others. Pete's Pathogram assessed self-reported satisfaction of each of the five basic needs (Survival, Belonging, Power, Freedom, and Fun) as defined by choice theory. The other instruments include the Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, and Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control measure. The test data were collected and recorded. Then, the treatment group was exposed to choice theory/reality therapy principles, as presented within the framework of the *Choice Connections Manual* (Loyd, 2003) through instruction, discussion, personal

application, and planning for practically applying these principles to life situations during the first five weeks of the course.

When the five weeks of instruction were completed, a posttest consisting of Pete's Pathogram, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, and Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control measure, were administered to the treatment and control groups. Data were collected and recorded. Pete's Pathogram (Basic Need Satisfaction) was used as the primary dependent measure. We also wanted to determine if exposure to choice theory increased internal locus of control, as measured by Rotter's I-E Locus of Control Scale and self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

The quantitative data obtained from two administrations of Pete's Pathogram to Groups 1 and 2 were analyzed by SPSS (Norusis, 2009), a statistical analysis program for social sciences. Two different operations of statistical analysis were conducted with the research data collected for each of the research questions and hypotheses. First, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted for the purpose of controlling for any pre-study differences that might have existed between the control and treatment groups with respect to the level of need satisfaction (as measured by Pete's Pathogram) prior to this study. This type of analysis was necessary because it was not possible to randomly assign students to control or treatment groups independently. Intact, pre-formed groups had to be used.

A paired samples t-test for a repeated measures design was conducted on all Pete's Pathogram data for both the treatment and control groups after the five-week treatment period. For a repeated measures design, a participant is measured on two occasions on one measure, in this case during the pretest and posttest. The primary question of interest is whether the mean difference between the scores on the two occasions is significantly different from zero (Green & Salkind, 2002).

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test for differences in pretest scores between the treatment and control group on Rotter's I-E Locus of Control measure and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. According to Pallant (2004): "ANCOVA is also handy when you have been unable to randomly assign your subjects to different groups, but instead have to use existing groups (e.g., classes of students). As these groups may differ on a number of different attributes (not just the ones you are interested in), ANCOVA can be used to reduce some of these differences" (p. 264).

ANCOVA can also be used when the researcher has a two group/pretest-posttest design. The scores on the pretest are used as a covariate to "control" for pre-existing differences between the groups (Pallant, 2004). This makes ANCOVA very useful in situations when you have quite small sample sizes, and only a small or medium effect sizes. According to Stevens (1996) this is very common in social science research and he recommends choosing two or three covariates to reduce the error variance and increase the chance of detecting a significant difference between groups. ANCOVA is an extension of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) that allows the researcher to explore differences between groups while statistically controlling for an additional continuous variable. SPSS uses regression procedures to remove the variation in the dependent variable that is due to the covariate, and then performs the normal ANOVA on the corrected or adjusted scores. By removing the influence of the additional variable, ANCOVA can increase the power or sensitivity of the statistical test (the F test).

RESULTS

A paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of teaching choice theory on students' scores on their perception of satisfaction of their five basic needs, as well as their perceived total need satisfaction. As shown in Table 1, there was a statistically significant increase in satisfaction of the belonging need for the treatment group from pretest ($M = 6.57$, $SD = 2.10$) to posttest ($M = 7.31$, $SD = 1.53$), $t(66) = -2.59$, $p < .05$. The r statistic (.30) indicated a small effect size. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference between the two ratings was -1.32 to -.171.

There was also a statistically significant increase in satisfaction of the total need satisfaction score for the treatment group from pretest ($M = 36.82$, $SD = 6.04$) to posttest ($M = 39.68$, $SD = 5.14$), $t(37) = -2.77$, $p < .01$. The r statistic (.41) indicated a moderate effect size. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference between the two ratings was -4.97 to -.77. There were no statistically significant increases in perceived satisfaction of the power, survival, freedom, or fun scores from pretest to posttest.

Table 1

Changes in Five Basic Needs Score and Composite Need Score from Pre-Test to Post-Test

	Pre-Test				Post-Test			
	Treatment n=67		Control n=109		Treatment		Control	
Basic Need Score	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Belonging	6.57	2.10	6.78	1.66	7.31	1.53	8.19	1.63
Power	6.52	1.84	6.30	1.18	6.81	1.59	7.42	1.55
Freedom	7.37	1.46	7.24	1.92	7.75	1.40	6.87	1.42
Fun	7.52	1.80	7.40	1.81	7.70	1.52	7.82	1.54
Survival	7.82	1.60	7.50	1.82	7.96	1.28	7.75	1.12
Total Need Score	36.82	6.04	35.23	6.29	39.68	5.14	38.06	5.30

ANCOVA results showed statistically significant ($p < .05$) group differences were detected on self-esteem scores in favor of the treatment group. After adjusting for differences in pretest scores between the treatment and control groups, there was a significant effect of the between subjects factor group $F(1,118) = 89.05$, $p < .05$, partial eta-squared = .05 (moderate effect size). The adjusted mean scores suggest that exposure to choice theory increased the self-esteem score as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. As shown in Table 2, the adjusted mean for the control group was 22.54 and the adjusted mean for the treatment group was 24.35.

Table 2

Changes in Rotter I-E Locus of Control Scores and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale Scores for Treatment Versus Control Group

	Pre-Test				Post-Test			
	Treatment		Control		Treatment		Control	
Measure	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Rotter I-E/LOC	10.27 n=37	3.39	10.24	2.65	10.27 n=63	3.54	10.77	3.04
Rosenberg SE	23.39 n=41	4.81	23.58	4.30	24.35 n=80	4.68	22.54	4.88

A similar ANCOVA analysis tested for differences in pretest scores between the treatment and control group on Rotter's I-E Locus of Control measure, but there were no statistically significant differences in locus of control scores between the treatment and control groups. On the locus of control measure, the adjusted mean for the control group was 10.77 and the adjusted mean for the treatment group was 10.26.

SUMMARY of FINDINGS

The eight research questions examined the effect of teaching choice theory principles on the self-perceived need satisfaction, self-esteem, and locus of control for at-risk college freshman. The findings indicated that with respect to the needs for survival, belonging, power, freedom, and fun, teaching choice theory was effective with increasing the post-test scores for belonging (small effect size) and the total need score (i.e., the sum of all five needs). The impact on the total need score was more pronounced, given the moderate effect size. Students who were taught Choice Theory principles (as compared to their control counterparts) also reported higher self-esteem as measured by the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (a moderate effect size), but their scores on the Rotter I-E Locus of Control Scale did not increase.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the research data presented, the following conclusions were reached:

Based on the Pre- and Posttest exposure to and practice of choice theory/reality therapy principles by at-risk, first-semester college freshmen, a positive effect was found on students' perceptions of the satisfaction of their belonging needs as well as their total need satisfaction.

Based on the pre- and posttest scores exposure to and practice of choice theory/reality therapy principles by at-risk, first-semester college freshmen, a positive effect was found on these students' perceptions of their self-esteem.

Given the striking similarities between the conceptualization of the basic psychological needs, as proposed by Glasser (1998) in choice theory, and the three basic psychological needs theorized by self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000), the large volume of research findings on the basic needs for relatedness (i.e., belonging), competence (i.e., power and achievement), and autonomy (i.e., freedom) generated by self-determination theory research has direct bearing on the application of choice theory/reality therapy in a wide variety of settings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the very strong empirical support generated for SDT in a wide variety of settings and the striking conceptual similarity between SDT theory of three basic psychological needs and Glasser's four basic psychological needs (supplemented by the fifth physiological need for survival), it appears prudent to apply the recommendations from SDT research to teachers, counselors, school administrators and parents practicing choice theory/reality therapy, particularly those concerned with helping students and/or clients to self-evaluate the satisfaction of their basic needs and how they can move forward with satisfying them more fully. Ryan and Deci (2000) stated that "The fact that psychological-need deprivation appears to be a principal source of human distress suggests that assessments and interventions would do well to target these primary foundations of mental health" (p. 74)

The following recommendations are drawn from the large body of research findings on SDT's basic three needs of relatedness (love and belonging), competence (power and achievement), and autonomy (freedom). As noted previously, while SDT does not address the need for fun explicitly, it posits that human beings have a natural sense of curiosity and desire to master their environments (Niemi & Ryan, 2009):

Teach students and clients about the direct connection between satisfying one's basic needs and being happy, well-adjusted, highly motivated, having high self-esteem, and being personally and socially adjusted and the direct relationship between not satisfying one's basic needs and feeling diminished motivation, a low sense of well-being, and poor personal and social adjustment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Students who have their basic needs met also tend to be more intrinsically motivated and more willing to engage in less interesting tasks and to value academic activities (Jang et al., 2009).

Administer a self-evaluation instrument that is appropriate to the age and setting of the individual. The Student Needs Survey (Burns, Vance, Szadokierski, & Stockwell, 2006; see Appendix A) was developed for the elementary classroom and it provides scores on all five of Glasser's basic human needs. The Need Satisfaction Scale for the Classroom (Filak & Sheldon, 2003; see Appendix B) is a short and simple way (9 items) to assess basic needs in a high school or college classroom setting. Pete's Pathogram (Appendix C) is ideal for use in a high school, college, or use with adults in a wide variety of settings.

In a recent article by Sheldon and Niemi (2006) entitled: "It's Not Just the Amount That Counts: Balanced Need Satisfaction Also Affects Well-being," the researchers found that people who experienced balanced need satisfaction reported higher well-being than those with the same sum score who reported greater variability in need satisfaction. Need satisfaction at school, at home, and with friends are all very important to adolescents. Adolescents' overall well-being and school adjustment is enhanced when there is balance among their needs (Veronneau, Koestner, & Abila, 2005) and balance across the three contexts (Sheldon & Gunz, 2009). Milyavskaya et al. (2009) studied 2,300 adolescents in four countries across three contexts (home, school, and with friends). Adolescents who experienced more balance among their needs across contexts reported being happier, less likely to drop out of school, and were rated as better adjusted by their teachers. These results suggest that meeting basic needs is important in all contexts for optimal happiness and adjustment. Satisfaction in one context cannot compensate for unhappiness in another context in young persons. Given these findings, it is probably best to have adolescents and young adults to assess all three areas using the measure developed by Koestner and Veronneau (2001) and Veronneau et al. (2005).

Meeting students' need for relatedness and belonging is closely connected with feeling that the teacher genuinely likes, respects, and values him or her. Students who feel connected with their teacher are much more likely to develop intrinsic motivation for the arduous tasks involved in learning (Niemic & Ryan, 2009). Conversely, students who feel disconnected from or rejected by teachers are likely to stop moving toward intrinsic motivation and respond only to external contingencies and controls.

The primary reason that children internalize externally imposed standards (like appropriate classroom behavior) is because the desired behaviors are demonstrated, prompted, and valued by significant others (teacher, peers, etc.) whom they feel or want to feel attached and related. This suggests that teachers who model relatedness and connection (Glasser's belonging need) with students are much more likely to succeed with having students internalize externally imposed requirements, like course or grade curriculum requirements or standardized testing mandated by the state (Ryan, Stiller, & Lynch, 1994).

Bear in mind that research shows that it is not enough for students to fulfill their need for power and achievement (i.e., to attain academic competence and skill) to heighten internal motivation. It is also important to fulfill students' need for autonomy for intrinsic (internal) motivation to take root (deCharms, 1968).

Research studies show that students assigned to autonomy-supportive teachers (Deci, Nezlek, & Sheinman, 1981) reported increased intrinsic motivation, perceived competence, and self-esteem over students taught by controlling teachers. The Problems in Schools (PIS) Questionnaire (Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman, & Ryan, 1981) and the Problems at Work (PAW) Questionnaire (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989), were developed to assess whether individuals in a position of authority, whose job is, in part, to motivate others, tend to be oriented toward controlling the behavior of those others versus supporting their own autonomy. The PIS assesses whether teachers tend to be controlling versus autonomy supportive with their students. The PAW assesses whether managers tend to be controlling versus autonomy supportive with their employees. These instruments can be downloaded from the following website: http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/moq_description.php

Teach parents, teachers, counselors and administrators that working with students, clients, and supervisees from an "inner control" vs. an "external control" orientation fosters greater interest, excitement, and confidence in students, which in turn leads to enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Deci & Ryan, 1991; Sheldon, Ryan, Rawsthorne, & Ilardi, 1997) greater vitality (Nix, Ryan, Manley, & Deci, 1999; higher self-esteem (Deci & Ryan, 1995), and a greater sense of well being (Ryan, Deci, & Grolnick, 1995).

Teachers who promote freedom and autonomy in students elicit from them greater motivation, desire for challenge, and curiosity (Deci et al., 1981; Flink, Boggiano, & Barrett, 1990; Ryan & Grolnik, 1986). The Learning Climate Questionnaire (Williams & Deci, 1996; see Appendix D) can be used in high school or college classrooms to get feedback from students on whether the instructor is autonomy-supportive vs. controlling. It can be adapted to the particular needs of the classroom.

Research has shown a positive relationship between parents who facilitate freedom and autonomy in adolescents and the quality of the parent-child relationship. In other words, facilitating autonomy in adolescents results in improved relationships with them (Ryan & Lynch, 1989; Ryan et al., 1994).

Parents and teachers who remind students about the value of school and completing school assignments for success in their later lives and future careers are more likely to engender a

sense of “choice” and personal ownership rather than forced compliance to an external regulation, even though much of what is imposed on students is not their direct choice (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Vallerand, 1997). When students are given a meaningful rationale for why a learning activity is important, students generally internalize more and show a greater effort to learn (Reeve, Jang, Hardre, & Omura, 2002).

The more students were exposed to external control psychology, the less they showed interest, value, and effort toward achievement and the more they tended to disown responsibility for negative outcomes, blaming others, such as the teacher, for their failures (Ryan & Connell, 1989).

Students in more inner-directed classrooms displayed more engagement (Connell & Wellborn, 1991) and better performance (Miserandino, 1996); lower dropout rates (Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; higher quality learning (Grolnick & Ryan, 1987); and better teacher ratings (Hayamizu, 1997).

When college students learn in order to teach the material to other students rather than to do well on a test, they are more intrinsically motivated and show better conceptual learning (Benware & Deci, 1984). Hence, asking more advanced or older students to assist younger ones pays dividends to both the student helper and the “helpee.”

Evaluative pressure should be minimized and autonomy support behaviors should be maximized when teaching because high evaluative pressure and controlling (low autonomy support) behaviors detract from student motivation and school performance (Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Kage & Namiki, 1990). Minimizing the use of coercion and maximizing the use of giving students a voice and a choice over their academic activities can also strengthen students’ autonomy needs.

While it is important to set classroom limits to create order in a classroom, it is important not to overdo classroom limits and rules. Koestner, Ryan, Bernieri, and Holt (1984) found that students who were given controlling limits showed significantly less intrinsic motivation than students given autonomy-supportive limits.

It is important that teachers provide students with the appropriate tools and feedback to promote success and self-efficacy. Grading homework and class assignment with an emphasis on what the student is doing right and specific suggestions for improvement that lead to greater mastery improve students’ self-efficacy and motivation (Niemic & Ryan, 2009).

The more teachers feel pressure from above (e.g., having to comply with an imposed curriculum, pressure to meet performance standards, etc.), the less autonomous they are likely to perform as teachers and the more likely they are to be controlling with students (Pelletier, Seguin-Levesque, & Legault, 2002). It is critical that teachers do not allow these pressures to usurp their enthusiasm and creative energy and avoid dropping the use of effective, interesting, and inspiring teaching practices that they would use if so many external pressures were not at play (Niemic & Ryan, 2009).

FINAL INSIGHTS and OVERVIEW

This article has demonstrated that failing to meet one’s basic psychological needs for love and belonging, power, freedom, and fun leads to a wide array of personal and academic problems that directly impact upon the purposes and goals of professional educators at the elementary, middle school, high school and post-secondary levels. On the other hand,

students who have their basic needs met are primed for thriving in the classroom environment, developing socially, and experiencing overall well-being. Actively monitoring students' perceptions of their basic needs and using that information to help students satisfy their needs more fully seems in the best interests of not only students, their parents and families, and to educators themselves, but also to society as a whole. The use of any and all of the basic needs measures listed in the appendices below are excellent tools for identifying deficits and taking corrective action while requiring a minimal amount of classroom time to make an assessment. These instruments were graciously made available by the authors of these instruments for your use.

References

- Abdallah, T. M. (1989). Self-esteem and locus of control in college men in Saudi Arabia, *Psychological Reports*, 65, 1323-1326.
- Ammerman, R. T., Kazdin, A. E., & Van Hoeselt, B. (1993). Correlates of loneliness in non-referred and psychiatrically hospitalized children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 2, 187-202. doi:10.1007/BF01321330
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 2045-2068. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Benware, C. A., & Deci, E. L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational set. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(4), 755-765. doi:10.2307/1162999
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightman (Eds.). *Measures of personality and psychological attitudes*, Volume 1. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Buck, N. S. (2002). *Peaceful parenting*. Chula Vista: CA: Black Forest Press.
- Burns, M. K., Vance, D., Szadokierski, I., & Stockwell, C. (2006). Student needs survey: A psychometrically sound measure of the five basic needs. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 25(2), 4-8.
- Chirkov, V. I., Ryan, R. M., & Willness, C. (2005). Cultural context and psychological needs in Canada and Brazil: Testing a self-determination approach to the internalization of cultural practices, identity, and well-being. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36, 423-443. doi:10.1177/0022022105275960
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-esteem processes. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Stroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 22, pp. 43-77). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 580-590. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.580

Deci, E. L., & Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic motivation of the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1-10. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.40.1.1

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 109-134.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 38. Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237-288).

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31-49). New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., Ryan, R., Gagne, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 930-942. doi:10.1177/0146167201278002

Deci, E. L., Schwartz, A. J., Sheinman, L., & Ryan, R. M. (1981). An instrument to assess adults' orientations toward control versus autonomy with children: Reflections on intrinsic motivation and perceived competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 642-650. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.73.5.642

East, P. L., Hess, L. E., & Lerner, R. M. (1987). Peer social support and adjustment of early adolescent peer groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 7, 153-163. doi:10.1177/0272431687072003

Filak V. F., & Sheldon, K. M. (2003). Student psychological need satisfaction and college teacher-course evaluations. *Educational Psychology*, 23, 235-247. doi:10.1080/01443410802337794

Flink, C., Boggiano, A. K., & Barrett, M. (1990). Controlling teaching strategies: Undermining children's self-determination and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 916-924. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.916

Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory: A new psychology of personal freedom*. New York: Harper Collins.

Glasser, W. (2000). *Counseling with choice theory: The new reality therapy*. New York: Harper Collins.

Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2002). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 890-898. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.52.5.890

Harter, S. (1993). Causes and consequences of low self-esteem in children and adolescents. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard* (pp. 87-116). New York: Plenum Press.

Hattie, J. (1992). *Self-concept*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hayamizu, T. (1997). Between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 39, 98-108.

Huebner, E. S. (1991). Correlates of life satisfaction in children. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 6, 103-111. doi:10.1037/h0088805

Jang, H., Reeve, J., Ryan, R. M., & Kim, A. (2009). Can self-determination theory explain what underlies the productive, satisfying learning experiences of collectivistically-oriented Korean students? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 644-661. doi:10.1037/a0014241

Kage, M., & Namiki, H. (1990). The effects of evaluation structure on children's intrinsic motivation and learning. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 38, 36-45.

Koestner, R., Ryan, R. M., Bernieri, F., & Holt, K. (1984). Setting limits on children's behavior: The differential effects of controlling versus informational styles on intrinsic motivation and creativity. *Journal of Personality*, 52, 233-248. doi:0.1111/j.1467-6494.1984.tb00879.x

Koestner, R. F., & Véronneau, M. H. (2001). *Children's Intrinsic Needs Satisfaction Scale*. Unpublished questionnaire, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

La Guardia, J. G., Ryan, R. M., Couchman, C. E. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Within person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 367-384. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.3.367

Lefcourt, H. M. (1976). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Loyd, B. (2003). *Choice connections manual: A manual for high school counselors*. Unpublished manuscript. Walden University.

Loyd, B. (2005). The effects of reality therapy/choice theory principles on high school students' perception of needs satisfaction and behavioral change. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 25(1), 5-9.

Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The new update on adult learning and education: New directions for adult and continuing education*, 89, (pp. 25-34). San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Milyavskaya, M., Gingras, I., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Gagnon, H., Fang, J., & Boiché, J. (2009). Balance across contexts: Importance of balanced need satisfaction across various life contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1031-1045. doi:10.1177/0146167209337036

- Miserandino, M. (1996). Children who do well in school: Individual differences in perceived competence and autonomy in above-average children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 203-214. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.88.2.203
- Moller, A. C., Friedman, R., & Deci, E. L. (2006). A self-determination theory perspective on the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspect of self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Self-esteem issues and answers: A sourcebook of current perspectives* (pp. 188-194). New York: Psychology Press.
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*, 7(2), 133-144.
- Nix, G., Ryan, R. M., Manley, J. B., & Deci, E. L. (1999). Revitalization through self-regulation: The effects of autonomous and controlled motivation on happiness and vitality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 266-284. doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1382
- Norusis, M. (2009). *SPSS 17.0 Guide to Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pallant, J. (2004). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 12; 2nd ed.)*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Pelletier, L. G., Seguin-Levesque, C., & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 186-196. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.186
- Peterson, A. V. (2008). *Pete's pathogram: Pathway to success*. Action Printing.
- Peterson, A. V., Chang, C., & Collins, P. L. (1998). Taiwanese university students meet their basic needs through study of CT/RT. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 17(2), 27-29.
- Peterson, A. V., & Parr, G. D. (1982). Pathogram: A visual aid to obtain focus and commitment. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 2, 18-22.
- Peterson, A. V., & Truscott, J. D. (1988). Pete's pathogram: Quantifying the genetic needs. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 8(1), 22-32.
- Peterson, A. V., Woodward, G. D., & Kissko, R. (1991). A comparison of basic week trainees and introduction to counseling students graduate students on four basic need factors. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 8(1), 22-32.
- Phares, E. J. (1976). *Locus of control in personality*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning.
- Reeve, J., Jang, H., Hardre, P., & Omura, M. (2002). Providing a rationale in an autonomy-supportive way as a strategy to motivate others during an uninteresting activity, *Motivation and Emotion*, 26, 183-207. doi:10.1023/A:1021711629417
- Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, R. & Ryan, R. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 419-426. doi:10.1177/0146167200266002
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Rosenberg, M. (1985). Self-concept and psychological well-being in adolescence. In R. L. Leahy (Ed.), *The development of the self* (pp. 205-246). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological monographs*, 80, 128.
- Ryan, R. M., & Brown, K. W. (2003). Why we don't need self-esteem: On fundamental needs, contingent love, and mindfulness. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 71-76.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 749-761. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.749
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
- Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., & Grolnick, W. S. (1995). Autonomy, relatedness, and the self: Their relation to development and psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Theory and methods* (pp. 618-655). New York: Wiley.
- Ryan, R. M., & Grolnick, W. S. (1986). Origins and pawns in the classroom: Self-report and projective assessments of individual differences in children's perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 550-558. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.3.550
- Ryan, R. M., & Lynch, J. H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development*, 60, 340-356. doi:10.2307/1130981
- Ryan, R. M., Stiller, J. & Lynch, J. H. (1994). Representations of relationships to teachers, parents, and friends as predictors of academic motivation and self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14, 226-249. doi:10.1177/027243169401400207
- Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 482-497. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.3.482
- Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y. & Kasser, T. (2001). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 325-339. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.2.325
- Sheldon, K. M., & Gunz, A. (2009). Psychological needs as basic motives, not just experiential requirements. *Journal of Personality*, 77(5), 1467-1492. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00589.x
- Sheldon, K. M., & Krieger, L. K. (2007). Understanding the negative effects of legal education on law students: A longitudinal test of self-determination theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 883-897. doi:10.1177/0146167207301014
- Sheldon, K. M., & Niemiec, C. (2006). It's not just the amount that counts: Balanced need satisfaction also affects well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 331-341. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.2.331
- Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Rawsthorne, L., & Ilardi, B. (1997). Trait self and true self: Cross-role variation in the big five personality traits and its relations with psychological

authenticity and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1380-1393. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.6.1380

Silverstone, P. H. (1991). Low self-esteem in different psychiatric conditions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 30(2), 185-188.

Stevens, J. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (5th ed.). London, England: Routledge Academic.

Stoever, S. A. (2002). Multiple predictors of college success: Investigation of an empirical model. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3019217)

Sullo, R. (1997). *Inspiring quality in your school*. West Haven, CT: National Education Association Publications.

Thatcher, J. A. (1983). The effects of reality therapy upon self-concept and locus of control for juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 3(1), 31.

Triola, M. (2002). *Essentials of statistics*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (Vol. 29, pp. 271-360). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Vallerand, R. J., & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and amotivational styles as predictors of behaviors: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 599-620. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00922.x

Veronneau, M. H., Koestner, R., & Abela, J. R. Z. (2005). Intrinsic need satisfaction and well-being in children and adolescents: An application of the self-determination theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 280-292. doi:10.1521/jscp.24.2.280.62277

Williams, G. C., & Deci, E. L. (1996). Internalization of biopsychosocial values by medical students: A test of self-determination theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 767-779.

Wubbolding, R. (2000). *Reality therapy for the 21st Century*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.

Yarish, P. (1986). Reality therapy and the locus of control of juvenile offenders. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 6(1), 3-10.

Brief Bios

Thomas K. Burdenski, Jr., Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist, marriage and family therapist, and professional counselor who teaches and supervises counselors-in-training to use choice theory/reality therapy. He is Choice Theory/Reality Therapy Certified and an approved practicum supervisor. He is also on the editorial board of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*.

Brenda Faulkner, M.Ed., is the Student Success Programs Director at Tarleton State University. She is Choice Theory/Reality Therapy Certified and an approved practicum supervisor. She has been a Licensed Professional Counselor for 10 years and a Supervisor for 8 years.

Appendix A

Student Needs Survey (Burns et al., 2006)

Please mark an "X" in the box that best answers each question. There are no right or wrong answers.	Never True	Almost Never True	Don't Know	Almost Always True	Always True
Teachers at this school really care about students					
Students help set school rules					
I have fun with my friends in class					
I feel included by other students at this school					
Students at this school enjoy learning					
Students in our class enjoy being around each other					
The teachers seem to care for one another					
Other adults in the building, besides my teacher, know me					
I feel important when I am at school					
My teachers expect me to get good grades on work & tests					
I usually know how well I am doing in school					
I can choose my own partners for projects					
My teachers care about me					
I feel like there is order in the school					
The teachers are open to suggestions from students					
At school, I get to learn things I am interested in					
I have choices in my assignments					
People at school listen to what I have to say					
I have choices on different ways to complete assignments					
I feel safe when I am at school					
I have many friends at school					
Students are kind to each other at this school					
The school is neat and clean					
We often laugh in my classroom					
In our class we do special fun activities					

Scoring

1. Replace the "X" in each box with the corresponding number below

Never True=1	Almost Never True=2	Don't Know=3	Almost Always True=4	Always True=5
-----------------	---------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	------------------

2. Create five subscale scores

- a. Belonging = $4 + 7 + 8 + 13 + 21 =$ _____
- b. Power = $9 + 10 + 11 + 15 + 18 =$ _____
- c. Freedom = $2 + 12 + 16 + 17 + 19 =$ _____
- d. Fun = $1 + 14 + 20 + 22 + 23 =$ _____
- e. Survival $3 + 5 + 6 + 24 + 25 =$ _____

From: "Student needs survey: A psychometrically sound measure of the five basic needs," by M. K. Burns, D. Vance, I. Szadokierski, and C. Stockwell, 2006, *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 25, p. 8. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix B

Need Satisfaction Scale for the Classroom (Filak & Sheldon, 2003)

Instructions: We are interested in how you feel about yourself and how you think other people see you. For each statement, choose the number from the scale that best describes your feelings and ideas in the **past week**. Circle the number that corresponds to your answer.

Not at all true 1	Slightly true 2	Moderately true 3	Mostly true 4	Completely true 5
1. I feel like I had a lot of input in deciding how to learn in this class				1 2 3 4 5
2. The teacher cared about me and my progress				1 2 3 4 5
3. I enjoyed the challenges this class has provided				1 2 3 4 5
4. The teacher took my perspective into consideration in this class				1 2 3 4 5
5. I do not think the tasks I did in this class were very interesting				1 2 3 4 5
6. The teacher was pretty friendly toward me				1 2 3 4 5
7. Most days I felt a sense of accomplishment from doing work in this class				1 2 3 4 5
8. I don't feel the teacher understood me				1 2 3 4 5
9. I was free to express my opinions in this class				1 2 3 4 5

Scoring information. Form three subscale scores, one for the degree to which the person experiences satisfaction of each of the three needs. To do that, you must first reverse score items 5 and 8 (i.e., the items shown below with (R) following the items number). To reverse score an item, simply subtract the item response from 6. Thus, for example, a 2 would be converted to a 4. Once you have reverse scored the items, simply average the items on the relevant subscale. They are:

Autonomy (Freedom need): $1 + 4 + 9/3$ Mean Subscale Score : _____
 Competence (Power/Achievement need): $3 + 5(R) + 7/3$ Mean Subscale Score : _____
 Relatedness (Belonging need): $2 + 6 + 8(R)/3$ Mean Subscale Score : _____

From: "Student psychological need satisfaction and college teacher-course evaluations," by V. F. Filak and K. M. Sheldon, 2003, *Educational Psychology*, 23, pp. 235-247. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix C

Pete's Pathogram (Peterson & Truscott, 1988)

9 = EXTREMELY STRONG																		
8 = MODERATELY STRONG																		
7 = SOMEWHAT STRONG																		
6 = SLIGHTLY STRONG																		
5 = NEUTRAL																		
4 = SLIGHTLY WEAK																		
3 = SOMEWHAT WEAK																		
2 = MODERATELY WEAK																		
1= EXTREMELY WEAK																		
	I	E	S	I	E	S	I	E	S	I	E	S	I	E	S	I	E	S
NEEDS	BELONGING Love relatedness Acceptance caring			POWER Competence meaning achievement importance control			FREEDOM Choice autonomy Expression Thought to be to become			FUN Discovery learning adventure exploring enjoyment			SURVIVAL Food water shelter reproduction feeling safe and secure					

I = INTENSITY (perceived level of intensity, urge, strength, drive of need)
 E = EFFORT (perceived level of effort, energy, time expended meeting need)
 S = SATISFACTION (perceived level of need satisfaction and success)

From: "Pete's pathogram: Quantifying the genetic needs," by A. V. Peterson and J. D. Truscott, 1988, *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 8, pp. 22-32. Adapted with permission.

Appendix D

Learning Climate Questionnaire (Williams & Deci, 1996)

This questionnaire contains items that are related to your experience with your instructor in this class. Instructors have different styles in dealing with students, and we would like to know more about how you have felt about your encounters with your instructor. Your responses are confidential. Please be honest and candid.

1. I feel that my instructor provides me choices and options						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
2. I feel understood by my instructor						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
3. I am able to be open with my instructor during class.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
4. My instructor conveyed confidence in my ability to do well in the course.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
5. I feel that my instructor accepts me.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
6. My instructor made sure I really understood the goals of the course and what I need to do.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
7. My instructor encouraged me to ask questions.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
8. I feel a lot of trust in my instructor.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
9. My instructor answers my questions fully and carefully.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
10. My instructor listens to how I would like to do things.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
11. My instructor handles people's emotions very well.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
12. I feel that my instructor cares about me as a person.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
13. I don't feel very good about the way my instructor talks to me.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
14. My instructor tries to understand how I see things before suggesting a new way to do things.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree
15. I feel able to share my feelings with my instructor.						
1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4 neutral	5	6	7 Strongly disagree

The Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ; Williams & Deci, 1996)

The LCQ has a long form containing 15 items and a short form containing 6 of the items. The questionnaire is typically used with respect to specific learning settings, such as a particular class, at the college or graduate school level. Thus, the questions are sometimes adapted slightly, at least in the instructions, so the wording pertains to the particular situation being studied--an organic chemistry class, for example. In these cases, the questions pertain to the autonomy support of an individual instructor, preceptor, or professor. If, however, it is being used to assess a general learning climate in which each student has several instructors, the questions are stated with respect to the autonomy support of the faculty members in general. Below, you will find the 15-item version of the questionnaire, worded in terms of "my instructor." If you would like to use the 6-item version, simply reconstitute the questionnaire using only items # 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, and 14.

Scoring: Scores on both the 15-item version and the 6-item version are calculated by averaging the individual item scores. However, for the long version, before averaging the item scores, you must first "reverse" the score of item 13 (i.e., subtract the score on item 13 from 8 and use the result as the item score for this item--for example, the score of 3, when reversed would become 5). Higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy support.

From: "Internalization of biopsychosocial values by medical students: A test of self-determination theory," by G. C. Williams and E. L. Deci, 1996, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, pp. 767-779. Reprinted with permission.

PROJECT: IMPACT R.T. (PART II)

Sylvie Bilodeau
Trainer and Research Leader
Du Parc Group Home

Abstract

Impact R.T. seeks to present longitudinally collected evidence from four group homes in Canada, over five years, in order to demonstrate the indisputable impact that Reality Therapy and Choice Theory concepts had on the residents and personnel in these group homes. Generally speaking, the findings that were reported in the present study tended to be very positive for all involved, including the children in question, their parents, as well as their caretakers. Notably, the significance of the results of Impact R.T. were initially reported in the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, Volume XXIX, Spring 2010 as Part I, with more appendices and references having been made available upon request. Regarding Part II, to be reported here in this issue of the Journal, it will simply seek to provide a bit more closure for those who seek it.

Long story, made very short, is that in the present study the true impact of teaching Reality Therapy and Choice Theory to institutional personnel and students definitely paid off in many ways. For instance, there was an astounding drop in the use of physical restraints used on students who were residents in the group homes under investigation. More specifically, group homes in this study began employing RT/CT concepts in 2001. Over the next five (5) years it was found that the frequency of use of such restraints per youth dropped from 3.75 in 2001 to 0.00 in 2006. Such results appear to provide a very strong testimonial for the use of RT/CT-type procedures with youth in group homes in Canada. Of course, these findings will also need to be replicated in other environments, and in other countries, in order to determine how generalizable such findings are in other places and under different circumstances.

While these findings are briefly described here for the sake of the reader, anyone who is interested in finding out more about these research findings, and how they were achieved, is invited to request such information in English from Jean Seville Suffield.

Brief biographical profiles

Sylvie Bilodeau has been involved with Quebec Youth Services for over twenty-five years. As an educator and leader of four group homes for youth in Quebec City, Quebec (Canada) Sylvie worked with the Institut universitaire, a research institute for youth social development, specifically mandated to conduct research in the field of violence experienced and perpetuated by youth. Impact R.T. is the result of a 5-year study investigating the impact of reality therapy within four group homes in Quebec.

Jean Seville Suffield, Senior Faculty with The William Glasser Institute, has been involved with training and research in school districts in her former capacity as Superintendent of Schools in pursuing Quality School concepts. She has worked internationally with school districts, business organizations and several of The William Glasser Institute organizations. Presently, she is involved in a research project with the francophone [fransaskoises] school district in Saskatchewan, Canada. Jean was granted permission to have the research

project translated from French to English by the Impact R.T. team and plans to use some aspects of this study in the Saskatchewan project. Those interested in more detail may contact Jean Seville Suffield at jeanseville@hotmail.com

GONE, BUT NOT FORGOTTEN!

Each subsequent issue of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* will have a section within it dedicated to those who devoted their lives, in word and deed, to making a difference in helping us to better understand ourselves, as well as choice theory, reality therapy, the quality school, lead management, and/or other theories/models that have been developed by Dr. William Glasser. Eulogies are invited that will appear in the next issue of the *Journal* regarding Dr. Larry Palmatier, formerly a professor of counseling psychology at the University of San Francisco. These eulogies should seek to describe how Dr. Palmatier impacted what we know about Dr. Glasser's various theories and models that were conveyed to us via Larry's teachings, demeanor, and/or his love for others.

While this section of the *Journal's* next issue will be dedicated to describing Dr. Larry Palmatier and how he effectively shared his life with us, subsequent issues will likewise focus on others who similarly affected our lives and will always be missed, but never be forgotten, because of how they lived their lives and taught us while they were among us. Kindly make your recommendations for those who should be so honored, and include your eulogies describing them so that our dearly departed may be remembered by us at least one more time. Then kindly submit them to Dr. Thomas S. Parish, Editor, at parishts@gmail.com