

Volume XXXIV
No. 2

Spring 2015



International Journal of
Choice Theory® and
Reality Therapy

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

Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, Spring, 2015

Table of Contents		2
Thomas S. Parish	Introduction to the Journal	3
	Editorial Notes to the CT/RT Membership	6
Jon Carlson	Bob Wubbolding: A Living Legend in Counseling	7
Ernie Perkins	Is Choice Theory an Effective Client Assessment Tool?	11
Sterlin K. Lujan	Quality Counseling: An Examination of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy	17
Derrick P. Nantz	Exposing the Roots of External Control Psychology: Altruism as Moral Compulsion	24
Patricia A. Robey	Keeping the Flag of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy Flying: An Interview with Robert Wubbolding	35
This special section of the Journal contains tributes that celebrate the life and accomplishments of Kim Olver		42
Albert Katz	Joycelyn G. Parish	Nano Farabaugh
Beverly LaFond	Judith Barnes Claps	Nicole Carson
Bryan Zeman	Ken Larsen	Pat Robey
Bob & Sandi Wubbolding	Mike Fulkerson	Patti Price
Christine Zigler	Maureen Craig McIntosh	Thomas S. Parish
Jean Seville Suffield		

Invitation to submit your own special note of appreciation for Kim Olver:

If you don't have a tribute for Kim Olver included here, but would really like to have one included for Kim's perusal, you may still send it to me at parishts@gmail.com

Invitation to Institute Members and Friends to Submit Tributes on behalf of Pat Robey,

who has been very active within the WGI-US organization for many years, a very ardent supporter of Dr. Glasser's work, and has befriended hundreds of members of WGI and beyond.

Please submit your "TRIBUTE" for **Pat Robey** to parishts@gmail.com , and be sure to do so before September 10, 2015.

Introduction to the *Journal*, its editor, editorial board, and essential info regarding the *Journal*

***IJCTRT* Editor:**

The current editor of the *Journal* is **Dr. Thomas S. Parish**. Dr. Parish is an Emeritus Professor 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 CTRTC certified, specializing in the areas of mental health, educational counseling, and marriage and family counseling. He has authored hundreds of refereed journal articles (many of which having focused on CT/RT) that have appeared in more than thirty different professional refereed journals. He has an extensive background in designing and conducting research studies as well as developing strategies for the implementation of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. He is currently serving as a consultant for LDS Family Services, which is located in Independence, Missouri. This organization provides various psychological and family services to much of Kansas and Missouri. Any correspondence, including questions and/or manuscript submissions, should be sent to Dr. Parish at: parishts@gmail.com You may also contact him by phone at: (785) 845-2044, (785) 861-7261, or (785) 862-1379. In addition, a website is currently operational for the *Journal*. It is www.ctrjournal.com. Plus the *Journal* is no longer password protected on the William Glasser Institute (WGI) website, so anyone can now gain access to it.

***IJCTRT* Editorial Board:**

Besides **Dr. Thomas S. Parish**, who serves as the editor of the *Journal*, there is also in place an outstanding team of individuals who have agreed to serve on its editorial board. They are:

Emerson Capps, Ed.D., Professor Emeritus at Midwest State University, plus 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, Georgia.

Joycelyn G. Parish, Ph.D., former senior research analyst for the Kansas State Department of Education in Topeka, Kansas.

Patricia A. Robey, Ed.D., Associate Professor at Governors State University, University Park, Illinois, Licensed Professional Counselor, and Senior Faculty of WGI-US and William Glasser International

Brandi Roth, Ph.D., licensed private practice professional psychologist in Beverly Hills, California.

Jean Seville Suffield, Ph.D., Senior Faculty, William Glasser International, as well as president and owner of Choice-Makers@ located in Longueuil, Quebec, CANADA.

Jeffrey Tirengel, Ph.D., Professor of psychology at Alliant International University, and also serves as a licensed psychologist at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles, California.

Robert E. Wubbolding, Ed.D., Professor Emeritus at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, and is the Director for the Center of Reality Therapy, also in Cincinnati, Ohio.

IJRTCT Technical Advisor:

Finally, since the *IJCTRT* is currently an on-line journal, we have also chosen to have a "Technical Advisor" working with the editor and the editorial board. He is **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 the 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 the fall (about October 15) and spring (about April 15) 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.

Permissions:

Copyright for articles are retained 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 written permission of the editor—except in the case of brief quotations embodied in the article or review.

Indices of Previous Authors and Titles:

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

Vols. 1-5 in Vol. 6.1; Vols. 6-10 in Vol. 10.2; Vols. 11-15 in Vol. 16.2; Vols. 16-20 in Vol. 20.2; Vols. 21-24 in Vol. 25.2; Vols. 26-30 in Vol. 31.2.

Though it's been Mentioned before in Past Issues of the Journal, What Follows are the Answers to Key Questions Regarding Choice Theory and Reality Therapy—

Are YOU interested in *finding* past research, ideas, and/or innovations regarding Choice Theory and/or Reality Therapy? If so, you might do the following:

Check out the last sections of the 2011 issues of the *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, as they summarize CT/RT research, ideas, and innovations, which are categorized by topic and by author.

Are YOU interested in *acquiring* past issues of CT/RT-related articles? If so, you might note the following:

All issues of *IJCTRT* from 2010 until present are available at "<http://www.ctrtjournal.com>." Notably, future issues of the Journal will also be made available at this website, too, all without charge. Yes, it's available to anyone, be they members or not!

Anything prior to 2010 can be acquired by going to <http://education.mwsu.edu> then under the Links Area, click on the hyperlink "International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy," which will take you to the Journal page. On this page there will be hyperlinks to abstracts and a form to request a copy of any full article(s), which is (are) available to you free-of-charge.

Bottom line: *The International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* definitely seeks to help EVERYONE to know more about Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. After all, our goal, like The William Glasser Institute, is to *teach* the world CT/RT, and we are absolutely committed to reaching this end!

Editorial Notes to the CT/RT Membership Who Read/Get Published In the International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy:

As the editor of the *International Journal of Choice theory and Reality Therapy* I have sought to be “the wind beneath our authors’ wings,” always seeking the enhance manuscripts’ readability and formatting clarity, as well as seeking to make each article that appears in the Journal a “good fit” for the Journal, i.e., that each article manages to advance the knowledge and understanding of the Journal’s readership!

Furthermore, past, current, and would-be contributors are urged to submit their papers only after they have been compared with others already published on-line in the Journal since 2010. To do so the prospective author need only go to www.ctrtjournal.com and compare past inclusions with their own, and then make any modifications that might be necessary so that any future submissions don’t need to be rewritten by members of the editorial staff.

A final point that needs to be addressed is that neither *the International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, nor its editorial staff, claim to be perfect, so kindly forgive us for any errors that might be made along the way, whatever they might be, as we endeavor to get this Journal out to the readership on a semi-annual basis. We realize, however, that without your contributions that we, in fact, have little to offer, so please submit your papers to us for review and possible publication in the Journal, whether they are perfect or not, as long as they advance Choice Theory, Reality Therapy, and/or any other concepts that have been introduced by Dr. William Glasser and/or his associates. Only by doing so will WGI be able to constantly grow and develop well beyond its foreseeable future.

Remember that the future of the Journal, as well as the WGI organization, is in our hands collectively, so how will each of you seek to do your best to “teach the world Choice Theory and/or Reality Therapy?” Please make it so!

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas S. Parish, Editor, IJCTRT

BOB WUBBOLDING—A LIVING LEGEND IN COUNSELING

Jon Carlson, Distinguished Professor, Governors State University, University Park, Illinois

Abstract

If you thought you knew Dr. Robert E. Wubbolding, a quick read of this brief report will provide you with significant insights regarding him, and how he sees the world around him. For those of you that don't know Bob, reading this report should help you learn about him and what he does, and possibly what you might need to do to make the world a better place for the whole human race, whether or not you ever choose to do Choice Theory and/or Reality Therapy or not!

On March 29, 2014 at the annual American Counseling Association (ACA) Conference in Honolulu, Bob Wubbolding was recognized as being a "Living Legend in Counseling." He joined Gerald Corey, Marcheta Evans, Jeffrey Kottler, Debbie Joffe Ellis, Howard Kirschenbaum, and Mark Pope in receiving this recognition. The original "Living Legends in Counseling" were identified in 2004 at the ACA Conference in Kansas City. Those honored were Albert Ellis, William Glasser, Patricia Arredondo, John Krumboltz and Jon Carlson. As part of the program Bob was asked to provide some comments as to his personal development, as well as some of his professional wisdom. The questions and Bob's responses follow:

What is your legacy, something you are proud of?

I hope that I have been able to teach students and participants in my training sessions a system that empowers clients and helps them make more effective choices regardless of their current circumstances. We live in an era when we identify people by their degree of victimization. It is my hope that we, in the counseling profession, can decrease the victimization and unfair treatment of other human beings. But equally important for me is that we in the helping professions adopt a worldview of empowerment and opportunities for our clients. In other words, I'm hoping to see the decrease in the perception and the assumption that human problems are due to societal forces over which our clients have no control. In other words, even victimized people actually have choices. The testimony and the life of Viktor Frankl illustrates that regardless of our external environment there are still a few creative and meaningful choices available.

I'm hoping that I can influence a few people to incorporate the above principles and yet combine them with compassion and empathy for human

beings. Abraham Maslow did a study of self-actualizing people and found 14 common characteristics. One was a deep empathy for human beings. He called this quality, or rather a collection of multifaceted qualities, "gemeinschaftsgefühl," a German word which is not easily translated into English.

What tips do you have for students who are training to be counselors?

I have many thoughts that I hope are useful and encouraging to students.

1st. Keep your idealism. You are choosing one of the most noble professions ever devised by the human mind. You are undoubtedly interested in "helping people". It is easy to have this idealism undermined when you encounter people who simply do not want to be helped. If you believe you will change the world, I hope that you will keep that idea before you. The fact is that you will change the world. When you help one person recover from addictions or turn away from crime, or when you assist a family to respect rather than abuse each other, you impact not only your clients, but you influence their children and their children's children. Your influence cascades down through history and you do make the world a better place.

2nd. Get involved in a professional organization. But also, commit yourself to activities outside the profession. I recommend working in political campaigns. You will learn about your community in ways that will surprise you. The lessons you learn cannot be learned in school or in a counseling office.

3rd. Get to work early, stay late and do more than what you're getting paid to do. Your job is not only to work for the agency or the school, but also to make it a better place and to make it perceived in the community as providing excellent services. Lou Holtz, the famous football coach, said, "Nobody ever drowned in sweat." Chris Mack, a basketball coach tells his players, "Every day you've got to show up for work or you get fired, and remember nobody is going to feel sorry for you."

4th. Approach life like a basketball game. On the floor there are 5 people who are against you. They will do everything within their power to defeat you and even make you look bad. Notably, however, in the stands there are 10,000 people on your side.

5th. If you wake up looking for problems, or if you search for injustice, unfairness, racism, sexism, and every kind of phobia imaginable, you are

sure to find them. We all know that these are real. On the other hand, if you wake up looking for opportunities and say to yourself, "Who will I meet today who will help me get where I want to go," you are sure to see the world accordingly. The question is, which viewpoint is better for you?

6th. Don't expect applause from your peers. Some will applaud, but make a decision about whose approval you are seeking. I suggest that one person would be the person who hired you.

What was the most difficult challenge for you?

After I graduated from high school I spent 9 years in a Catholic seminary followed by 6 years as a Catholic priest. I then decided to leave the clerical life. (I resigned freely and honorably!) This decision was quite challenging at the time. Another challenge was writing my first book in 1988 followed by 12 more after that. Still another major challenge is waking up and repeating self-talk statements that the world is on my side and in fact is conspiring to help me. I recommend this mode of thinking.

What book, movie or trip was life altering for you?

*Several books have impacted my life significantly. The biblical book of Ecclesiastes, most especially the section "There is a time for everything" Viktor Frankl's book **Man's Search for Meaning** and Thomas Sowell's books **Race and Culture: A World View** and **The Vision of the Anointed**. Both of the last two books mentioned provide a very different viewpoint of the world and its problems.*

A trip to Los Angeles to attend a training seminar resulted in an interview at the University of Southern California followed by two years teaching in their overseas programs in Japan, Korea and Germany.

What would surprise someone about you?

Probably my answer to the previous question!

What have you done or are looking forward to doing while at this meeting in Hawaii?

I am looking forward to re-connecting with friends and establishing new relationships with students, professors and practicing counselors. I often

Skype into counseling classes throughout the country and throughout the world and discuss choice theory/reality therapy, as well as the counseling profession in general.

Say something about your relationships and friendships.

Several things come to mind: I have found it helpful to think about the consequences of words and to not follow my first impulse. I have come to realize that a simple comment can be life-changing. Perhaps many of you can recall an especially helpful or intensely hurtful comment made to you. The same consequence might result from our words spoken to others. On the other hand, I cannot weigh every word and pretend that people pay a great deal of attention to what I say. For me, it is a matter of balance. I try to think about my manner of communication without being overly introspective about it and without taking myself too seriously. But, relationships are built upon empathic, compassionate and trusting communications.

IS CHOICE THEORY AN EFFECTIVE CLIENT ASSESSMENT TOOL?

Ernie Perkins

Abstract

Among his degrees, Ernie Perkins has a masters in human relations with an emphasis in counseling from the University of Oklahoma. One of the questions on his final comprehensive examination on September 21, 2005 was as follows: A main idea in William Glasser's Reality Therapy is that clients know if their behavior has been successful or unsuccessful in helping them get what they want in life. Explore this idea as a form of client assessment and describe its strengths and weaknesses. This article is his answer to the question.

Question and Answer

Question: A main idea in William Glasser's Reality Therapy is that clients know if their behavior has been successful or unsuccessful in helping them get what they want in life. Explore this idea as a form of client assessment and describe its strengths and weaknesses.

Answer: I cannot accept the question as it is presented. Furthermore, I do not believe that William Glasser would accept it as it is worded. I will tell you why.

I am not sure that Glasser and his Reality Therapy can be used in client assessment based on his book, *Warning: Psychiatry can be hazardous to your mental health* (2003). Glasser has a very narrow definition of mental illness. He believes mental illnesses are only those in which the brain has been damaged. Emotional distress, therefore, is not an illness. He states, "none of the people described in the DSM-IV are mentally ill. I don't deny the reality of their symptoms; I deny that these symptoms . . . are an untreatable component of an incurable brain malfunction" (p. xxi). Thus, his statement, "In it (DSM-IV) . . . all the known psychological symptoms are described. In it, these symptoms are grouped together into syndromes, each of which is referred to as a mental disorder. The symptoms described are accurate. Grouping them together and calling them mental disorders is wrong." (Glasser, 2003, p. xxi)

Lynch, writing the foreword to the book, writes that most mental disorders, as diagnosed by the medical profession, are based on the "unproven hypotheses . . . that the fundamental cause for mental distress is biological, either due to a biochemical imbalance, a genetic defect, or both" (Glasser, 2003, p. xii).

Glasser advocates that mental distress is unhappiness. To the extent that the person is unhappy, it is to that extent that that person may be wrongly diagnosed. His/Her answer is not drugs, but counseling. Most of the situations diagnosed as mental illnesses are a result

of wrong choices, and, just as physical health can be taught to those out of shape but not physically sick, so can mental health be taught to those out of shape emotionally (unhappy).

The weakness of Reality Therapy as a means by which one can assess a client is simple. It is hard to assess by a standard that denies the assessment catalogue.

The strengths of Reality Therapy must be seen in its theory and method of treatment and not in its ability to be used as a medically-directed assessment tool.

William Glasser's theory in Reality Therapy is that everyone has five needs. These are as follows: (1) the need for survival, (2) the need for love, loving sex, belonging, (3) the need for power (I prefer words such as significance, meaning, purpose), (4) the need for fun, and (5) the need for freedom. Everything that the person does is an effort to satisfy these needs. Each person has a "quality world" picture of that which will satisfy a particular need. When the real world reality does not match the quality world picture, that person will experience an unbalanced comparison between the quality world and real world. To whatever extent that the scales are unbalanced, it is to that extent that the person is frustrated, agitated, or unhappy (Glasser, 1998). Many times the person may not realize why his/her needs are not being met. The question implies that the person will realize that his/her needs are not being met by something that he/she is or is not doing. It is not as simple as that. Because it is not, there is the possibility that a counselor can help the person work to that understanding.

But, before I move to the art of counseling from the reality therapy perspective, let me first share why it works.

The first reason, and in my opinion, one of the most important, is the essential truth upon which Reality Therapy is based. I agree with the proposition that philosophy can be viewed as seeing truth from three belief systems (Miller, 1985). These systems are as follows: pragmatic truth, existential truth, and essential truth. Space limitations permit me to give only a brief oversimplification of these, but I do so that the reader may see my presuppositions.

First, there is pragmatic truth: "If it works, it is true," is an oversimplification of pragmatic truth, yet, it does go a long way toward defining this view. Time, circumstances, and situations have combined to work out the current truth. Each generation works out pragmatic truth within its own culture. Morals and societal behaviors in most societies are pragmatic. Life styles, for which persons would have been condemned in one generation, may be totally accepted in the next.

The existentialist believes truth is as he or she believes it to be at a particular time, situation, and/or circumstance. Truth is never concrete, but is continually changing. There is no objective language, and everything depends on each person's definition of words and situations. What one would define as truth, another may not. Neither of the two has the right to declare that the other is wrong. In other words, no one can actually determine truth for another person.

For the essentialist, truth does not change and it is spelled with CAPITAL LETTERS. Truth's demands are the same for every generation and for every culture. Because it is essential Truth, it can be, and indeed, will be, discovered in every culture. Essential Truth can be accepted or rejected but it does not change. To deny it is to face consequences. Those consequences usually result in a lesser than a fulfilled and happy life. To find them, and to live by them, usually results in a more meaningful and happy life. The choice is given to each of us as to what we are going to do with them (Perkins, 1997).

Reality Therapy is built on the essential Truth found in the Bible (Hab. 3:17-19). Verse seventeen says everything is terrible. Verse eighteen says regardless of the fact everything is terrible, "I will rejoice. I will joy . . ." Verse nineteen gives the essential truth that "God will make my feet like hinds feet and will make me walk upon my high places." The hind is a mountain deer that is able to run upon high and dangerous trails because wherever it places its front feet, the back feet would land in identically the same spot when it moves to the next step. In other words, the front feet determine where the back feet go. Thus, application can be made that as actions are, so will feeling be. "As I do, so will I be" is a way to express this essential Truth. This rule is built not only upon the essential Truth of Hab. 3, it is also backed up by Proverbs "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (23:7). Because Reality Therapy is built on essential Truth (though Glasser does not see the connection between my interpretations of Hab. 3:17-19 and his theory), he has rediscovered an essential Truth and has stated it in a manner consistent with current literature. Reality Therapy is not a contemporary fad that will go out of style in a few years. Most therapists have neither the time nor money to invest in a system that does not last. While therapists will discover new and individual methods to apply and use Reality Therapy, it will not change its basic foundation. It will endure and will be an investment that lasts for a lifetime.

Another reason that Reality Therapy works is the simple fact, it works. While this may sound redundant and overly pious, the fact is, we therapists are in this profession because we want to help people with their emotional and mental problems. Why waste time in a program if it offers little or no hope for the client? In one of my textbooks from which I was studying couple therapy, the author states his belief in the importance of a long passage of time for psychoanalysis to be most effective. He states "usually patient and analyst will meet regularly, four or five times per week, over some years" (Grier, 2001, p. 1). He gives reasons for this, of course, but the fact of my life and contacts with those I am trying to help says this is most unrealistic. I believe it is unrealistic for many other practicing therapists as well. Many find themselves having only a brief time to work with clients. Very few clients will spend two years of three sessions a week with us. Reality therapy works because it does not require an endless commitment between counselor and client. It works because it gives confidence to the client that help and healing is possible. I have trouble with those methods in which the counselor is not to present himself or herself as "the expert." In these methods, the client is to realize that the counselor has no idea if help can be found or not. It is only a "seek and search" endeavor with two "little lambs who have lost their way" trying to find a solution (Becvar & Becvar, 2003). While no therapist knows the mind of another person, the fact remains, physical healing comes more often if the

patient has confidence in the medical doctor and the prescribed medications. If this fact has been proven in the medical world, why should we not believe that the same principles also apply in the world of the emotions? Hence, I am convinced that the more the client has confidence in the ability and knowledge of the counselor, the more common will be lasting and effective help. One of the things that impressed me most of Dr. Glasser's videoed sessions with clients is his shared confidence that "I can help." He does not hesitate to share with the client that help is available and is on the way. This confidence is contagious with the client's catching it and as a result responding in such a manner that he or she does indeed help himself or herself toward developing a plan on the pathway to healing.

The last reason is this: I like having a workable outline that takes me and the client from where we are to where we need to be. In my studies I searched for the outline in other methods and found very few. The idea seems to be, talk until an answer somehow surfaces. While this may work for some, as a public speaker who speaks before groups weekly in numbers from ten to three thousand, I know the importance of knowing what I want to convey. Effective communicators may appear to be speaking from "off-the-cuff," but most have an outline, formal or informal, that they are following. If an outline helps me communicate more effectively with a group, why would I deny that an outline can help me more effectively communicate with the client? While the skeptic may deny that the therapist is communicating in the same manner as is the public speaker, surely he or she would not deny that communication is taking place. If a friend and I are "shooting the breeze," no outline is obviously needed. But, if we are seriously trying to find a solution to a problem, we will be more effective if we are organized in our discussion. Beyond any doubt, Reality Therapy gives me the best workable outline I have found.

Space limitations prohibit me from going far into the art of Reality Therapy. However, one cannot discuss its strengths without sharing some of its methods.

The outline I mention above has been provided by Wubbolding (2000) and has been endorsed by Glasser. The outline (WDEP) is as follows:

W –(Want) Ask the clients what they want. As the therapist explores, he/she may want to include, but not limit themselves, to the three essential elements found in the quality world pictures. These are relationships, treasured possessions, and/or core beliefs. In my own counseling sessions, I will pull off my ring and say something like this: "Pretend that this is a magic ring. If you place it on your finger, everything will become just like you want it to be. Describe the results to me."

In this manner, the client can share his/her quality world picture. Wubbolding goes into more details asking the clients to share what they want for their family, their personal growth, and just about every avenue of their lives. While this is good, in my personal work, I do not have the time to explore every aspect of the person's quality world. I am most interested in the pressing problem that has caused the person to come to me.

D—(Doing) "Total Behavior." "It is a total behavior because it is made up of four separate components: *acting, thinking, feeling, and physiology*. It takes all four components,

working together, for you to read this page (emphases his)" (Glasser, 2003, p. 110). Most of the time the client will respond with some actions that he/she is doing. While they may believe only their physiology and actions are involved, I would like to point out that it is also affecting them emotionally and in their thought processes too.

E—(Evaluation) Many clients want to focus on the things of the past. Glasser, however, does not go there. "Because . . . all the needs can be satisfied only in the present. Therefore reality therapy focuses almost exclusively on the here and now" (Glasser, 2000, p. 23).

My simple explanation of the emphasis on the present is as follows:

$1+1+2+2+4(\text{past})=10(\text{present})$. Ten is the summation of all that has gone before. If it is impossible to go back and change the past, how can I change the ten? Not by going to the left of the equal sign, that is impossible, but by adding or taking away new numbers from the ten. Therapy may be used to determine what numbers of the past I may try to change in the future, but I really can't go back and change those that have already been used in the equation.

Please note, $1+1+2+2+4(\text{past})=10(\text{present})-1-2+5=12(\text{future})$. Note that I have changed the original ten, not by going back beyond the first equal sign, but by taking away from the ten and by adding to the ten I have come up with a new summation of the total. We only have control, however limited it may be, of the present and the future. Absolutely no control whatsoever of the past(i.e., we simply can't change the past!). The only value the past has is our ability to study the past to determine what we will add to or take away from our lives in order to change the future situation.

Let me use this as an example. I stole something yesterday=I am a thief today. I cannot change what I did yesterday. Thus, if I want to change what I am today, I must work to do something today and tomorrow which will help remove the present identification of what I am. *Les Miserables*, the classic story by Victor Hugo, is a good example of a man, Jean Valjean, who was a thief, and could not change the past. But, he totally changed the future and thus changed what (or who) he became. The past was still there as Lavert, the lawman, would not let him forget, but even Lavert finally came to understanding that the thief was no longer the current identification of the hero of the story.

So what are you doing *now* and is it working to change the present and the future, i.e., is it working? After all, it is foolish to believe that one can keep doing the same thing and get different results. The principle of cause and effect works here. If one keeps doing the same actions (total behavior), why should that person expect the results be any different from what happened previously?

P--(Planning) Using this simple outline, the counselor can help the client move toward a new plan of action (total behavior) that should help him or her to get better results. If so, then the client has found help with his/her problem. If not, then, walk through the outline again, and come up with either a new quality world picture, or another new plan.

To summarize: Reality Therapy's strengths are not in its being an assessment tool to catalogue a mental disorder. Its strengths lie in its ability to help people find the cause for their unhappiness, and to develop plans by which they may make new and better choices toward a better and happier life.

References

Becvar, D., & Becvar, R. (2003). *Family therapy: A systemic integration*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

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

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

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

Grier, F. (2001). F. Grier (Ed.), *Brief encounters with couples: Some analytical perspectives*. London: Karnac.

Miller, M. (1985). *Principles and a philosophy for vocational education*. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

Perkins, E. (1997). *Pathway to wisdom*. Oklahoma City: Encounter Publishing Co.

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

Brief Bio—

Ernie Perkins has been in the ministry for sixty-four years and at the age of seventy-five is still a vocational evangelist preaching between thirty-five and forty revivals each year, as well as at evangelism and bible conferences. His ministry has included being senior pastor for nineteen years, denomination leader for twenty-nine years, and an evangelist for sixteen years. He is a firm believer in life-long learning with almost five hundred semester hours resulting in three masters and four earned doctorates. More about him can be learned from his websites: www.ernieperkins.org and www.ernieperkins.com ernieperkins@sbcglobal.net or ernie@ernieperkins.org

QUALITY COUNSELING: AN EXAMINATION OF CHOICE THEORY AND REALITY THERAPY

Sterlin K. Lujan, Texas A&M University Texarkana

Abstract

The aim of this journal article is to conduct an overview of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy. It examines the theory's primary concepts, view of human nature, and the cause of psychopathology. It also looks at clinical approaches and evaluation strategies. It examines the nature of CT/RT's theoretical origins and methodology, an exploration of therapist-client relationship conducted and expanded in the form of 'Quality Counseling.'

Introduction

The first counseling approaches focused on the inner and sexual life of clients. These orientations, namely the psychoanalytic or Freudian traditions, examined past history and early childhood experiences. They explored and discovered unconscious and repressed material, then allowed clients to relive them. They sought to expose defense mechanisms and impart clients with life-changing insights. This school of thought, however, touted a dark view of human nature. The psychoanalysts viewed humans as automatons, shambling forward in an unaware and hypnotic manner fashioned hopelessly by deterministic forces. Nearly every school of psychology that followed Freudianism railed in defiance to this bleak picture. As a result, many theorists remade the Freudian ideas by piecing them back together in a more optimistic and versatile manner; nevertheless, they maintained the purity and integrity of their own distinct ideas about human psychology.

Dr. William Glasser's Choice Theory/Reality Therapy represents one such idea. It arrived in the 1960's as "Reality Therapy, and then became associated with "Control Theory" in the 1980's." In June of 1996, Glasser changed the name of "Control Theory" to "Choice Theory;" the new name provided a more accurate description of its conceptual framework (Wubbolding, 2000). It also portrayed human nature under a new light. Whereas psychoanalysis pushed the deterministic perspective, Choice Theory maintained an opposing view. It acknowledged that humans possess free will and purpose. In teaching one client about Choice Theory's ideas concerning purpose and free will, Glasser said, "All anyone can do from birth to death is behave" (Glasser, 1998, p.71).

This implied that people control most aspects of mind and body. Glasser labeled this concept "Total Behavior." He elaborated – in a similar vein as Abraham Maslow – that all human behavior moves toward satisfaction of needs: survival, love and belonging, power, freedom, and fun (Wubbolding, 2000). He also said people construct a mental "Quality World." This quality world contains a unique picture of perfection or utopia. Furthermore, since Choice Theory suggests that all that people do is behave--and behavior is an attempt to match their quality world pictures, they often act irrationally and dangerously in driving the system to get what it wants. They try to control others: manipulate, mislead, force and coerce people. Glasser referred to this as "external control psychology" (Glasser, 1998).

This paper examines these concepts: how Choice Theory views psychopathology, its clinical approach, and client evaluation, "Quality Counseling" which expands on the therapeutic alliance within Reality Therapy, and reviews how the terms Choice Theory and Reality Therapy are related. In conclusion, this paper explains how Choice Theory developed as a model of human psychological functioning.

Definitions and Concepts

Reality Therapy is the counseling process that Dr. Glasser used from the 60s with the publication of Reality Therapy (1965). This process provides specific therapeutic skills and techniques for counseling and may be applied to education, business, and social programs (Wubbolding, 2000). Control Theory was based on the work of William Powers which explained behavior as a negative feedback loop whereby individuals could only behave to seek to maintain a balance between what they want and what they perceive that they have. Although a perfect match is impossible, an analogy offered is that of a thermostat which seeks to regulate its own behavior (furnace or air conditioning) with the desired result of changing the world around it (Wubbolding, 2000, p.10), or by reaching the desired temperature. In 1996 Dr. Glasser decided to change the name 'control theory' to that of 'choice theory' because he believed it reflected more of what he wanted to teach, that individuals choose almost all that they do.

Dr. Glasser taught that the five basic needs are genetic; however, they cannot be satisfied directly but met indirectly by individuals attempting to reduce the gap between what they truly wanted [Quality World pictures] and what they perceived they were getting.

The first need is survival. All people desire shelter, water, and food and the need to reproduce. Without these things, people die and life ceases.

Humans, most importantly, strive for love and belonging. According to Glasser, relationship problems bring the most people to counseling, because people need each other (Glasser, *Choice Theory*, 1998). Humans are social animals. Even the most stoic individuals desire interaction, community and love. Almost everyone becomes close to others and it is the management of their relationships that determines healthy or unhealthy functioning. Glasser mentioned that early humans focused on survival, whereas modern humans – through technological and medical advancement - have generally overcome this focus on survival (Glasser, *Choice Theory*, 1998). Therefore, people tend to their happiness and efficacy through love and belonging. Even people who lead lives of solitude suffer from loneliness and alienation. They often display this through *depressing* and other behaviors that are less effective for them. In one phrase: without others we suffer, even if we prefer only our own company. Cameron in *Regret, Choice Theory and Reality Therapy* (2009) said it best, "We need to have positive relationships and when we damage our most significant relationships we are unable to get our other needs met" (p.40).

Power represents another important requirement. People gain meaning from life when they feel in control of their environment. If they perceive themselves as stronger in interacting with others, they feel safe and happy; however, in modern society, some people easily

achieve power without asserting unhealthy external control. Individuals readily accomplish this through work (Glasser, *Choice Theory*, 1998). When people enter into careers with leadership hierarchies, they may satisfy their need for power in acceptable or more effective ways. They often satisfy this need less effectively through controlling or hurting others aggressively. For instance, if a person enjoys stealing, assaulting, or engaging in unwanted sexual advances – that person may be seen as meeting this need in a less effective and destructive fashion.

Another important need is freedom and, at least for some, may be the most important. Freedom suggests that people desire independence. They do not appreciate feeling forced or coerced or threatened. Individuals want to live uninhibited lives. They do not want to suffer at the hands of external control psychology; however, for the need of freedom to be fully realized, individuals have been aware with the ability to perceive their own attempts to dominate others. Many in society believe that controlling others allows society to function. Dr. Glasser explains why this is so.

Dr. Glasser elaborates that the need for freedom is evolution's attempt to provide the correct balance between your need to try to force me to live my life the way you want and my need to be free of that force (Glasser, 1998, pp. 39-40).

Lastly, people require fun. Humans are imbued with a desire to play. This *fun*, however, can be achieved in a variety of ways. Every person is unique and all the images or pictures in that person's quality world are important to that individual. As a result, people often choose behaviors that hurt themselves and others and these may result in psychological harm.

Dr. Glasser described the picture album as one that contains people's ideal existence. It contains people, animals, ideas, surroundings, objects, and beliefs that are important to them.

Quality Worlds may have pictures that others perceive as harmful, criminal, or unrealistic. When people with these pictures attempt to match their quality world pictures, they hurt others and also themselves. Dr. Glasser's Choice Theory explains psychopathology through his axiom that 'all behavior is total.'

Total behavior is comprised of four components: thinking, acting, feeling, and physiology (Wubbolding, 2000). People have more direct control over their thinking and acting with less control over their feeling and physiology. Wubbolding described this concept through the metaphor of a suitcase. He explains, "The handle of the suitcase of total behavior is attached to the action ingredient. Transporting a suitcase is most dexterously accomplished by lifting it by the handle" (Wubbolding, p. 22). Feelings indicate the 'state' of the system. Individuals need to focus and change their thinking and acting if they wish to perceive a change in their feelings and physiology.

Psychopathology

The previous example also alludes to how Choice Theory treats psychopathology. From the start, Choice Theory dispels psychiatric dogma. It treats psychiatric labels as mythological and does not consider people diseased. Individuals are not seen as being disabled by a broken brain (Glasser, 1998). The problems do not lie outside of the person. The individual creates his own problems through total behavior (unless they have a legitimate brain disease).

Glasser claimed that psychopathology surfaces due to people's creative systems overcompensating for emotional and physiological distress (Glasser, 1998). For instance, when people fail to meet their needs in productive and acceptable ways, their creative systems adopt pathological behaviors that fall within what the DSM refers to as Schizophrenia or as a Bi-Polar disorder (Glasser, 1998). In understanding Choice Theory, a person chose these behaviors indirectly through over-productive creative systems and the behaviors are not symptomatic of an underlying disease or condition.

The implications of this idea are staggering and many will raise objections; however, the evidence for mental illness is scanty. Brain scans do not have the capacity to diagnose mental illness alone. Thus, mental illness is diagnosed on behavioral patterns and not on the discovery of disease processes. Therefore, it is not surprising that Glasser claimed that people choose their behavior, including alleged mental illness. Glasser suggested that people are *depressing* or *anxietying* or *phobicking* (Glasser, 1998). Using verbs to express the fact that people choose their diseases further helps in teaching that people are not externally afflicted. The common use of nouns and adjectives to describe 'depression' and other 'mental illnesses' prevents huge numbers of people from ever thinking that they can do something more than suffer (Glasser, 1998, p.77).

This means that people continue life with the self-fulfilling prophecy that they are doomed to sickness unto death; and this begs the question, how does Choice Theory handle clinical approach and client evaluation?

Clinical Approach and Evaluation

Reality Therapy offers ways of setting the environment and follows procedures that lead to change. This process interrelates with choice theory in ascertaining the quality world pictures, needs, total behavior, and evaluation emanating from perceiving to what degree the person has matched their pictures to get he needs. Some questions may be: What do you want out of life? What do you want out of your relationship? What do you desire out of your friends? Out of work? Out of play? Out of power?

Wubbolding used and Reality Therapy and streamlined counseling procedures (Wubbolding, 2000). He provided the acronym WDEP which allows counselors not only to ground themselves in a coherent framework, but to expand into a myriad of questions within the process (Wubbolding, 2000). This process is intended for clinicians to follow a path within the counseling session. First they obtain what the client wants, what he is doing to achieve it. Then they help the client evaluate current behavior, and assess the plan. Within this framework, counseling comes to a quick close. This occurs because clinicians ignore past

history, unconscious activity, and transference. They focus mainly on thinking and acting (hand and handle) aspects of total behavior. The Freudian concepts do not fit into this model because focusing on emotion and past history is fruitless except to elucidate the present and this is a decision made by the counselor. If reviewing the past only allows clients to relive painful experiences, then this would not be within the realm of reality therapy. Reality Therapy operates in the present moment with present relationships (Glasser, 1998).

Client evaluation, then, is based on client wants, their behaviors and their plan to achieve what they really want. The clinician listens to the client's story and gathers pertinent data; however, the clinician does not make a mental health diagnosis outright. That said, a diagnosis is ethically mandatory even if Choice Theorists disagree with the DSM. He stated that a pathological diagnosis is only necessary for insurance purposes (Glasser, 1998).

Therapeutic Alliance: Quality Counseling

Given a Choice Theory view on clinical assessment, what does the therapeutic alliance between client and counselor look like? In my perspective, scholars and researchers have failed to elaborate on the importance of the therapeutic and working alliance. They emphasize the importance of a good helper-client relationship, but they do not delve much further than previous theoretical orientations. The counselor just assumes that he should develop a good working rapport. No theoretical input is suggested. Counseling sessions just proceed via the counselor asking a series of questions and confronting their clients; however, I believe there is value in examining how counselors working from CT/RT may interact. This is not to say that the older theoretical and ethical concerns are moot. I simply believe that given the rich theoretical world of Choice Theory, better, more significant explanations may be explored and applied. For the purpose of expanding the helper-client relationship within Choice Theory, I call this new interaction "Quality Counseling."

Quality counseling demands that the therapist not only gather rapport but help the client place the counselor in his quality world. Glasser mentioned this but did not complete the process (Glasser, 1998). The ACT method helps further the position. The A stands for accept. The counselor immediately accepts the client and withholds judgment and criticism. The C stands for care. The counselor develops rapport and uses empathy and reflection of feeling to develop trust. The T stands for transact. Once counselors have reached this level with the client, the counselor begins the WDEP process as elaborated by Wubbolding. The helper-client role is then fully established and the healing transaction starts. This is the initial framework for how counselors using reality therapy based on choice theory can establish a true-to-life and authentic working therapeutic alliance. The ACT process ultimately leads the client to experiencing his first genuine relationship which is also devoid of external control psychology.

Conclusion

The above statement represents the virtues that Choice Theory and Reality Therapy extol: meeting needs through non-coercive healthy relationships. This psychological orientation emphasizes responsibility and action. It sees humans who enter this world encoded with basic needs and who choose, of their own volition, to meet those needs in purposeful ways to match pictures in their quality worlds.

By the same token, Choice Theory does not see people as sick or suffering from mental diseases. All behavior is purposeful and an attempt to meet needs through matching quality world pictures.

Overall, Choice Theory harbors an optimistic vision of human nature. It boasts a compact, simple and elegant understanding of human psychology. It is the theoretical orientation that does not see people as broken or doomed or as mere automatons. It is the psychology that bestows the utmost faith in the individual. It allows people to choose what they want out of life, to pull themselves up by the bootstraps. It is the psychological philosophy that establishes the most trust in the individual.

References

Cameron, A. (2009). *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 28(2), 40-42(1st edition). Philadelphia, PA: Routledge.

Clifton, D. (2011). "MINDING UP' WITH CHOICE THEORY IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING 21st CENTURY." *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, 30(2), 17-22. Retrieved from <http://199.79.56.33/docview/1010819816?accountid=7087>

Ezrina, L. B. (2014). "CHOICE THEORY AND REALITY THERAPY: OVERVIEW." *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*, 34(1), 6-13. Retrieved from <http://199.79.56.33/docview/1625136609?accountid=7087>

Glasser, William. M.D. (1998). *Choice Theory: A New Psychology of Personal Freedom*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

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

Brief Bio--

Sterlin Lujan received his bachelor's degree in psychology from Texas A&M University Texarkana, where he graduated with academic distinction. He is currently enrolled at Texas A&M University Texarkana for his graduate degree in counseling psychology. He is focused on receiving his LCDC and working with clients who suffer from alcohol and drug abuse. He eventually hopes to earn a Ph.D. in counseling psychology to teach and expand Choice Theory and Reality Therapy.

Sterlin is also a journalist who loves writing on a wide variety of topics. He is published monthly in HER Magazine, which is a magazine affiliated with the Texarkana Gazette in Texarkana, Texas. He has covered topics ranging from the history of the major holidays to a handful of book reviews.

Sterlin is also an avid reader in his free time, especially on topics regarding philosophy, psychology, economics, political theory, history, literature, and science.

EXPOSING THE ROOTS OF EXTERNAL CONTROL PSYCHOLOGY: ALTRUISM AS MORAL COMPULSION

Derrick P. Nantz, M.A., M.B.A.

Abstract

In this article I argue that while William Glasser's concept of external control psychology is one of his most important identifications ('the cause of all our misery'), he does not fully account for what gives rise to it. He attributes much of external control behavior to crass selfishness, yet elsewhere he says that most instances of external control are quite subtle and performed on those we are closest to. I argue here that the primary philosophic cause of external control behavior today is a belief in the morality of altruism. When one accepts altruism, one receives moral sanction to use external control on others to discourage them, dissuade them, or discount their otherwise legitimate self-interested goals and desires. One will be motivated to make others "do what is right," i.e. sacrifice, to what one believes is in the best interest of the group, the collective, the family, or whatever "non-self" unit of value one holds as the standard. Identifying altruism as a moral system that encourages one to perform external control helps account, I believe, for the large portion of external control behavior that is not overtly coercive, but is subtle and often indirect.

Introduction: Our Present Psychology has Failed

In William Glasser's book *Choice Theory* he boldly announces that our present psychology has failed and we need a new psychological framework. In the last three centuries mankind has progressed from working in fields to walking on the moon but, through the advancements of our modern age, we are still not happy. We are not happy, Glasser claims, because there is a crucial area of our lives that we have neglected and/or failed to properly understand. This area is the quality of relationships we have with those we love.

It is in this realm where masses of people have tried and overwhelmingly failed to satisfy their fundamental need for *love and belonging*. Where we have greatly improved the means by which we satisfy our other basic needs—freedom, survival, power, fun— we still attempt to fulfill our need for love and belonging by rote, Glasser says, blindly following the customs of our parents—as our parents did with their parents, an endless unthinking routine repeated generation after generation. This "psychology of our ancestors, our parents and grandparents, of our teachers and leaders, of almost all the people we know or know about" (1998, p. 5) must change, Glasser insists, if we are to have any hope of being happy.

External Control Psychology: The Source of Our Misery and the Obstacle to Our Happiness

In identifying *love and belonging* as the area of our life where we experience the greatest frustration and misery, Glasser identifies a particular psychological framework as the cause of our deep discontentment. Glasser labels this framework *external control psychology* [ECP] and he describes it as a pervasive, relationship-destroying mentality that leads us to treat others as a means to an end, rather than as autonomous agents. "I use the term

external control,” Glasser (2002) explains, “because it is the direct opposite of *self-control*. People who use it spend all their efforts trying to change others, and very little effort trying to change themselves” (p. 12). This framework makes one see behavior like manipulation, coercion, control, and threats, as proper, even practical ways of dealing with others. Those who employ external control, Glasser (1998) says, “have discovered not only what is right for them – but also, unfortunately, what is right for us...[and] these people feel obligated to try to force us to do what they know is right” (p. 4).

According to Glasser, external control harms both the practitioner and the person upon whom ECP is exercised. It is both in how we respond to the practitioners of ECP and how we limit our own use of external control behavior that we will improve our relationships, succeed in fulfilling our need for love and belonging, and ultimately have a chance at deep and sustained happiness. It is for this reason that Glasser (1998) described choice theory as an “internal control psychology” and “a new pro-relationship theory” (p. 7).

In this article, what I would like to do is focus less on Glasser’s prescription for how to manage external control behavior and instead hone in on the possible premises underlying ECP. It has been well established by the school of cognitive therapy that human emotion and behavior are the consequences of a person’s thinking. As Aaron Beck (1979) explains, “the individual’s problems are derived largely from certain distortions of reality based upon erroneous premises and assumptions”(p. 2). Long-term success in therapy almost always requires that a client understand his/her problems and what motivates him/her to perform the ineffective behaviors he or she believes are ‘solutions’. Long-term success in eliminating external control psychology thus requires that we understand the fundamental roots of ECP and why we erroneously believe it is an effective way of dealing with others. Glasser (1998) acknowledges this when he states: “Choice theory is about making better choices, but we have to understand the reason for the bad choices before we can make good ones” (p. 157).

Further, if ECP is as pervasive and destructive as Glasser (1998) says it is—if it is “a terrible plague that invades every part of our lives” (p. 7) — then we cannot treat it lightly. We cannot simply tell ourselves to stop controlling and coercing others, nor can we just hope that one day we will “learn that what is right for me does not make it right for anyone else” (p. 53). We must investigate the particular *intellectual* premises that led us (and continues to lead us) to coerce, control, and disrespect others. We must, in a sense, follow the recommendation of Albert Ellis (1998), who as far back as 1956 said: “Assuming that emotionally disturbed individuals act in irrational and illogical ways, the questions that are therapeutically relevant are: How do they originally get to be illogical? How do they keep perpetuating their irrational thinking?” (p. 109). This same advice could apply not just to an individual, but equally to a culture: How did we originally come to find ECP as an appropriate way for dealing with one other? How do we keep perpetuating ECP?

Glasser’s Account of the Roots of ECP are Insufficient

Glasser (1998) introduces the concept of ECP with the following statement: “The seeds of almost all our unhappiness are planted early in our lives when we begin to encounter people who ... feel obligated to try to force us to do what *they know* is right” (p. 4). Glasser (1998) suggests that the ECP framework originates from an innate drive for power: “[T]he child,

driven by power, is now exploring his/her controlling behaviors that have worked so well to find out if they work well enough to get rid of every discomfort that comes along....The baby says to himself/herself, *Why not find out how much I can get others to do for me*" (p. 58-59). But, because we are more than animals motivated by drives and instincts, Glasser reports that we soon start to use external control for other reasons.

One such reason Glasser (1998) suggests that it is thoughtless adherence to tradition: "It is the psychology of our ancestors, our parents, and grandparents, of our teachers and leaders, of almost all the people we know or know about. Coercion, to try and get our way, has been with us so long that it is considered common sense...we neither care where it came from nor question its validity" (p. 6). While this might be true for a great number of unscrupulous, uncritical individuals, it does not explain why more thoughtful and seemingly moral people employ in ECP. Nor does this explain how ECP originally came to be a part of our culture's tradition.

This is likely why Glasser (1998) suggests that we embrace ECP for another reason, namely that we believe it works: "It works for the powerful because it often gets them what they want. It works for the powerless because they experience it working on them..." (p. 6). What Glasser means here is that while ECP subtly undermines relationships, it generally gets immediate, observable results. An authoritative husband, for example, sees his wife and child going along with what he vociferously demands and it may not be until much later that he becomes aware of the negative effects of his authoritarianism. Similarly, an overbearing manager may witness his employees dutifully following his orders, but he may never hear what is whispered behind his back or learn the real reason why he has such high turnover with his employees.

Glasser's point is that the visible, short-term gains of ECP are always easier to identify than the long-term losses. Thus, the practitioner of ECP fails to make the connection that while others are complying with his orders, abiding by his threats, and fearing his punishments, they are simultaneously quietly disconnecting from him, losing respect for him, and finding ways to avoid him (Glasser, 2002). This problem is compounded, Glasser says, by the fact that even when we sense that there is something wrong with our controlling behavior, we do little to question it and much to evade it, as, to us, it is common sense.

This explanation digs deeper into the motivation behind ECP and provides some plausible reasons for how many well-intentioned individuals might unwittingly engage in ECP. But, it seems hard to see how intelligent, scrupulous, and morally forthright individuals fail to make the connection between their controlling behavior and the health of their relationships.

Perhaps sensing some inadequacy in his account of the source of ECP, Glasser (1998) offers another explanation for ECP, namely that "[w]hat may also be involved here is ownership" (p. 15). Glasser suggests that many of us believe on some level that we 'own' or have the right to control our spouses, lovers, children, employees, students, in general, our subordinates. And, this seems true enough. It is not unusual to see a boss micromanaging his employees, treating them in a demeaning or disrespectful manner; or to see parents demanding total obedience from their child, at the expense of the child's understanding; or

to see a husband treating his spouse in a controlling, overbearing way. Therefore, I believe that this explanation of Glasser's does help to account for why some individuals embrace ECP, but it still does not go far enough to explain all instances of ECP.

Where Glasser falls short in giving a full account of the roots of ECP is that he assumes that ECP is only the result of ignorance, short-sightedness, or crude, irrational egoism. While ECP *can* be motivated by the crude, irrational drive for power, I believe external control is as prevalent as it is because it has a profound moral sanction, a sanction given by the morality of altruism. In the next section, I will explain why the morality of altruism is the root cause of most instances of external control behavior today.

The Preponderance of External Control Behavior is Subtle

Selfishness is a dirty word. Today most people fear being labeled selfish and work hard to be thought of as kind, giving, caring, selfless, compassionate, and altruistic. Altruism and selflessness are words always found in accolades, compliments, and award ceremonies; selfishness and egoism almost always accompany censures, angry tirades, or accounts of why someone committed some heinous act. Examples of 'selfish' and 'greedy' behavior, we are told, range from Bernie Madoff's treatment of his investors, to Tiger Woods' treatment of his wife, to the common criminal's treatment of the person whose property he steals. When cast in this light it is easy to see why such 'selfish' behavior is wrong: It is unprincipled and blatantly disregards the rights and property of others.

But, while these examples are clear instances of crude, irrationally selfish behavior motivated by ECP, such examples, I believe, constitute a low overall percentage of the total external control behavior we see in society. In a modern, civilized society, most people enjoy a relatively high degree of freedom and comfortable living standards. They generally acquire what they have through hard work and cooperation/trade with others. Thus, in the type of society we have today (at least in the developed nations), the unprincipled, short-ranged, crudely exploitative members of society are a minority. The wrongness and impracticality of 'flying by the seat of one's pants', 'walking all over others', and 'acting on impulse' are well known to both victims and (usually once caught) perpetrators.

So, while ECP *can* take the form of one person to coercing or abusing another, the lion's share of external control behavior is subtle, indirect, and even well-intended. This is why Glasser (1998) states that Choice Theory is for the "husband-wife, parent-child, teacher-student, and manager-worker," written with an aim to repair "unsatisfying relationships" (p. ix). It is why Glasser (1998) says that external control can be "as slight as a disapproving glance" (p. 5). And, it is why Glasser's (2002) seven deadly habits of external control identify not primarily coercive behaviors, but the wider category of *non-respectful* behaviors: "Criticizing, blaming, complaining, nagging, threatening, punishing, and rewarding to control" (p. 13).

ECP is a psychological framework that is pervasive. It is a psychology that nearly *all* of us subscribe to (at least in some form) and it leads to problems that show up in nearly all of our relationships. Most strikingly, and the reason why Glasser feels so inclined to write about it, is that ECP shows up in our closest, most meaningful relationships, corroding them and preventing us from living happy, fruitful lives.

If this is true, that external control behavior can be performed by genuinely well-intentioned, scrupulous people, then it is a mistake to assume that all external control behavior is the result of the causes Glasser cites, namely, thoughtless conventionalism, ignorance of the destructiveness of external control behavior, or irrational egoism. These explanations are insufficient. As I explain in the following section, the roots of ECP run deeper; they rest in the soil of morality.

Why Altruism has Escaped Recognition as a Cause of ECP

Glasser's failure to fully account of the roots of ECP is, I believe, not an accident. It is the result of a deeper failure on the part of most people to recognize altruism as a destructive code of morality. Altruism is so frequently misunderstood because it is almost always confused with kindness, generosity, or benevolence. Deeper than this, not only is altruism severely misunderstood, but it is often assumed to be synonymous with 'the good', or with moral behavior as such. In a sense analogous to how Glasser says we think of external control psychology, belief in the moral correctness of altruism is something we accept almost unquestionably as part of 'common sense'.

Take the following quotes from well-known sources in the field of psychology as representative:

- 1) "Leaving the world a better place to live in, serving others, participation in charity (the greatest virtue of all) – these activities are right and good and have provided life meaning for many humans..." (Yalom, 1980, p. 431).
- 2) "Altruism, especially when it extends beyond biological relations (kin altruism) and beyond "tit-for-tat" calculations grounded in self-interest (reciprocal altruism), is widely lauded and is commonly considered a foundation of moral life...[i]n its fullest expression, which may include significant self-sacrifice in the aid of strangers or even enemies, altruism is a source of perennial fascination across cultures" (Saunders, 2004, p. 327).
- 3) "The healthy person...clearly understands self-other boundaries. He or she can choose to be of egoistic help to others ...[or] he or she can also *proceed further developmentally* and deliberately choose the blurred ego boundaries of the transcendent state. Help rendered then becomes altruistic" (Thrasher, 1991, p. 163).
- 4) "In the altruistic mode, the person is concerned about the welfare of others [and] gets gratification from subordinating his interests to the needs of other people...[such] [p]eople perform many different acts of helpfulness and generosity without expecting praise or commendation. *The altruistic act is its own reward*" (Beck, 1979, p. 244-245).

Our belief in and commitment to altruism may seem harmless, but I believe this is a mistake with serious consequences. It has led individuals for millennia to pursue 'the good' at the expense of their happiness, and it has permitted individuals to manipulate and compel others in the name of 'the good'—i.e. *self-sacrifice*. What I hope to show in the remainder of this article is that it is largely because altruism has gone unchallenged that a key source of external control psychology has gone unrecognized.

Why Altruism Means Self-Sacrifice

The first thing to note about altruism is that it is fundamentally different from concepts it is often paired with, namely, generosity, kindness, benevolence, empathy, politeness, care, and compassion. Many thinkers (as noted above) make the mistake when discussing altruism that one 'just knows' what it is or they proceed in a way that confuses altruism with related concepts. Altruism is rarely defined and often used carelessly.

Distinct from such concepts as kindness, generosity, benevolence, or charity, altruism is a term that demands more from a person than just helping others in one's spare time or when one can afford it. Altruism is an *ethical system* that urges one to act for the sake of others as a matter of *moral duty*. Altruism does not occur when one casts a sympathetic smile in another's direction, gives a coworker a ride to work, or gives a portion of one's earnings to charity. Altruism occurs when one morally commits to serving others while denying one's self—as *way of life*.

This tendency to evade what altruism really means is the reason why philosophers such as Friedrich Nietzsche and Ayn Rand were so vocal about its dangers. Nietzsche (1966) writes, "the feelings of devotion, self-sacrifice for one's neighbor, the whole morality of self-denial must be questioned mercilessly and taken to court [...]. There is too much charm and sugar in these feelings of 'for others', of 'not for myself', for us not to need to become doubly suspicious at this point" (§33). And, Rand (1984) urged people to recognize that at root altruism means "that man has no right to exist for his own sake, that service to others is the only justification of his existence, and that self-sacrifice is his highest duty, virtue, and value" (p. 61).

We need not look to altruism's opponents to grasp its true meaning though. Philosopher Auguste Comte, who coined the term "altruism," took the word from the Latin *alter*, meaning 'other'. So, in literal terms altruism means 'other-ism'. To Comte (1973b), the goal of morality is to "teach us to live for others. Its aim being to fit us for the unintermitting service of Humanity..." (p. 228). Comte (1971) referred to altruism as a 'religion of Humanity,' one he hoped would replace supernatural religion and bring us to a point where "actions of a self-regarding kind...have to give way" (p. 382).

What stands out from Comte's 'religion of Humanity' is his perspective on human nature and man's moral purpose. He views members of society not as independent, efficacious beings worthy of respect, but as dependent beings born into a host of pre-established social obligations. Under such conditions, an individual's desires and goals ought not be respected and nurtured, but controlled and compelled toward the service of 'Humanity'.

The best way to steer people toward this end Comte (1971) thought would be by means of *moral education*, an education that would "raise social feeling by artificial effort to the position which, in the natural condition, is held by selfish feeling" (p. 98). Such an education would make us "incorporate with Humanity" (Comte, 1973a, p. 282) by means of "atrophy[ing] by prolonged inaction...the selfish propensities" (Comte, 1971, p. 98).

While most people don't have the global view that Comte did and do not interpret altruism in such a strict way, they do overwhelmingly accept Comte's basic premise—that

morality at root means selflessness and acting for the sake of others. And this is where the danger lies. Accepting this premise, even implicitly, does two things: 1) It gives moral sanction to the practitioner of external control to compel others to act against their self-interest. (It even gives practitioners of external control a weapon, the word 'selfish', to hurl at non-compliant individuals.) 2) It weakens the average person's confidence in himself making him vulnerable to the external control of others. If one operates on even the implicit belief that the 'selfless is the good', then every action one engages for oneself will produce a degree of guilt—and practitioners of external control easily pick up on this.

Ayn Rand (1979) explains the role of guilt in the altruist morality as follows:

Even though altruism declares that 'it is more blessed to give than to receive', it does not work that way in practice. The givers are never blessed; the more they give, the more is demanded of them; complaints, reproaches and insults are the only response they get for practicing altruism's virtues. [...] Guilt is altruism's stock in trade, and the inducing of guilt is its only means of self-perpetuation. If the giver is not kept under a torrent of degrading, demeaning accusations, he might take a look around and put an end to the self-sacrificing (p.306).

It is in this way why altruism is such an effective tool to control and manipulate people.

Individuals are faced with unrealistic, impracticable demands which they must satisfy to be good according to the morality of altruism, and when they fall short of this unrealistic standard (as they must) they are left open to criticism, guilt, and manipulation. A rational, life-affirming morality would not put a person in such a situation. It would neither encourage one to practice external control behavior nor make one vulnerable to external control behavior.

Personal Happiness as the Proper Goal of Morality

Morality is a code of values and principles a person chooses to adopt in order to guide his life and direct his actions. Unfortunately, most people today do not give deep thought to the moral principles they adopt and they generally absorb their moral values from their cultural surroundings. The problem with this is not just that society can be wrong, but also that society does not always emanate one unified, coherent moral message. In fact, the two most prevalent moral messages we hear in society today are ones that seem to be at odds. These are: 1) We should devote our lives to helping others (altruism). 2) We should strive to be as successful and happy as possible (egoism). The first message, that we should devote our lives to others, is almost indisputably deemed to be the 'moral path'. But what of the second? Is it moral? Where does it stand?

Happiness requires a course of action markedly different from what altruism demands. It is a demanding pursuit. Happiness requires that one to attain self-discipline, commitment, integrity, and a strong work ethic. It requires that one adopt and pursue rational values and set appropriate goals. It necessitates that one gain a basic level of intelligence, maintain physical and mental health, cultivates meaningful relationships, etc. Happiness "must be nurtured if it is to be strong," Glasser (2002) says (p. 112). Yet, in this challenging, life-long endeavor, one is supposed to, under the dictates of altruism, be prepared to drop all such self-interested concerns to satisfy the standing claims of others in need. We are told we

have the right to the pursuit of happiness, but that we also have a moral duty to be our brother's keeper.

How then can happiness be possible under such a moral code of altruism? It cannot. Altruism *makes the achievement of happiness impossible*. When practiced seriously and consistently, altruism will bring personal *unhappiness* because it drains a person of his time, energy, values, and independence. Nietzsche (1974) warned of this when he said, "[t]he praise of [selfless] virtue is the praise of something that is privately harmful—the praise of instincts that deprive a human being of his noblest selfishness and the strength for the highest autonomy" (p. 21).

Nietzsche was keen in this regard to point out that altruism does not just ask that we serve others as a duty, it requires that we *sacrifice* ourselves—with the first thing to go being our happiness. Altruism urges a person to "lose one's way in order to come to the assistance of a neighbor," Nietzsche said (1974, p. 338). This is why he referred to it as a harmful, 'decadent' morality and he called it "anti-natural," since it urges us to go against our instincts of self-preservation (Nietzsche, 2005, p. 174). Similarly, it is why Ayn Rand (1964; 2009) called altruism a morality of death. While both of these characterizations may seem harsh, even counter-intuitive, if one understands that altruism demands self-sacrifice as a way of life, that it makes happiness impossible, and it reduces a person's quality of life with every moral choice he makes, this characterization does not seem far off the mark.

How Accepting Altruism Leads To ECP

Regardless of what one thinks of Nietzsche and Rand's characterization of altruism, however, for our purposes here we can make two rather noncontroversial statements about it. These statements should help us to see how altruism gives rise to external control behavior: 1) Altruism holds a fundamentally *collectivist perspective*, a perspective where people are viewed and valued, not as individuals, but as members of a group. 2) Altruism *encourages dependency*. It maintains that we have a moral responsibility to serve one another and rely on one another when in need. It eschews independent, self-interested action. This collectivist perspective and duty to serve others are two structural pillars that help support and give rise to external control.

Looking at the first pillar, consider how viewing an individual *not* as an autonomous being, but as a mere member of some 'collective' might provide moral justification for external control behavior. On such grounds a person is *not* viewed as an entity born with rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but is seen as an entity born into a network of pre-established social obligations. Viewing society and human nature in this way clearly authorizes some individuals (those representing the collective) to treat others in a controlling or demeaning way, as the individual is but a mere means to serving the ends of 'the collective' (e.g. humanity, society, the community, family, etc.).

Take the following passage by Nietzsche (1982):

One's own path. – If we take the decisive step and enter upon the path which is called our 'own path', a secret is suddenly revealed to us: all those who have hitherto been our friends and familiars have imagined themselves

superior to us, and are now offended. The best of them are lenient with us and wait patiently for us soon to find our way back to the 'right path' – they know, it seems, what the right path is! The others resort to mockery and act as though one had become temporarily insane, or they make spiteful allusions to the person they suppose has misled us. The more malicious declare us to be vain fools and seek to blacken our motives, while the worst former friend of all sees in us his worst enemy.... What are we to do? My advice is: to inaugurate our sovereignty by promising all our acquaintances a year's amnesty in advance for all their sins (p. 484).

Many people can relate to the situation Nietzsche describes. Many individuals brace themselves whenever they make important decisions in life for how many people they might offend in the process—even when such decisions have seemingly little effect on others. It may be deciding where to live or go to college, what career to pursue, or whom to date, those who operate on ECP do not believe such decisions should be made individually. They should be made collectively. Hence, with the full moral support of altruism behind them, the practitioners of external control insert themselves in other peoples' private decisions, demanding that the others' needs be taken into consideration.

It could be one's mother appealing to her son to marry someone who 'fits better in the family'. It could be a father encouraging his son to take up a career more 'befitting of the family name'. It could be a teacher encouraging her student to act 'more like a young lady'. The collectivist perspective in altruism urges conformity to a standard set down by the collective—not based on truth or by reference to what is in the individual's own best interest—but based on the mere fact that it was arrived at 'collectively'; as if, to paraphrase the character Dr. Stockmann in Henrik Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People*, 'the majority have a monopoly on moral truth'. Thus, the collectivist perspective, when put into practice squelches independence and ultimately puts one's life under the control others.

Turning to the other pillar of altruism, the condition of dependency, one can see that whether psychological or existential, a dependent person is one that is easier to control. Though dependency is romanticized by advocates of altruism, it is actually an unfortunate and unhealthy condition to be in (Locke & Kenner, 2009). Glasser (1998) does not seem to be in favor of dependency as he states the purpose of Choice Theory is to give us *more* control of our lives and to help us answer the 'all-important question', "How can I figure out how to be free to live my life the way I want to live it and still get along well with the people I need?" (p. 5).

Yet, altruism encourages dependence at its very core by demanding that we think not of ourselves, but of others in any situation. Just as we established that one cannot obtain happiness living by altruism, one equally cannot achieve independence under altruism either. Becoming self-sufficient, self-confident, and efficacious requires a great deal of hard work and perseverance. It requires one to spend quite a bit of time working by oneself on oneself. But, again, as altruism enters the picture, this morality tells us that our life is not our own and that we ought to serve others before ourselves. Consequently, it is hard to see how a proud, independent person could emerge from such a moral framework.

Conclusion

In this article we began with William Glasser's identification of a particular facet of society that is dysfunctional and in need of repair. This facet, he said, is the sphere of social relationships where we aim to satisfy our need of love and belonging. The malignancy affecting our social relationships, Glasser identifies, is a certain type of psychological framework, which he calls external control psychology. This framework drives us to control and manipulate, rather than to deal with others in a positive, supportive, encouraging manner, giving individuals the respect they deserve as rational human beings. In evaluating Glasser's account of the roots of external control psychology, we judged his account to be insufficient and we proposed instead a somewhat counterintuitive explanation for why the bulk of society operates on an external control framework. We suggested that external control psychology was an outgrowth of our culture's widespread acceptance of the morality of *altruism*.

After clarifying what altruism is, distinguishing it from related terms, we determined that altruism is an ethical system that places moral value on selfless service to others. It is a moral system that promotes collectivism and encourages dependency as a virtue. Through its advocacy of collectivism and its encouragement of dependency, we proposed that altruism plays a significant role in generating a framework upon which external control psychology operates.

Though it may run counter to our moral sensibilities to characterize altruism in such a negative light, this is good reason to recognize it as such. As Locke and Kenner note, "Altruism has had an intellectual 'free ride' going unchallenged for too long" (p. 191). I have argued that altruism is responsible for the lion's share of external control behavior in society and it generates much of our personal unhappiness. If we value personal happiness and respectful relationships with one another, we ought to reject the unrealistic moral demands of altruism and replace it with a life-affirming alternative.

References

Beck, A. (1979). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York, NY: Meridian

Comte, A. (1971). *A general view of positivism*. (J.H. Bridges, Trans.). Dubuque, IA: Brown Reprints. (Original work published 1865.)

Comte, A. (1973a). *System of positive polity: Or treatise on sociology instituting the religion of humanity, volume one*. (J.H. Bridges, Trans.). New York, NY: Burt Franklin. (Original work published 1875.)

Comte, A. (1973b). *System of positive polity: Or treatise on sociology instituting the religion of humanity, volume four*. (R. Congreve, Trans.). New York, NY: Burt Franklin. (Original work published 1875.) Available online at:
<http://www.archive.org/details/systempositivep01comtgoog>

Ellis, A. (1998). *The Albert Ellis reader: A guide to well-being using rational-emotive behavior therapy*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press.

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

Glasser, W. (2002). *Unhappy teenagers: A way for parents to reach them*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Locke, E. A. & Kenner, E. (2009). How altruism undermines mental health and happiness. In A. Antoniou, C. Cooper, G. Chrousos, C. Spielberger, & M. Eysenck (Eds.) *Handbook of managerial behavior and occupational health*. Cheltenham, UK: Elgar. p. 179-92.

Nietzsche, F. (1966). *Beyond good and evil*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans.) New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1886.)

Nietzsche, F. (1974). *The gay science*. (W. Kaufmann, Trans.) New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1882.)

Nietzsche, F. (1982). *Daybreak: Thoughts on the prejudices of morality*. (R.J. Hollingdale, Trans.) New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1881.)

Nietzsche, F. (2005). *Twilight of the idols*. (J. Norman, Trans.) New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1888.)

Rand, A. (1979). Moral inflation. In *The Ayn Rand letter* (301-314). Palo Alto, CA: Palo Alto Book Service.

Rand, A. (1984). *Philosophy, who needs it?* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Rand, A. (1998). *The virtue of selfishness: A new concept of egoism*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Rand, A. (2009). Altruism. In P. Schwartz & M. Podritske (Eds.), *Objectively speaking*. Lanham: Md: Lexington Books. p. 143-52.

Saunders, D. C. (2004). Kindness. In M.E. Seligman & C. Peterson (Eds.), *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification* (p. 345-336). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Thrasher, P. (1991). On altruism: Comment on Batson. *American Psychologist*, 46, 2. 163-164.

Yalom, I. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brief Bio--

Derrick P. Nantz is a philosophy instructor at Wake Tech Community College in Raleigh, NC. He can be reached at dpnantz@waketech.edu.

KEEPING THE FLAG OF CHOICE THEORY AND REALITY THERAPY FLYING: AN INTERVIEW WITH ROBERT WUBBOLDING

Patricia A. Robey Ed.D., LPC, CTRTC

Abstract

This article presents an interview with Dr. Robert Wubbolding, senior faculty of William Glasser International (WGI) and WGI-US and former Director of Training for the William Glasser Institute. Wubbolding answers questions regarding his introduction to choice theory and reality therapy and how these ideas have impacted his personal and professional life. Wubbolding shares early memories of his time with William Glasser and some of the highlights of his experiences with the William Glasser Institute.

Biography: Dr. Robert Wubbolding is an internationally known author, teacher, and practitioner of choice theory and reality therapy. Wubbolding is a psychologist, a professional clinical counselor, a member of the American Psychological Association and the American Counseling Association, and a member of local and state counseling associations in Ohio. He has worked as a high school teacher and a counselor for both high school and elementary school students. He has served as a consultant in drug and alcohol abuse programs for the U.S. Army and Air Force, as a group counselor in a halfway house for women, and in private practice as the Director of The Center for Reality Therapy in Cincinnati, Ohio. Wubbolding (1989, 2000, 2011) developed the WDEP formulation, a teaching and learning tool for the procedures of reality therapy. This tool was endorsed by Dr. Glasser in Wubbolding's book *Understanding Reality Therapy* (1991).

Interview

Robey: It's so good to have this opportunity to interview you, Bob. The first thing I would like to do is congratulate you on being acknowledged as a "Living Legend" in 2014 by the American Counseling Association. Tell us what this means and what the criteria were for this award.

Wubbolding: It is true that in 2014 at the American Counseling Association (ACA) conference I was honored to be called a "Living Legend in Counseling." This honor was orchestrated by Dr. Jon Carlson. Jon is the author of dozens of books on counseling and has been at the forefront of efforts to elevate the profession of counseling by his writings. And so, it is very gratifying to be acknowledged by this award. The criteria for the bestowal of this honor were set by Jon and included the long standing association with ACA, the publication of many books, articles, and book chapters, national and international presentations, the education of counselors and availability to students at universities and conferences. For instance, I have attended every ACA conference for over 30 years and have been a member since the 1960's when I was a high school and elementary school counselor.

Robey: Tell me a little about your personal and professional background. How did you get to where you are today?

Wubbolding: On a personal level I am the youngest of 6. My father was a jeweler and my mother was a homemaker. My father died when I was quite young and the family worked together to insure the education of all of us. It is very stylish to declare early hardships and struggles but I cannot say that I came from a hardship family or one that struggled for its survival. I have always thought that my cultural background is completely irrelevant. I can say that the family, including aunts and uncles, who helped in our upbringing was typically cohesive, church attending, tax paying and law abiding. The neighborhood was safe and we could all walk the streets at night without fear in a neighborhood of working class people. One anecdote from this period illustrates the importance of community relationships. My father worked at night to "finish off" the unfinished attic to make 2 more bedrooms. Many years later I discovered that the hammering and loud conversations of my 2 older brothers made sleeping difficult for the neighbors. At that time they did not object to this inconvenience because of our friendly relationship with them.

After graduating from high school, I entered the Catholic seminary and was ordained a priest in 1962. To make a long story short, I left the active ministry in 1969 but did not marry until 1982. In this day and age, I need to add that my departure from the clergy was both free and honorable. In 1971, I completed my doctorate in counseling from the University of Cincinnati, and worked in corrections and an elementary school, while also teaching graduate students at Xavier University, three very different settings that provided experiences both rich and varied in content. In 2001 after 32 years at Xavier University, I retired. However, I have always said, "I will never retire, instead I will re-fire. I will continue to sit up, stand up, and speak up until I'm taken up." For several decades during that time, I also maintained a private counseling/psychology practice and supervised up to 5 reality therapists. As you can see I was interested in gaining experience in a wide variety of settings and worked part time at most of them.

At the present time I spend most of my time traveling with my wife Sandie to attend conferences and, as one person said recently, I clearly attempt to "keep the flag of choice theory and reality therapy flying." By the way, I replied to that person that supporting the flagpole requires many strong arms. In the last year, I have written 5 chapters in textbooks, several journal articles, revised a book published in the United Kingdom and revised another book for publication in Japanese. Sandie and I will travel to Japan later this year to help promote this book.

Robey: I am impressed by all you have done and all that you continue to do to promote choice theory and reality therapy, Bob. I get a sense of your passion and commitment when I hear you talk about this. Tell me how you were introduced to Glasser's ideas and what excited you about them.

Wubbolding: After I received my doctorate, I attended training programs in a wide variety of counseling theories and methods. Among these sessions was one conducted at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland taught by Ed Ford, who at that time lived in

Youngstown, Ohio. During the years since that time we have become close friends. I spoke to him just the other day. He is now 88 years old and has lived in Scottsdale, Arizona since the late 1970's with his wife Hester. You asked what excited me about Glasser's ideas. I have always held the principle of personal responsibility as a necessary pre-requisite for healthy relationships and for positive community living. Learning about a mental health system that focused on behavior as chosen and as currently motivated, I realized how Glasser succeeded in demystifying counseling, psychotherapy, effective classroom teaching and supervision. In other words, human beings have at least some control over their own mental health and in many cases they have much control over it. I also learned that the theory and practice constituted a system that transcended the work of even the founder. In fact, in 1980 Naomi Glasser edited the book *What Are You Doing?* published by Harper Collins, that contained cases written by individuals who practiced reality therapy. The very purpose of the book was to illustrate that Glasser's ideas could be used by a wide variety of professional people and were applicable to an amazing assortment of problems. It was clear to me after my first contact with reality therapy that Dr. Glasser wanted nothing more than for as many people as possible, at all levels of the helping and teaching professions, to put into practice the demystified principles that he had developed.

Robey: How have you put Glasser's ideas into action in your personal and professional life?

Wubbolding: Whether it is a personal or a professional application each day I decide on something that I want for that day. It could be spending time with my wife Sandie, writing, calling friends, watching basketball, exercising, attending church and dozens of other possibilities. In reading this answer Sandie stated, "I noticed you did not include answering emails." I have always found that reading emails and answering them results in internally balanced scales. However, the choice to put the scale in balance often remains a procrastinated item on my "to do list" and often lacks implementation. I try to express the above thought in CT terms rather than say, "The task is overwhelming." (Laughs) Each day I plan to study and I most often follow through on this. I encourage students to read outside their profession and to stay in touch with the world around them. I read 3 newspapers a day and read books on culture, current events, economics and history (I also taught high school history when I was a high school counselor). I also spend quite a bit of time reading books and articles on psychology, counseling, neuroscience, etc.

Robey: I have always been impressed by your ability to have quotes and jokes readily available to support what you are saying in your lectures and teaching. After hearing of all that you read I can see that this is not an accident but a result of your desire to be a life-long learner as well as a contributor to our profession. I am sure that this has made a great impact on the people who have had the good luck to know you. Would you share some of your success stories that are related to your use of these ideas?

Wubbolding: I believe that I have improved my relationships with family members: brothers and sisters, nieces, nephews, in-laws, etc. On a professional level I have become very relaxed as a teacher and trainer and have been able to bring many creative ideas to the teaching of choice theory/reality therapy as well as other topics that I teach. These ideas have sparked many imaginative and productive skills in others. I am especially proud

of my role in introducing CT/RT to various countries in Europe, Asia and the Middle East, as well as having several of my books translated into various languages. I encounter many graduate students, practitioners and university instructors in classes and at conferences. Their response to CT/RT is genuinely enthusiastic and accepting of it. They believe it offers them a structure and specific tools immediately applicable and implementable as well as theory and research based. I have also learned the value of not taking myself too seriously and how to incorporate humor into the educational process, but to do this purposefully and to communicate a lesson. Victor Borge, the great comedian, once said that "the shortest difference between two people is a laugh." Mark Twain remarked, "He who laughs, lasts." I regard it as a special success when professional people relate that they used the WDEP system to help clients or students turn from less effective, out of control behaviors to more effective behaviors and healthy choices that improve their relationships. These successes are not mine alone. They belong for the most part to William Glasser, MD, founder of reality therapy.

Robey: What are some of the challenges you faced as you attempted to teach others about these ideas?

Wubbolding: The main challenge that I have faced is presenting the ideas to the public. For me it is no longer much of a challenge to "win them over." I believe in the importance of accepting their perception of their own behavior and that of their families, as well as their perceptions of the world around them. Accepting their viewpoint and their quality world is for me crucial and easy. For example, I have done some work with NAMI, the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. I would *never* tell them that there is no such thing as mental illness. I would avoid arguing about this because it is far more relationship-building to demonstrate how to talk to family members with reality therapy than to demean them by denying their core beliefs. When people learn how to assist others by using the components of reality therapy, which is rooted in choice theory, such intellectual principles become irrelevant.

Robey: You have a long history and relationship with Bill Glasser and the William Glasser Institute. What are some of your memories of the development of the Institute and its changes over time?

Wubbolding: I first met Dr. Glasser in the early 70's after my first exposure to his ideas via Ed Ford's workshop. I then continued to attend the training weeks, all of which were conducted in Los Angeles with Dr. Glasser leading them. In one year, for instance, I travelled to L.A. 4 times to attend these sessions. Other years I merely traveled about 2 or 3 times. Then I participated in the first certification week held in 1975. I was en route to Japan where I lived for a year. Glasser then developed a teaching faculty made up of various people from around the country. Subsequently, he "re-certified" his faculty in 1983. I still have a picture on my wall of his letter of endorsement of me as senior faculty. Three years after Naomi died, he married Sandie's best friend Carleen at the international conference held in Philadelphia. He had lived in Cincinnati for 1 year before their wedding and the 4 of us spent quite a bit of time together.

One of my most significant memories is that of petitioning the advisory board to select Cincinnati, Ohio as the site of the 1990 conference. This decision occurred about 3 or even 4 years before the 1990 date. Sandie and I volunteered to be co-chairs and we announced that 1990 would be the 25th anniversary of the publication of Glasser's first major book *Reality Therapy*. We did everything in our power in concert with a very effective convention committee to make this event "a big deal" and 460 people attended the banquet. Bill and Naomi showed their usual graciousness by agreeing to have their picture taken with attendees in front of the ice sculpture of the WGI logo: the hands and the flame. We will bring these pictures to the 50th anniversary in Las Vegas summer 2015.

There have been numerous changes in both Glasser's ideas and in the training programs themselves. I have always been fond of describing this as "redesigning the airplane while it is in flight."

Another favorite reflection and memory is that Glasser always maintained an almost naïve idealism that his work would change the world. As he said in his interview with Robert Schuller on the Hour of Power (an interview which is now often used in training), the ideas are life changing and are universally applicable. His idealism served as a model for me and I hope for many others that the work we do is very significant in that it impacts the lives, the relationships, and the behavior of all people who implement even a portion of CT/RT.

Robey: You were the Director of Training for almost 23 years, from 1988 to 2011. Tell me about how you earned that position and what your duties were as Director of Training.

Wubbolding: I believe Glasser appointed me director of training in 1988 because I had been a member of the advisory board and served as chair of the professional development committee, working along side of Linda Harshman, the executive director. He and Naomi decided that I would be a good choice for this position for reasons that I was and even now remain only marginally aware of.

My responsibilities were to work with Linda Harshman in the monitoring of the entire training process. At no time did this work involve close scrutiny of anyone. My work was to evaluate in an informal manner the training programs but not the trainers. Dr. Glasser insisted that I attend certification weeks and actively participate. As this participation evolved, the individuals in the training groups wanted me to demonstrate by role-plays. I sometimes think they wanted to see a rather bizarre way to deal with difficult clients. When they observed they usually concluded that the demonstration was not so bizarre after all. The value of my presence in the certification groups illustrated in a concrete manner that the William Glasser Institute was intended to be a *system*. There was a network of relationships and policies that buttressed the structure of the organization.

One of the projects that I am especially proud of is the Glasser Scholars Program. This was an international call for applicants interested in our training. It began in 2008 and 12 university professors completed the program beginning with the basic intensive training through basic instructorship. Throughout this 4-year process they encountered 3 instructors: myself, Dr. John Brickell and you, Dr. Pat Robey. Then at certification they

experienced a 4th instructor. This program originally conceived by Dr. Emerson Capps was designed to train university professors to teach choice theory/reality therapy in their graduate programs at their respective universities and to publish articles so as to widen the research base for reality therapy. Even now they continue to fulfill both of these responsibilities. I meet them at conferences and stay in touch with them by email. At the present time one of the Glasser scholars, Gloria Cisse, chairs the diversity committee for William Glasser Institute.

Not incidentally, Linda Harshman and I worked closely together for decades to add to the quality of the training and to make concrete Dr. Glasser's wish that mental health and his system be made accessible to the public. Sadly, Linda died April 4, 2014.

Robey: What do you hope to see as the future of William Glasser International and William Glasser US?

Wubbolding: I hope the organizations establish guidelines, and not rigid rules. Quality is everyone's responsibility and if our faculty training programs are effective the certification process will continue to maintain and even increase the respect it deserves among professional people.

As a person who has taught around the world it has become obvious that the entire system of faculty training and certification needs to be both adaptable and adapted to specific cultures and countries. The best people to do this are the local professionals. Moreover, the application to schools is perhaps the most difficult one of all. It is not, however, impossible if the principles are adapted to the quality world of people on the local level. For instance, if school personnel are seeking a discipline program, we should be able to deliver it. If choice theory and reality therapy are to be widely taught, both the theory and practice should be both relevant and applicable for meeting the wants and needs of the consumer. If we see our principles as developmental, we can apply them in different ways as the consumers learn them. For instance, if they initially use CT/RT for difficult behaviors they gradually see a depth to the principles that transcend their initial use of them.

Robey: What would you like to be remembered for?

Wubbolding: I think my epitaph for my tombstone would summarize what I'd like to be remembered for: "I tried, God, I tried."

My wife Sandie informed me that I would like to be remembered for my total dedication to my profession, my faith and my family.

Robey: (Laughs) It's good to have spouses who remind us of things like this, isn't it? What would you like to add that I haven't asked you about?

Wubbolding: Many thanks for this opportunity to be interviewed by you. It has been my honor and pleasure to be associated with the various Glasser organizations and to have so

many trusted friends from around the world. I hope that I have given something to them. They have given me much love, friendship and genuine inspiration.

Even though Dr. Glasser died August 23, 2013, I thank him for his monumental contributions to the lives of so many people around the world. Sandie and I wish to continue our friendship with Carleen Glasser, with whom we feel very close. It is our hope that both of us contribute to the continuance of the Glasser legacy and that it will thrive and flourish, in the professional world and beyond.

Robey: Thank you for taking the time to share your story and recollections with me, Bob. I've enjoyed learning more about you and I'm sure readers will enjoy it as well.

References

Glasser, N. (Ed.) (1980). *What are you doing? How people are helped through reality therapy*. New York: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality therapy*. New York, NY: Harper & Row. Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Wubbolding, R. (1989). Radio station WDEP and other metaphors used in teaching reality therapy. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 8 (2), 74-79.

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

Wubbolding, R. E. (2011). *Reality therapy*. In J. Carlson & M. Englar-Carlson (Eds.) *Theories of Psychotherapy Series*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Wubbolding, R. E. (1991). *Understanding reality therapy*. New York: Harper Collins.

Brief Bio--

Patricia A. Robey, Ed.D, LPC, CTRTC, is an associate professor of counseling at Governors State University, the MA in Counseling Program Coordinator, a Licensed Professional Counselor, and a senior faculty member of the William Glasser Institute – US and William Glasser International. Pat has authored and co-authored numerous articles and book chapters on applications of choice theory and reality therapy and is lead editor and chapter contributor to the book *Contemporary Issues in Couples Counseling: A Choice Theory and Reality Therapy Approach*.

What follows are our expressions of appreciation for a job well done by . . . Kim Olver!



Of the many qualities that Kim has, I believe that multi-faceted talent rises above all else. The law of Dharma by Chopra comes to mind:

"According to this law [the law of Dharma], you have a unique talent and a unique way of expressing it. There is something that you can do better than anyone else in the whole world--and for every unique talent and unique expression of that talent, there are also unique needs. When these needs are matched with the creative expression of your talent, that is the spark that creates affluence. Expressing your talents to fulfill needs creates unlimited wealth and abundance."

— [Deepak Chopra](#)

With deep respect,

Jean Suffield

Our Tribute to Kim Olver--

Many thanks and much gratitude to Kim Olver for the leadership she has provided during a challenging time of transition for the Glasser Institutes. Kim courageously accepted the position of executive director at the time her predecessor Linda Harshman was in the process of retiring. She has demonstrated her total commitment to the organization by accepting and embracing the unavoidable fact that her "part-time" job evolved into a more than full-time responsibility. She rapidly involved others in the administration of the institute and the performance of her far-reaching and countless number of duties. Of special note is her prompt response to communications such as emails. We frequently comment about how accessible she is. This characteristic of a leader and administrator can hardly be overemphasized. Her responsibility includes organizing conferences, faculty programs, allocating scarce resources, persuading, encouraging and developing new programs. In other words, she is everywhere all the time! She has demonstrated a work ethic rooted in vision and a sense of mission.

Bob and Sandie Wubbolding

My Tribute to Kim Olver--

Because of your good reputation as a speaker, writer, and all around competent person, I felt privileged to spend some time with you and your mother prior to WGI 2009 Meeting in Edinburg, Scotland. Attending your high quality workshops increased my knowledge on Diversity, Relationships, and CT/RT.

When you were announced as executive director I rejoiced. You were born to lead us through the transition. What I like is that you are a living example of Integrity, Transparency, & Inclusiveness... and you are a lot of fun to be around as well with your singing and dancing.

I know for a fact that you sometimes spend 16 hours out of one day on WGI business as I have observed (1) at face-to-face US Board Meetings, (2) Faculty Retreats, and(3) the Buffalo Conference, not to mention (4) the International Board work. Even at the regional level you spent about 25 hours with students and members before, during, and after the 2013 Sunbelt Region Conference. You won our hearts.

With my greatest respect and admiration,

Beverly LaFond

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

Kim is one of the first people I met on my Choice Theory training journey. I remember instantly loving this woman and knew we'd be lifelong friends. I was so impressed by her exuberance, positivity, and her keen sense of purpose and vision. She has a genuine desire to connect with and listen to those around her, and an uncanny way of doing this while staying true to her beliefs and ideals. She has been an incredible mentor throughout my training. Eight years later, Kim and I have developed a wonderful friendship and I feel so grateful to have her in my life!

Nicole Carson

My tribute to Kim Olver--

I value being able to contact Kim and know that she will always respond. She is a good listener. She cooperates and supports to help further the development and expansion of Choice Theory. She has great ideas and I value her inputs and feel encouraged to expand what I am doing. Through the interactions I have had with Kim, I am pleased she is so ably doing what she is doing. Thanks, Kim.

Bryan Zeman

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

Of all the people that I know, Kim truly stands at as one of the most capable individuals who can multitask with ease, even under stressful conditions. Yes, she is an outstanding presenter, and a very effective counselor, life coach and leader, plus she also enjoys having a good time, and always helps others to have a good time too. Kim is one-of-a-kind, and she always gives her best all-of-the-time! We who are members of WGI-US and/or WGI-International are extremely fortunate to have Kim's services and loyalty, and may we always strive to be like her so that our organizations will continue to grow for many years to come.

Best wishes, Kim . . .

Thomas S. Parish

My Tribute to Kim Olver--

I have known Kim for many years. Kim has always been dedicated to the advancement of Choice Theory in the world. She thinks into the ideas and shares and processes the ideas with many of us. She is a leader in marketing strategies for WGI with being organized with regular updates and newsletters. Kim has written several books on relationships and on diversity and is very personable and easy to talk with. She is always interested in listening to you and is a remarkable encourager.

Maureen Craig McIntosh

Our Tribute to Kim Olver--

Kim is a "wonder woman." She got certified while raising two active boys and working full time. She is extremely innovative and brought the practice of Choice Therapy to many groups of people, including the corporate world and the military, after moving into private practice. After taking over the helm of the Institute from Linda Harshman, she helped the Institute to move into the 21st century through reaching out to all types of social media and teleconferencing. Her energy, humor and creativity have inspired many people to branch out, reach out, and grow. If only all of us could figure out where Kim finds her 36 hour days.

Judith Barnes Claps

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

I value brevity, so here is a brief picture of my working relationship with Kim:

I've known and worked with Kim over the past couple of years on a number of projects. I would describe her as capable and smart, but with an engaging humility that makes it easy to connect with her. Her joie de vivre makes her pleasant and fun to be with, professionally and personally. She fulfills a key role in moving Dr. Glasser's work forward.

Ken Larsen

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

I'm honored to say that I was Kim's instructor and practicum supervisor during her certification training. Since then I have watched her grow and blossom into the strong, determined leader of our U.S. branch of the WGAI. What I remember most is her willingness to learn, her ability to face challenges both personal and professional, and her fearlessness when working on tough problems. She is always ready to learn, has a great sense of humor, and knows what to do when answers are not readily available. You don't have to know her very long to see the impact she can make in our organization. We are in good hands! Thank you, Kim.

With great regard and admiration,

Al Katz

To the WGI Community--

I have come to appreciate Kim and what she brings to the William Glasser Institute over the past 2 years of being on the WGI-US Board with her. Her patience, commitment, sense of humor, and dedication have facilitated a warm and supportive, as well as challenging (in a good way) environment for us. She is tireless and humble in the work she does with the board, inspirational qualities from a leader. I can feel the growth of The Institute in many tangible ways, and I thank Kim's cooperative, inclusive, transparent, consensus-driven style of leadership for helping us all achieve the progress we are making. Sincerely,

Peter Driscoll

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

Though my connection with Kim is extremely limited, I look forward to the "Quote of the month" emails. The quotes so often have provided me with an opportunity to expand my perceptions that I have taken to sharing with Kim the impact each quote has had on me. Kim is always gracious and responds in ways that for me are very need-fulfilling. Kim's ability to relate and communicate are traits many of us would benefit from acquiring.... told you it was limited!

Patti Price

Our Tribute to Kim Olver--

You want to know about Kim Olver? When you walk into a room, you know Kim is there. Her throaty laugh warms your heart and you know you are in a good and safe place. In a few moments, she will find you and greet you warmly and start introducing you to the other people in the room, connecting you to them, and inviting you in.

We both had Kim as a practicum supervisor. She embodies the theory and practice of Glasser's Choice Theory. There is no question you can't ask. Her brain is open for picking. When we discuss choice theory/reality therapy/lead management, the conversation often turns to "quotes from Kim." "Just trust the process." "Who is doing the most work in this role play, you or the client?" "Where are you on the chart?" "What question do you wish you would have asked? Ask it now!"

Kim was generous with her time and her attention to our learning. She accommodated our schedules and often drove two hours so that our practicum group could meet near our homes. She would do anything to help us prepare for certification. Her encouragement empowered us to grow in personal freedom. She was and is a constant cheer leader in our efforts to integrate choice theory into our lives. We are forever grateful to Kim!

**Nano Farabaugh,
Christine Ziegler**

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

Despite having some big shoes to fill, Kim has done an excellent job as the WGI Executive Director. She is very helpful in assisting faculty in advertising and promoting their work. The faculty trainings have been well-organized and well done. Kim really personifies what a lead manager is supposed to be.

Thanks,

Mike Fulkerson

My Tribute to Kim Olver—

I would like to offer Kim a heartfelt tribute and thank you for her devotion and service to WGI. Her wealth of knowledge and example are strengths to the organization and its members. Thank you, Kim, for being there for all of us!

Joycelyn G. Parish

My Tribute to Kim Olver

I was thrilled when I heard that Kim had accepted the position of executive director for the William Glasser Institute (now WGI-US and WGI). Kim's commitment, passion, fairness, and competence make her the perfect person for that role. Her commitment is evidenced by the number of hours she puts in as executive director, many more than she is contracted for. I am grateful for the vision she has that, along with the board members and WGI membership, will lead the WGI into a fresh new customer-driven direction while still maintaining the quality of our certification training process.

I am also grateful to call Kim a personal friend. I value her sense of humor, loyalty, playfulness, and empathy. The stories she has shared of her adventures in teaching, coaching, training, friending, parenting, grandparenting, etc. are joyful to hear and paint a picture of a life well-lived. When I hear others talk about Kim I also recognize that she has led a life of a person well loved.

Thanks, Kim, for all you have done and continue to do that adds such value to those of us who are privileged to know you.

With respect and friendship, and "Yours in Choice,"

Pat Robey