Psychoanalytic Training: Retrospective Assessment by Practitioners In the Field

by

Robin Roger

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

©Copyright by Robin Roger 1999
The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author’s permission.

0-612-45868-7
Acknowledgements

I owe special thanks to the six psychoanalysts who were willing to be interviewed for this thesis. Each one of their educational histories taught me something about what is necessary for optimal psychoanalytic training.

I have learned a great deal from my thesis supervisor Dr. Otto Weininger, who encouraged me and guided me smoothly through the thesis process. Dr. Gillian Gillison took time away from her own pressing projects to provide me with an independent perspective. Her rigorous evaluation enabled me to think more deeply about my subject as well as the process of scholarly writing.

My husband, Dr. Laurence Klotz, provided me with the time and technology I needed to complete this project during what should have been family time. He and my children, Alexander and Betsy, deserve special gratitude for tolerating this intrusion on their lives.
Psychoanalytic Training: Retrospective Assessment by Practitioners in the Field
Master of Arts, 1999
Robin Roger
Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto

Abstract

This thesis asks the question: do psychoanalysts who have practiced for ten years or more reassess their training experience as a result of encountering professional challenges and vicissitudes? To answer this question, six practitioners in practice ten years or more were interviewed concerning their education.

The formal requirements and educational challenges of psychoanalytic education are described. Complexities of the training experience are illustrated by examples from memoirs written by analysts looking back at their education and careers. Literature on psychoanalytic education is also reviewed. What emerges is the infinite variability and psychological complexity of the task of becoming a psychoanalyst, and the nature of likely obstacles to total educational success.

The research reveals that analysts do reassess their education but retain their original basic impression. Excerpts from the interviews to support this are given with a discussion of their implications.
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I: INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I aim to understand the process of learning to be a psychoanalyst by asking analysts to describe their training experience after many years in practice. The formulation of this topic developed as a result of exposure to several different but complementary areas of study in which I have been simultaneously engaged in the past several years.

As a student in the Department of Adult Education at OISE/UT I have been considering what conditions are necessary to ensure optimal learning for adults. The learning that has concerned me most is learning originating from life-cycle junctures which occur randomly but create intense needs to understand. This learning may be cognitive or experiential, and may pertain to emotional or social demands. They are responses to adult life. Being sent back to a starting position as a learner always creates echoes of childhood status. My interest has been how to teach adults while treating them as adults. In my view, adults can not learn unless their life experience is acknowledged as a component of their status, and acknowledged by co-learners and teachers. This is true for analytic candidates, who are often middle-aged before beginning training, as it is for any other adult learner.

In fact, it is all the more important, because analytic candidates are simultaneously responsible for the welfare of another adult—the patient in treatment with them—and engaged in their own regressive therapeutic enterprise. The two learning states must be carefully separated within the analytic program and within the teachers' and students' minds. The psychoanalyst must be an adult who is trained to be aware of his or her own childishness. But the educator must be respectful of the adult who is also
feeling like a child. Surely an educational program aimed at such a paradoxical outcome must be exquisitely balanced between authoritative and liberal, personal and professional, intellectual and emotional. How this might be achieved is a fascinating educational challenge.

My concurrent study of psychoanalytic theory and developmental psychology intensified my interest in how humans develop cognitive and emotional capacities in a way that complicates and enriches learning efforts. Concurrent with this, I have been engaged in a supervised program of reading and clinical psychotherapy practice at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry. This has allowed me to experience the quandaries and doubts that confront the novice, as well as to observe the learning process of my peers. Without this personal experience, I would not have been able to understand the literature on psychoanalytic education. It is an inescapable fact that psychoanalytic psychotherapy cannot be completely understood in theory. An educator may be able to study surgical education without making an incision, (although his or her work would be enhanced by the experience) but the psychotherapeutic educator must have an experiential appreciation of the challenges of grappling with the unconscious.

In addition, as a professional writer, I have been teamed with content experts in the fields of infant development and clinical psychology, and have reviewed the standard academic literature in these areas. As I struggled to master the opposing world-views implicit in developmental psychology and analytic theory, I remained aware of the learning process in which I was engaged, and how it required that I apply my critical faculties, my creative abilities, my intuitive and emotional instincts and my cognitive
learning skills all at the same time. Such complex but exhilarating demands have
informed my reflections on what is demanded of students of psychotherapy.

Part of my fascination with this learning process included asking other therapists
how they learned their skills. The answers were thought-provoking but unexpected.
One analyst mentioned that the teaching at her Institute was extremely poor, although
she was complimentary of her supervisors. A recently graduated analyst commented that
now that she was in the field she found she had to forget everything she was taught and
really start to learn. A third, more seasoned professional, stated somewhat bitterly that
her Institute class experience had been dismal. A fourth analyst declared his training
analysis, (as opposed to an analysis he undertook voluntarily after graduation)
"absolutely useless." I was also strongly advised by a senior analyst to consider training
myself independently outside an Institute setting.

It began to seem that psychoanalytic education was an ordeal to be endured rather
than a learning experience, and that this negative process was a somewhat open secret
within the analytic culture, but kept quiet in the public domain. This was somewhat
disturbing. Would a bitter training experience leave a negative aftertaste that might be
expressed in a practitioner's subsequent career? Would analytic educators, otherwise
known as training analysts, be soured to such a degree that they might inflict the negative
aspects of their own training on their students, so that an endless chain of discontented
and disillusioned candidates would emerge from their institutes? A profession with an
arduous, arbitrary, boring and expensive entry process could only hope to graduate
burned-out practitioners.
But these very same practitioners were enthusiastic about their work, which they discussed with relish. Their education had not diminished their zest, commitment or sense of mastery. Perhaps, then, their training had not been so bad as they described. Or perhaps it seemed worse at the time than it would eventually be remembered. Perhaps their assessment of their training changed as they worked, developed and struggled in the field, and their description of their training was being revised. It was even possible that the gratifying autonomy of practice simply released expressions of frustration that persisted while being a reined-in subordinate. It was possible that these analysts were like student chefs who had been allowed to read cookbooks and slice the vegetables during the training period, but were now free to savour the aromas, taste the flavours and feel the textures of the food that nourished them. The training paled by comparison, and experience threw training into a new light. The question arose: did analysts' reassess and change their assessment over time?

This analogy to cooking is less fanciful than it might seem. Cooking is an art that cannot be learned entirely through an intellectual, cognitive process. The sensory faculties of the cook must be engaged, cultivated and gratified to achieve learning. At the same time, however, food preparation has a complex scientific support structure, the knowledge of which aids in the competency of the cook. Knowing what emulsification is and how it is achieved is useful to a cook who wishes to create this chemical reaction. But the cook also needs to recognize what it looks like when a combination of liquids blend to a certain consistency, to feel the change in the resistance of the sauce to the utensils, and to taste the change in flavour as the ingredients blend. Theory attained
cognitively and applied skills attained experientially combine to create mastery. Either one by itself results in mere competence.

Furthermore, a chef needs to taste a wide variety of foods and flavours in order to continue to develop his or her palette, and must continue to do so throughout his or her career. Increased exposure results in increased sophistication. Experience itself may cause a chef to conclude that the training program in which he learned to make macaroni and cheese was not adequate, even though he thought so at the time.

Thus I set out to investigate whether analysts change their assessment of their education as a result of practice, and if so, in what way. Within the field of education, research which asks the learner about the learning experience is sometimes called action research, and operates on the premise that a description of the subjective experience of the learning process will yield important information that can be applied to the improvement of subsequent educational programs. It is an attempt to understand a phenomenon rather than to measure an outcome. This research does not depend on or result in an assessment of the practitioners' abilities. Nor can it determine the reliability of the participants' viewpoints. It can only report and analyze what psychoanalysts say about their training. But this can tell us a great deal about what the candidate found useful, or useless, and how he or she learned or had to overcome obstacles to learning. I briefly discuss some of my additional findings about analytic education in my discussion of the research.

Because I intended to document the subjective learning experiences of the candidates, I began by reviewing literature written by analysts about their training. My focus was more on the testimonies of analytic learners than the theories of analytic
educators. There is an abundance of commentary by analytic educators on the pedagogical challenges of training analysts, and much of it was reviewed, but this literature tends to take on the tone of the expert delivering expertise rather than an analyst thinking about the struggle of becoming an analyst. It is as if training analysts were never once candidates themselves. It may not be necessary in every field for the educators to retain a fresh feeling of the process of training, but it is essential in psychoanalytic education because the process requires intense intellectual and emotional growth which renders the candidate extremely vulnerable. Just as the sensitive parent must occasionally remember what it was like to be a child, the effective analytic educator must take the developmental nature of candidacy into account. Furthermore, the psychoanalytic experience reveals that we are all infantile at the core and that these powerful primal forces continue to operate throughout life. This is as true for the educators as the students, for the analysts as the analysands. When this awareness is lost, psychoanalysis is no longer the enterprise. Literature that lacks this sensibility was excluded from this study.

At the same time, however, it is critical to view analytic training as a learning experience as much as, if not more than, a treatment process. (Jacobs, David and Meyer 1995 :3) Many of the problems of learning and teaching that are encountered in other fields of adult learning occur in analytic training programs. For this reason, I felt it was important to review current literature on adult learning and faculty development, (which is a separate enterprise in educating adults) that had some bearing on the psychoanalytic training challenge. In my opinion, this literature offers a great deal to analytic educators, who appear not to have entered into a dialogue with adult educators.
After hearing so many analysts make such definitive statements about their training, I expected to discover that the subjects interviewed had all reassessed and changed their views between graduation and the time of my interview. It had not seemed possible that they had all begun with negative ideas and retained them intact throughout their career. What I discovered did not meet my expectations. While practitioners did revisit their training at certain points in their career, and reassess it, they did not necessarily change their evaluation. Their comments were more in the manner of a performance review, in which an employee is evaluated on an annual basis and told where his or her performance is wanting or satisfactory. The review can remain the same year after year, but it is still a reassessment. These analysts reported fairly consistent views of their training, but these views had been amplified and refined over time.

Learning takes place with every passing day of life, and nowhere surpasses the intensity of the first year of life, when the infant’s teachers are mother and father. Transference echoes through the teacher-student relationship as well as the peer learning experience. Like it or not, consciously or not, teachers stand in loco parentis, peers represent siblings, and students must grapple with those ramifications. Adult students may be treated as equals by adult educators, but entrenched patterns infiltrate the process. Students will always find it too easy to slip into a subordinate position with a teacher, even when they are senior in years. For many adult learners, this is not a recognized consideration, but for psychoanalytic candidates, it is not only likely to be evident, it ought to be struggled with as part of attaining a sense of mature independence from the analytic teachers. In other words, some measure of analytic work needs to be done about
the analytic training process for the candidate to understand the emotional burden of the
learning he or she is undergoing. My inquiry into how analysts look back on their
training was also meant to see whether such work did in fact take place, either as a
matter of passing reflection, or as a conscious consideration during the training itself.
This does not fall within the normal bounds of qualitative research, but requires listening
to subjects with a “third ear” (Reik, 1948) to detect ambivalence, idealization, projection,
denial or grandiosity. However, a one-hour interview can not yield firm conclusions
about a learner’s psychological process, and my sense of each learner is confined to a
thumb-nail portrait in the research findings. Each candidate did convey something of his
or her learning personality and psychic investment in the learning process during the
interview, and the retelling of it sparked vivid memories and feelings. A longer, more
in-depth study of the interpenetration of emotion and cognition in analytic training would
be extremely illuminating.

I chose to focus on psychoanalysis rather than psychodynamic therapy or
cognitive behavioural therapy because I believed that a narrowly defined professional
group with standardized educational requirements would be easier to study. Furthermore,
psychoanalysis is grounded in the theoretical writings of Sigmund Freud, and extends
from a definable conceptual source even if it has expanded exponentially since then.
Wishing to increase my knowledge of Freud as a solid base for learning how to be a
therapist made the choice of psychoanalysis that much more attractive.

Psychoanalysis may be a small enterprise in the world of psychotherapy today,
but it is infinitely complex in practice and theory, and is now in a state of theoretical
proliferation that makes the mastery of its literature nearly impossible. I still believe that
it was correct to select the analytic sub-group as my focus of study, but I do not wish to imply that this simplified matters. Preparing myself to discuss training with seasoned analysts required a good deal of theoretical sophistication. This made the interviewing process all the more gratifying. It also made it clear to me how complex and challenging this field of endeavour is. I hope my report will capture how complicated a venture I undertook.
II: The Formal Requirements and Educational Challenges of Psychoanalytic Training

In order to put the comments made by the analysts interviewed for this thesis into context, it is necessary to describe what psychoanalytic training entails and to consider the learning challenges imposed by this training process. Psychoanalytic training is a mixture of practices that has its origins in expedience, accident, theory, and history. The evolution of this system is not the subject of this study, but it is necessary to point out the training process that is generally followed today, which consists of a personal analysis, supervised control cases and a didactic course of study, developed as a result of many different forces besides deliberate educational ones. While the broad strokes remain the same for most candidates, the experience is far from uniform.

Even though psychoanalysts began to train almost a century ago, there has never been a standardized course of preparation for psychoanalytic educators. A training analyst has been trained to analyze, but has not been trained to teach, a problem which psychoanalytic educators have recognized. (Fleming 1987:155). Thus each training program is highly conditioned by the clinical and pedagogical skills as well as the ideological orientation of the analysts available at that Institute.

Freud was the first to address the difficulties of designing psychoanalytic education, albeit in the context of considering other issues.

"It almost looks as if analysis were the third of those 'impossible' professions which one can be sure beforehand of achieving unsatisfying results. The other two, which have been known much longer, are education and government " (Freud 1937:248)

Freud’s suggestion that education and psychoanalysis are both “impossible” pursuits implies that psychoanalytic education is all the more likely to be of limited
success. This may also explain why he wrote relatively little about the pedagogy of analysis. Even though he was deeply concerned with the perpetuation of the field he established, his strategy for its continuation did not focus on the education of subsequent analysts.

Certainly the reports of his earliest followers suggest an almost easy-going attitude to the process of acquiring analytic skill. Of her control case with Freud, Helene Deutsch wrote:

"To be sure, this control was conducted in a very untypical way: usually our discussions were prefaced by Freud's modest remark "you know more about the patient than I do, because you see him every day; I can't tell you very much—but then, you don't need it anyway." (Deutsch 1973: 135)

Freud expressed concern that his technical writings, necessary though they might be, would become a constraining authority rather than an enlightening guide. (Roazen, 1971: 119.) As the originator of psychoanalysis, he was essentially self-taught, and thus established a discipline on a paradox: the technique of probing the mind can be described by one expert and the skill transferred to another person, except that person must teach him or herself.

Freud's divided view of psychoanalysis as both a therapeutic mode and a method of researching the mind further complicated his approach to analytic education. Simply put, his emphasis was on the latter to the detriment of the former. Late in his career, after decades of clinical experience, he was still aiming to describe absolute principles of the psyche. (Freud 1937:243). The training of the scientist of the mind is not the same as the training of the psychological therapist, as complementary as the two may be. Issues of theory and writings which put psychoanalysis in a strong scientific light absorbed
absorbed Freud, while relief from symptoms appeared to him to be a felicitous by-product of correct scientific understanding. (Roazen:1971:135). How to become a good analyst concerned him less than how the psyche worked.

At the same time, Freud saw psychoanalysis as an education in itself, both for the patient and for the aspiring analyst, who attains training through being a patient. As a kind of re-education of distorted emotions, psychoanalysis “acts as a second education of the adult, as a corrective to education as a child“. (Freud 1900:197). What the patient learns about his or her distorted feelings, repressed psychic material and other conflicts, continues to act after “graduation”. (Freud 1937: 249). Thus, the heart of analytic education must be the candidate’s own analysis.

“But where and how is the poor wretch to acquire the ideal qualifications which he will need in his profession? The answer is, in an analysis of himself, with which his preparation for his future activity begins. For practical reasons this analysis can only be short and incomplete. It has accomplished its purpose if it gives the learner a firm conviction of the existence of the unconscious, if it enables him, when repressed material emerges, to perceive in himself things which would otherwise be incredible to him, and if it shows him a first sample of the technique which has proved to be the only effective one in analytic work. “ (Freud 1937: 248)

This concise expression of content and process of analytic education might have stood for a complete curriculum, had Freud’s earliest protoges felt this was sufficient. The evidence suggests that their own analytic experiences were less than ideal, creating a sense that other educational buttressing was required. Deutsch, for example, was in the midst of her education-by-analysis when Freud terminated her treatment abruptly after one year in order to give her time to another patient. (Deutsch, 1973:133.) Margaret Mahler, as Deutsch’s analysand, experienced cancellations, interruptions, and arbitrary dismissal as “unanalyzable”. At the end of her life she speculated that the cause of this impasse was the fact that Deutsch had been coerced into treating Mahler gratis, much
against her personal inclinations. (Mahler 1988:60-64) Mahler's second
“analyst/teacher” August Aichorn became her lover, so a third analyst was recruited
(Ibid: 68). Martin Grotjahn, an analysand of Simmel during the ascent of Nazi power,
was required to save his analyst’s life. (Grotjahn 1987:34,35) These analysts recorded
their analytic experiences late in life, at the end of successful careers which were built on
extremely shaky foundations. It is illuminating that they chose to withhold this
information until their careers were over, possibly because they recognized how
compromised their own analyses had been. Their comments are not dissimilar in tone to
the comments heard from the analysts interviewed for this thesis.

Freud himself was a charismatic teacher, (Roazen 1971: 7) which undoubtedly
promoted the dissemination of his ideas, and made the question of transfer of knowledge
less urgent in his own mind. Furthermore, he inspired passionate loyalties, as must be
expected in followers who are at once analysands subject to idealizing transference, eager
and admiring students and respected colleagues entrusted with the task of furthering
psychoanalysis. The complications of learning from and being analyzed by the same
individual began with Freud, and were significant. As one analysand described it:

“My immediate reaction was to accept Freud’s interpretation. It was not until
many years later that I understood the basic error committed here by Freud.
The man who invented the concept of transference did not recognize it when it
occurred here. He overlooked one thing. Yes, I was afraid of my father in childhood, but
the one who I feared now was Freud himself. He could make me or break me, which
my father no longer could. (Kardiner 1977: 58 analysis original, bolding mine).

The highly evocative phrase: “he could make me or break me,” is at once a
reference to the psychic situation being analyzed and the training process underway. It is
a sentiment expressed by a number of analysts interviewed for this thesis as well as other
analytic writers. (Mahler, 1988:64). As Kardiner continued:
"I made a silent pact with Freud. "I will continue to be compliant provided that you will let me enjoy your protection." If he rejected me, I would lose my chance to enter this magical professional circle. This tacit acceptance on my part sealed off an important part of my character from scrutiny." (Ibid 1977:59.)

Analytic educators owe much to Kardiner for his candour. It should also be noted, however, that this statement was not published until 1976, some 55 years after the termination of his analysis. Reassessment of analytic training may be indefinitely delayed, depending on the nature of the analytic experience, if Kardiner's case is a model.

Eventually, the psychoanalysis undertaken by a candidate was conducted by a different analyst than the one who supervised the control case, a practice continued today. This protected the analysand from having to learn everything through the distorted lens of a transference neurosis. Even so, the process of identification with one of the figures in the analytic training program could be overwhelming in its intensity, particularly when the teacher enjoyed playing the role. One such "showman" was Karl Menninger, who created a community of followers around himself in Topeka Kansas. While Freud drew his circle of students around him at his home on Wednesday evenings, Menninger held a colloquium on Saturday mornings. Using this forum to display his brilliance and foster admiration, Menninger made a lasting impression on many aspiring psychoanalysts. One student recalled the overwhelming impact Menninger had on the formation of his analytic identity:

"...(He) knew he was a public figure...a creature of life... a psychiatric Muhammad Ali, with none of the signs of thin-blooded obsessionality. His flamboyance woke us up and made us think...He was a dramatic and influential teacher and he did it thoroughly and well...As I watched Dr. Karl's performances, I realized that his theatricality wasn't a quirk, ridiculous or fun. He was an icon, madly doing his duty and performing his role. The power of roles became clearer as I watched him. I also saw how I enacted the complementary role of student...It was once in a lifetime...Karl
Menninger was my one and only chance to be stamped into a psychiatrist, the role I'd always been moving toward.

...I had modeled myself on plenty of others before Dr. Karl...I was an angry, perfectionistic idealist, and so was Dr. Karl, and I imbibed, feasted and sated myself on him...I suppose his image sat on his shoulders of other, earlier models I had tried out, but the more unsettling truth is that he displaced all of them. I had the stench of idealism in my nostrils before I met him, but he gave me a language and a cause. No psychiatric name-calling, never abandon hope—for anyone—and offer help to all who ask, no matter how stupid or hopeless they appear to be—appear to be. In other words, be a doctor.

There were plenty of other teachers, uncles and family doctors who I had used as models... The one who sticks to my ribs, who I love—even though I didn’t know I loved him when I was his student—is Karl Menninger. It’s about figuring out how to turn myself into a psychiatrist—a real psychiatrist, and not succumb to the easier path of being one of the phonies—and watching it take ever deeper possession of me.” (Warme, 1998, unpublished manuscript.)

In the example above, Warme is describing his identification with his teacher, as distinct from his analyst or his supervisor. These two additional figures may also become sources of intense identification for a candidate, depending on a variety of factors. These identifications are essential vicissitudes of psychoanalytic learning, which intensify and fortify the learning process but also require clear understanding so that the student becomes aware of what he or she has mastered cognitively and what is merely an enactment of a psychological phenomenon. The concurrent experience of being in psychoanalysis while engaging in classroom and supervisory efforts is intended, in part, to help the learner achieve this understanding. (Fleming 1966: 29. 1987:149)

Nevertheless, idealization and unresolved identification remains a pitfall in every aspect of psychoanalytic training, and remains a challenge throughout the analytic educator’s career as well. Beginning with the adoration of Freud by his followers, (Fleming 1987:149), it has been a pronounced pattern in psychoanalytic education. Institutes which are geographically isolated in small communities, or are somehow sheltered from outside influences in a self-contained enclave, are all the more vulnerable
to becoming "inbred, provincial, tribally oriented, and ruled by a more or less closed system." (Fleming 1987:149) because such identification patterns become entrenched, and the loyalty to teachers and their points of view go unchallenged.

Freud's earliest disciples consulted Freud and each other on their cases, but they recognized the fact that Freud would not be available to subsequent generations of students. It was this first generation who devised and supported the addition of "control" analyses conducted by students under the supervision of experienced analysts, a requirement that has remained standard to the present. (Roazen 1971: 168, 323) As enduring as this requirement has been, early analytic educators, with time, recognized problems with this approach.

"I regret the great dependence of future analysts on control analyses, for I find that the best way to learn is through independent experience. The control analyst should exercise his advisory role only in difficult situations. This overdependence on controls makes psychoanalysis into something it is not and should not be; a method that can be learned like any other scientific discipline. When I was a training analyst I regarded the controls largely as a protection for the patients—beyond this, I think that in every learning process one gains most from the mistakes one makes... analysis in general now includes too much organization and obligatory teaching and learning. More and more, I feel like someone who has been working in an artist's studio and suddenly finds himself in a factory." (Deutsch 1973: 208)

The supervisory part of the analytic training process has undoubtedly received the most pedagogical scrutiny and been the subject of the greatest number of written studies. Pedagogical reasons aside, it is the most easily described part of the process, involving as it does, only one candidate and one supervisor as well as the patient under consideration, and continuing over a period of 80 hours. Classroom dynamics involve many participants and in most Institutes, involve a roster of teachers who teach relatively short segments. The personal analysis (also referred to as the training analysis) is protected by
confidentiality. As a result, supervision is often studied in isolation from the other two components of the program. An integrated study would be highly illuminating.

Supervision is based on the master-apprentice model of education, in which the junior neophyte learns by imitating and the senior partner teaches by displaying a skill. At its best, it provides the candidate with a mentor who can observe, provide feedback, enhance skills and clarify practice with theoretical explanation. At its worst, the candidate feels intimidated, coerced and confused rather than enlightened and empowered. (Dewald 1987:2-17)

Because supervision takes place after a personal analysis is well-established, the candidate has the opportunity to compare his or her experience of analysis to the experience of practice, and augment it with illustrative analytic theory. Thus, supervision combines experiential and cognitive learning, helping to entrench it more firmly in the candidate's understanding. "To know what one knows and how one knows it becomes part of the process of learning and to be able to express this level of insight in words becomes a significant (albeit often ideal) part of the interaction between teacher and student." (Fleming 1966: 27). The candidate not only grasps a concept, he or she develops a sense of owning his or her own knowledge.

A number of analysts have described the supervisory process in their memoirs. Margaret Mahler could trace her interest in infant development back to a talk given by her supervisor, Grete Bibring:

"...she related a strange phenomenon she had observed in herself: she related that when her children were babies, she had perceived and responded to their needs for her, even when they were sleeping in other rooms...This insight would guide me in my own psychoanalytic theory of development, informing my understanding of the early condition of symbiosis between mother and infant..." (Mahler, 1988:73)
More recently, one analytic candidate described his supervision as the saving grace of his training:

Behind every therapist is an influential teacher. Dan Giminoni was mine. By taking me seriously he helped me to take myself seriously, to set boundaries, to learn how to feel responsible, and to accept feeling responsible for engaging another person's psyche...it was only in retrospect that I was able to understand some of the actual ways in which he achieved this. 1. Being specific. Dan Giminoni would always teach by example...2. Gentle Confrontation...after I had finished a case presentation and could sense something awry, [I greatly appreciated] Dan Giminoni's almost caressing, "Jerry, do you have any second thoughts about what you've just told me?" 3. Teaching Symbolic Thinking...I was accustomed to thinking in terms of expressive, communicative symbols...It was quite another matter to try and transform the raw data from the therapeutic frame into meaningful psychoanalytic symbols...and I especially treasured it whenever Dan would succeed in heightening my symbolic awareness. 4. Unshockability...I could count on Dan being unruffled when I was most distressed. He not only expected but welcomed mistakes, providing he did not think they were hurtful to the patient...His optimism, grounded in realism and a wealth of indispensable clinical experience, was almost always genuinely encouraging." (Alper 1996: 84-86)

As important as supervision is in analytic training, formal preparation to become a supervisor has never become a standard requirement. The attitude entrenched in psychoanalytic education that to become an analyst one must be analyzed extends to supervision: to become a supervisor, one must be supervised. Analytic educators also recognize the fact that the supervisory process is too variable and idiosyncratic to lend itself to an easily defined training system.

"Like analysis itself, the supervisory experience here is never completely the same in two different situations. The multiplicity of factors existing in the candidate, the supervisor, the patient being analyzed and the institute itself all contribute to the fact that each supervisory experience ends up as unique and nonreproducible." (DeWald 1987: 3)

Yet, as Alper's description above shows, certain outcomes of successful supervision can be described even if the process is difficult to capture in words. Furthermore, supervision can be examined as a teaching and learning process, equal to, but separate from the supra-analytic consideration of countertransference as an obstacle
and an aid to therapeutic efficacy. (Jacobs, David and Meyer 1995: 6). Investigating how learning takes place within supervision is as important as what the content of that learning is.

The essence of supervisory education is enhancing the candidate’s capacity for empathic and cognitive knowing plus achieving a fluid movement between the experiential and the intellectual (Fleming 1966, 1987). Such a complex educational goal cannot be comprehensively described here, but the basic format may. The candidate meets with a training analyst and reports the events that have taken place in the sessions during the preceding interval. The supervisor comments on the student’s report. This simple process can be performed in an infinite variety of ways. The supervisor may chose to make theoretical explanations that pertain to the case, give very narrow and specific therapeutic advice, ask for explanations of the candidate’s interventions, focus on missed opportunities for interpretation and underlying countertransference conflicts or simply chat about the patient and what the candidate finds perplexing. The student may offer detailed moment-by-moment accounts from recorded notes or speak from memory. The focus can also move from general principles of this case to other case material from the analyst’s clinical experience or the candidate’s other work.

Supervision has been described as a process that takes place in three phases. (Fleming, 1966, Jacobs and others, 1995, Dewald 1987). In the beginning phase, the supervisor and supervisee establish a learning alliance through the process of becoming acquainted. The nature of this alliance is determined by such factors as the supervisor’s didactic style and the supervisee’s learning needs. The early presentation of material and
the manner in which it is received determine much of the course of the supervision to follow. The duration of this phase depends, in part, on the progress of the case at hand.

In the middle phase, once a productive partnership has been established and the candidate has developed some confidence, the focus of the supervision is broadened to include more sensitive and threatening considerations such as countertransference "blind spots". At the same time, the theory behind some of the practices and techniques employed is introduced as it pertains to the case. This phase is less synchronized with the minutia of the patient's sessions, and becomes more issue oriented. It is made possible by the grounding provided by the opening phase in which attention has been paid to the minute session-by-session interaction of patient and candidate.

The final phase of supervision is the period before the agreed-upon termination date of the collaboration. It can be parallel to the termination of the supervisee's case, but it may not coincide. It can be established as a matter of Institute policy—a standard length of supervision is often 80 hours, for example, or in some Institutes, supervisions last one year. Under other circumstances, a supervision may be open-ended and terminated by mutual consent. Thus it is more difficult to describe in general terms. It is intended to be a period of consolidation and leave-taking in which the candidate consciously acknowledges what has been learned and recognizes that he or she will be proceeding independently. During this phase the supervisor takes a less active role in instructing the candidate, allowing him or her to develop an identity as an independent practitioner.

It is interesting to note that the supervisory trajectory described by educators is not described in the analytic memoirs reviewed for this study, or by any of the research
subjects. Yet in the assessment of some analysts, supervision was their most significant educational experience, exceeding personal analysis in importance. This reflects the rich learning opportunity supervision can be when all the variables are favourable: a productive partnership combined with a conducive case conducted in the larger context of a supportive analytic Institute and learning environment.

But this is far from guaranteed. The success of supervision depends on the supervisor’s ability to productively observe and discuss the candidate’s emotional contribution to the therapeutic process. Psychoanalytic efficacy requires the analyst to receive and assess his or her own emotional response to the patient’s material throughout their interaction, and to scrutinize those responses as a way of formulating useful interventions. Part of learning to do this involves recognizing where the analyst’s affective response is coloured by his or her own psychic “blind spots” due to personal history. Thus the focus on the patient’s psyche in supervision can often become a focus on the supervisee’s psyche. While supervision is being conducted, the candidate is also engaged in intensive personal probing with his or her own analyst. Therefore, the supervisor who intrudes on sensitive psychic material which is already under scrutiny in the name of clarifying countertransference problems, can have a very intense impact on the supervisee. Yet staying clear of such psychic patterns deprives the candidate of important understanding. Attaining the perfect balance is the supervisory challenge, which has been noted above, is not something for which supervisors are formally trained.

Analytic educators continue to grapple with how that balance is attained.

(Fleming 1987, Jacobs and others 1995, Langs 1995) The relevant point for this study is
that the lack of clear direction in this complicated area has resulted in very mixed results, which are reported by the research subjects in this thesis.

To the requirement of a personal analysis and supervision of control cases, a third component was added over time. This didactic component, consisting of seminar-style classes on analytic papers developed into a formal experience but grew out of an extremely informal one. Freud held weekly gatherings in his home at which his followers presented papers, listened to his response, and discussed emergent issues. (Deutsch 1973:155) These were highly social but serious events at which Freud expected presenters to deliver remarks without reading from a prepared text. The same lively but informal attitude prevailed when the satellite analytic community in Berlin began to thrive (Grotjahn 1987). Psychoanalysis was something of a passion for its earliest adherents, and the intense exchange of ideas amongst them required and promoted a social context which was as critical to their learning as it was sustaining to their spirits.

For many analytic candidates, the group learning experience of the didactic component of psychoanalytic training is the closest thing to the Berlin coffeehouses, the Topeka colloquia or the Wednesday night gatherings in Vienna. It is the germ of an analytic community which can sustain and enrich learning as analysts continue in their careers.

Today's analytic candidate is required to attend four years of weekly classes in order to become conversant in analytic literature and concepts. It is seen primarily as an academic exercise, rather than a social one, almost the reverse of original analytic gatherings. Where a social context does arise for a candidate, it is more a matter of the
circumstances of the Institute than a policy of it. In large centres, with dispersed candidates, it is difficult for a sense of community to develop. In more isolated centres, there is still some community feeling. The analysts interviewed for this thesis who experienced a community environment during their training mentioned its importance, and those who did not commented on its absence.

Management of this group process is not a subject that has received a lot of attention in analytic literature, even though the didactic component is an extremely time-consuming portion of a candidate’s program. Yet class groups that develop conflict or factions are a well known phenomenon. (Levene 1996:331). The psychoanalytic class is composed of a group of individuals, each of whom is currently in analysis with one of the training analysts from the Institute in which he or she is a candidate. Powerful extra-classroom alliances colour events that take place within it. The training analysts are often former analysands of other analysts who are now their colleagues, and also have their own countertransfere ntial feelings about the students in the classroom. The potential for bitter rivalry, hostile interaction and dysfunctional group dynamics is extremely high, if not unavoidable. The community of learners that composes the psychoanalytic classroom is different in kind from many other adult learning groups.

In addition to these factors, the analytic class is subject to societal changes in the context of learning. While Freud’s gatherings may be recalled as convivial and informal, they were also subject to the social practices of the day. Deference to the group leader, a recognition of hierarchical importance and the understanding that the master of the subject matter was also master of the group were implicit attitudes absorbed from the 19th Century Gymnasium and University. The underlying metaphor of learning is one of
transfer, (in the non-analytical sense) or transmission. Certain knowledge is passed from teacher to learner.

When psychoanalysis crossed the Atlantic during the years of the Second World War, it was an adjustment for European emigre teachers to be regarded more as an equal than a superior. In Topeka Kansas, for example, psychologist David Rapaport, transplanted from Budapest, insisted that colleagues address him and each other by professional title and surname. His associates now recall that he was regarded as an absolute authority to whom students and colleagues acquiesced. (Friedman 1990:233). Rapaport demanded that all participants behave in a way that he considered proper without reference to their social patterns. It is a demand that no educator could make today.

While such control as Rapaport could command does not eliminate the rivalries and feelings affecting group interaction, it does contain them during classroom time. With the gradual change in the dominant metaphors of education, from one of transmission of information to the process of dialogue or conversation, (Tiberius and Billson, 1991:148), the equal participation of learners and teachers as informed parties in the learning process has become the common model. With such a shift, the management of social interaction becomes all the more crucial. Psychoanalytic candidates have already participated in the learning culture many times over before they arrive at their Institute, and are conditioned to learn in certain ways. The egalitarian seminar is a standard part of their experience.

But the responsibility for the positive social context in which the learning takes place remains primarily, but not solely, with the teacher.
“Several key features of a social context that fosters student learning and growth emerge from our review of the literature: mutual respect, a shared responsibility for learning and mutual commitment to goals, effective communication and feedback, cooperation and a willingness to negotiate conflicts, and a sense of security in the classroom”. (Ibid 1991: 67)

To generate a positive group learning experience, all parties to the process must be involved and responsible for the outcome of their interaction. The teacher is not only the manager of curriculum and information, but the central facilitator and coordinator of group interaction. To maintain group progress through the tasks at hand at the same time as enabling the group to interact constructively requires a dual focus and a broad set of group management skills. These include the ability to initiate group action, monitor its progress, modify its behaviour, enhance or enrich its development and repair its process should the need arise. While the teacher does not control the group, he or she acts as the hub to which all spokes connect, and allows the forward motion of the classroom/wheel to take place. Far more is required of the teacher than superior textual or analytical knowledge.

At the same time, the candidates must also be more initiating, proactive and responsible for their participation in the group. This seemingly complex scenario is achieved through simple approaches such as learning students' names, inviting responses about content and process, offering periodic feedback on group progress and performance and facilitating cross-classroom interaction.

Thus, the task in the analytic classroom is two-fold: to manage the ideological and dynamic undercurrents as well as the manifest social context. The fact that most teachers in analytic institutes are primarily practicing psychoanalysts who work in
intimate dyads (although a minority of academics with classroom experience also teach) indicates what a challenge such adept management is for them.

The classroom is the most public forum in which analytic education takes place, one to which candidates come as adult learners engaged in an intellectual activity. Yet the didactic classes are taught by the same training analysts and supervisors with whom these candidates have regressed to extremely private infantile states. Being aware of an infantile pull in an adult context is a useful but agitating experience for the candidate. It can be intensely complicated if the Institute treats their adult learners like children/students. Allowing adults to design and manage their own learning program, within the broad goals of a given program, acknowledges the mature status of the learner. (Thomas 1991) For the analytic candidate who is confronting his warded-off immaturity in another forum, rigid and arbitrary rules imposed by the Institute, the training analyst or the supervisor have particularly acute consequences. Research subjects interviewed for this study still rankled at being forced to time their vacations to their analyst’s vacation, or to pay for and attend supervisory sessions even after they had lost their supervisory patient.

The nature of the classroom experience is conditioned by the prevailing educational metaphors of the day. As discussed above, the transmission model supported a formal and hierarchical classroom, and the dialogue metaphor changes the experience to a shared exploration. Analytic educators also rely on metaphors to approach their subject: training is a process that includes filling a mug from a jug; passing a baton in a relay race and building a bridge. (Fleming 1987: 143-65). Similarly, many of the analysts who wrote their memoirs chose their own educational metaphor. Grotjahn’s
experience was “more like plowing a field. The harvest came much later.” (Grotjahn 1987:143). Margaret Mahler describes feeling like an unwanted guest at a party throughout her entire training experience. (Mahler 1988: 80). Other ‘s have used the concept of a journey, (Gargiulo 1998:413) and rehearsing a play (Alper 1996: 80). This proliferation of metaphors shows how complex analytic education is, and how penetrating an experience this learning process is for each analyst.

One of the central concepts of psychoanalysis is that experience takes place on a manifest and a latent level, and that reality is a complex blend of what we perceive externally and register internally. Our dual reality is examined and probed in the course of psychoanalysis. Gaining an awareness of our complex nature in treatment allows us to continue living with an enhanced level of perception outside of treatment.

Psychoanalytic education takes place with this awareness in mind, and thus is never simply the acquisition of craft, study of theory or supervision of a case. All parties to the analytic enterprise agree that many things are taking place simultaneously, and all impressions are meaningful. As a result, a dual curriculum is always operating, and the potential for paralyzing complexity is a constant threat. The goal of psychoanalysis, in part, is to achieve awareness of these two realities and once they are acknowledged, to be able to distinguish cognitive from affective realities with great clarity. Analytic education, therefore, must also enable its practitioners to achieve this clarity by experiencing chaos and re-establishing order through the application of cognitive and affective skills.

Finding ways to separate these learning tasks while still cultivating both these skill areas is the chief challenge of psychoanalytic education. This brief overview is
intended to indicate how the dual agendas of analytic education necessarily complicate the process and make the likelihood of a completely successful educational experience unlikely. Yet candidates who have undergone the experience must continue in practice without being overwhelmed by perceived deficiencies. Reassessing the learning process could well be a threatening experience.
The Research Question

Discussions with practicing analysts revealed an overt dissatisfaction with their training experience and an apparent satisfaction with practice. This disparity raised many questions concerning the nature of the training experience and the nature of its assessment by practitioners in the field. To explain this apparent contradiction between negative learning and positive practice, I postulated the possibility that the view of the training changed while in the field as a result of a variety of experiences. The narrow concern is: do practitioners reassess their education in the course of practice?

Rationale for Studying this Question

Describing the process by which analysts revisit their education and incorporate it into their view of their analytic identity will provide important information on the formative impact of the analytic training process as well as its afterlife. It will also give some sense of whether evaluations completed during and immediately after training are meaningful and accurate representations of how analysts have experienced the training.

Information on how analysts view their education will increase our knowledge of how psychoanalysis can best be taught. What worked well can be retained, what caused problems can be corrected. It may also indicate important directions to take in the area of continuing education. Looking at analysts in mid-career will also give an impression of the "shelf life" of the training, and its applicability in ongoing practice. If a specific pattern of reassessment emerges, such as a universal sense of doubt concerning the
significance of neuropsychology and brain chemistry, this would also have relevance to curriculum design. Psychoanalytic training has three parts; if one part is consistently reported as weak, more attention could be directed to that part.

Methodology: Sample Selection

The research for this study was conducted using qualitative methodology. The interviews were semi-structured, and the research subjects were recruited with the goal of achieving a meaningful diversity of practitioners from a variety of training backgrounds. Psychiatrists, psychologists and lay analysts of both genders and of a variety of ages were interviewed. Each subject trained in a different year. The subjects trained in three different programs.

The eligibility criterion required that participants be in practice ten years or more. This was established in order to investigate the retrospective aspect of the question. There is little doubt that recent graduates from training programs would have an opinion on the quality of their training. The question at hand was whether this assessment changed very much with time, or was even consciously revisited by practitioners. The ten year requirement ensured that the practitioners would have had enough post-training experience to encounter one or two professional vicissitudes that might demand new learning or stimulate re-assessment.

In the course of seeking and interviewing the subjects, the obstacles to meeting this criterion in Toronto became evident. There were very few women psychoanalysts practicing in Toronto over ten years ago, few of whom were laymen or psychologists. Thus, it was difficult to find a subject who was a non-M.D. woman who had graduated
from a different class from which another research subject had been drawn. Without funding for travel to interview analysts in other cities and countries, it was necessary to draw all subjects from Toronto. Well over 80 per cent of the analysts practicing in Toronto for over ten years trained in Toronto at one institute. Although a second institute has been founded, its first graduates have practiced less than ten years. In addition, few analysts have relocated to Toronto after training or working in other centres, in the last 30 years. Thus, there was a gap between a small group of male psychiatrists who had to train outside Toronto before the Toronto Institute of Psychoanalysis was established in the mid-Sixties, and the few practitioners who arrived here after leaving Montreal in the anglophone exodus that began in the late Seventies. In fact, the subjects I interviewed were not members of that exodus. While the desired diversity was achieved without travelling, the choice of subjects was quite limited.

Another ramification of the nature of the Toronto analytic community is that in order to guarantee confidentiality, it is not enough to simply use pseudonyms. Identifying a research subject by age, background discipline or time of training can be enough, in some cases, to reveal his or her identity. Some research participants were not concerned about this, but others were quite concerned. In order to provide the anonymity these individuals requested, identifying details such as age or specific details of which Institute was attended, or where training prior to the analytic training had been completed, have been removed or obscured. I have retained gender, so that the awkward use of he/she may be avoided. When these details are concealed, the participants in the study can be described as three psychiatrists, one psychologist, and two lay analysts.
Four men and two women were interviewed. Their ages ranged from mid-sixties to mid-forties.

**Methodology: Interview Style**

I chose to conduct semi-structured interviews for several reasons. To determine whether reassessment had taken place prior to the interview, as opposed to during the interview itself, required indirect questioning. Just as the clinician does not ask, "has your view of your mother changed since you were a child?" but instead says, "tell me about your mother", it was more effective to ask candidates to describe their education in order to listen for reassessments, changes of heart, and second thoughts. In the course of this indirect process, a great deal of additional—an illuminating—data was gathered.

A second reason for semi-structured interviewing is that this approach was most compatible with the discourse style of the research subjects. The fundamental rule of free association conditions analysts to follow the flow of a patient's discourse, and to be introspective in the same unstructured way. It is more a matter of rapidly shifting structure, adjusting to the emotional force of the moment. Analysts know that this can yield rich but unexpected results, and I wanted to harvest some of this fertile material. At the same time, tolerance for free association makes it difficult to keep analysts on task. Setting a structured, standardized set of questions would have been counter-productive.

The research subjects were interviewed for one hour, at the time and place of their choice.

**Methodology: Coding and Interpreting**

The interview was taped, transcribed, and coded according to system of data analysis described by Ruin and Rubin in Qualitative Interviewing. (1995). The purpose of this
coding process is to track recurring themes and meta-themes which may emerge from the datum. While examining the interview I looked for and identified explanatory concepts concerning the subjects' learning experience, and included them within brackets, in italicized fonts, in the body of the transcripted interviews. When the process was completed, I reviewed the number of subject codes I had identified and the frequency with which they occurred. This gave me a quantitative measure of which concerns arose most frequently in discussions concerning analytic training.

The slow retrospective coding of texts is almost the complete opposite of the process of "evenly suspended attention" (Freud, 1912:111). To appreciate the material from the vantage point of the informants, it was also necessary to listen to it in a more psychoanalytic spirit, and to let myself free associate to their comments individually and cumulatively. This process took place at different times than when I was coding what I came to think of as "the text". During the actual interviews I listened as receptively as possible to the subject without directing his or her attention to any particular point. A second unexpected opportunity for creative listening came from typing my own transcriptions. Listening, pausing to keystroke, replaying the tape and double-checking accuracy are excellent enhancements of memory, and the digital-aural pathway employed seems to bring the research subject's voice inside one's head in a more vivid way. Another technique I found very useful was listening to the tapes while driving. Although these are not recognized as legitimate research techniques, I mention them as accidental enhancements to the required process. Coded fragments from the interviews are included in Appendix B, along with a list of the generated codes.
Definition of Terms

The study was entitled "retrospective assessment" to distinguish this process from ongoing in-progress evaluation. Any student undergoing a demanding training program will be engaged in a simultaneous process of evaluation, whether it is intense and conscious or muted and less overt. What interested me was how the interaction of experience and training would challenge or reinforce a person's opinion of training. This can only be considered in retrospect.

The term assessment was not meant to refer to a formal, quantitative measure of a concrete sort, but simply a practitioner's general sense of the strengths or weaknesses of training. Nor was there a fixed reassessment point chosen to see if reassessment had taken place. The working assumption was that practice presents challenges which require practitioners to draw on their basic training in ways which would stimulate a process of re-evaluation as a byproduct of this experience. The resulting assessment might be positive, negative or a blend.

Such an internalized and private measurement might be something which the subject would find difficult to describe. It could take the form of a fond memory, or a bitter one, a persistent regret, a particular intransigent difficulty in practice, a conscious return to certain reading sources, a recognition of gaps in competency, or a powerful redefinition of basic beliefs about psychoanalysis. A return for further personal analysis, or enrolment in formal continuing education programs are other examples of reassessment indicated by subsequent action. It could be the result of a professional challenge, a change in life circumstances, or a radical and unexpected development in the field. The assessment might occur at any time after graduation—in the immediate,
intermediate or distant future. Any scenario was possible. For this reason, the data has been looked at with a view to identifying the broadest possible kinds of assessment statements, from conscious ideological shifts—such as from classical to self-psychology—to an effort to understand an old experience in the light of subsequent information.

Results

A brief educational profile of each subject follows in order to provide the educational context in which the individual operated. The strengths and weaknesses of each subject’s education provided the material to be reassessed in reaction to the professional vicissitudes encountered in the field. Each subject made it clear, in his or her own way, what was the high point of their learning, and what they considered most problematic.

Subject #1

This lay analyst has given a great deal of thought to his training, and developed a detailed assessment of its weakness and deficiencies. He began to feel his training, including his personal analysis were insufficient and limited almost immediately upon entering the field. He describes the school of psychoanalysis in which he was trained as classical Freudian, and identifies its limitations as overlooking and failing to understand the pre-oedipal period. The ramifications for his practice were that he felt he could not treat patients with problems originating in the pre-oedipal period of development, nor could he understand these deeper issues in himself. Technically this led to problems in understanding patients who communicated through emotional projection rather than free
association, and created impasses which were frustrating and threatening to his sense of competence. The absence of pre-oedipal analysis in his own treatment resulted in countertransference problems with patients with their own preoedipal conflicts, according to his understanding. His view of his training has remained essentially the same but has become more nuanced with time. He now believes that the essence of psychoanalytic training is “teaching about the countertransference” and teaching candidates “how to track the unconscious... you have to learn how to listen to the patient’s unconscious and then the unconscious will supervise the analysis.” He rates his training as between fair and poor.

_Statements of Reassessment_

“I was drawing on an oedipal analysis, an a depressive-position analysis, working in a Freudian way with non-Freudian patients and it wasn’t working; it got me reading. (It cast doubt back on my own analysis as did) my reading; it made me realize that my first two analysis did not really touch the deeper issues.”

All (my supervisors) were extremely deficient. I didn’t know it at the time. I had no basis for knowing.

The first supervision was a liability, but the man turned out to be a pervert... I don’t think you can set it aside; it was a liability, it distorted my instincts; my instincts were healthy, the supervision was destructive.
I think I probably learned more from (my classmates) and got more supervision from them than from any of my supervisors.

Comparing the lack of clinical sophistication of analysts in Toronto to New York or Philadelphia is shocking savvy; That’s not good... I was in no position to know this when I was a raw beginner. I was looking up at them, I was idealizing them.

All in all I was seeing (my first supervisor) for the better part of three years, not knowing anything about what was subsequently to emerge.

I felt almost from the start that I was practicing handicapped....It was a deepening, deepening awareness and frustration... I didn’t understand my patients...I couldn’t help them... the Freudian ego psychology training just wasn’t useful for that...I just shifted to the Kleinian model.

I’ve gone through so much growth and self-education since the training—I would not have been able to carry on the post-training growth process if I had not had the foundation; it acquainted me with the basics. It did not teach me how to be an analyst, but it gave me the tools with which to struggle in the decade after training to become an analyst.

I have to share some of the responsibility for my countertransference problem, I could have gone back into analysis, but I didn’t. A few years later I did deal with the counter
transference by going back into analysis... I chose a non-training analyst to go to after I
was an analyst.

Subject #2

This practitioner completed his psychiatric training at a strongly analytic centre
in the United States. It was there that he first read Freud "with all the eureka responses
you get if you are a born analyst." His analytic training was undertaken after many
years of practice in Toronto and was more of a formality than a new direction in learning.
He found the experience vastly inferior to his earlier training, and endured it as a
necessary piece of credential qualification. Although he acknowledges that his personal
analysis did provide some benefit, he found the classroom component uninformative and
the supervision of almost no value. This view has not changed and has not been subject
to much reassessment. He has given a lot of thought to his psychiatric training, however,
and has also given a lot of thought to the practice of psychoanalysis. He describes
psychoanalysis as "a process by which the patient does all the work and the analyst gets
all the credit." This reveals the emphasis he puts on listening and silence, as well as his
sense of humour. He considers psychoanalytic practice to be a lifelong learning
project, but relies on himself and the occasional peer to further his understanding, without
returning to anything gleaned from his formal psychoanalytic training. His view is that
no amount of reading or discussion can crystallize into knowledge until it is put into
practice. "I read, but I don't believe a damn thing until it comes up in my practice. " His
attitude to his analytic training might best be described as indifferent.
"The only thing I hadn't been prepared for is the difficulty of treatment. We were told, for example, that hysteria is relatively easy to treat. I find it very difficult to treat."

Subject #3

This practitioner took a pragmatic and neutral approach to his training, which he saw as a necessary experience but not an indispensable one. He was interested in analytic concepts and had a natural affinity for the work prior to beginning the program, and as such, did not find a significant change in his competency from start to finish of the program. Recognizing that analytic training must be integrated into a busy adult life, he accepted that he was engaged in an exercise in compromise and adjusted his expectations. "Some of these decisions were practicalities—here I was at the same time with a young family, having to maintain my income and my sanity. There were compromises in a sense... C'est la vie, right?" His personal learning style was to make his program as diverse as he could by seeking out supervisors with different approaches from each other and from his own analyst. "I'm always interested in gaining multiple perspectives in any field... somewhere hopefully there's an essential thread that runs through it all about the unconscious in many many ways, analysis just being one of them." He enjoyed the multiple perspectives approach but felt that one hour of supervision a week was of questionable educational value. He feels he got the most out of it that he could, but that he would not do it again knowing what he knows now. He understood the experience as something that was significantly influenced by outside social forces, and sees
psychoanalysis itself as a process that is also influenced by outside social pressures. His own training took place at a time when the Government of Ontario made charging patients any fee above the OHIP rate illegal, which threw the profession into a crisis, and made M.D. psychoanalysts very uncertain as to the future of psychoanalysis. This social event permeated every aspect of the learning experience, because it entered into the billing arrangements between the training analysts and their candidates and between the m.d. psychiatrist candidates and their patients, and reverberated in many different directions. Despite its disruptive impact, he also recognized it as a dramatic learning opportunity. "There was some very good discussion about the impact on the analytic experience of non-payment and the regressive aspects of it," he commented. He finds many aspects of psychoanalysis fascinating, and is very engaged by the issues in the field, from the issue of medication to the dramatic increase in reports of incest and sexual abuse to the question of frequency of sessions. The single greatest educational benefit of his training was developing what he referred to as a "core analytic identity", which he did not attribute to any particular component of the program, but a general outcome. His most positive learning experiences have been his own reading and the peer supervision group he established after entering practice. The weakest aspect of his program was the lack of acknowledgement of the emotional burden of training. "Is the intimate, personal experience of the candidate really adequately included—you can imagine from what I've said how difficult it would be for candidates to feel completely safe and trusting in this highly charged, political environment." His attitude could best be described as realistic and resigned.
**Statements of Reassessment**

"I think the development of my training as an analyst, my identity as an analyst has included recognizing that it’s a creative act, and that it draws on my own particular idiosyncratic self…"

"I continue to meet with a group of colleagues on a monthly basis to talk about cases. That’s been more useful than a stack of supervisions…It evolved out of need—an emotional need as much as anything…it was fairly early on after graduation, because we’ve been doing it for a good long time with very little disruption…It’s a mix of doing some reading and before long we talk about cases…"

(I copied my analyst’s) manner of using the patient’s material and then interpreting it …pretty closely. I’ve certainly gone on to do things quite differently.

"I’ve learned more about it (sexual abuse, incest) by having to deal with it and having to make my own observations about it which has worked for me"

There’s a lot of lingering questions about the cost of it for me and where I got to intellectually and I think one could get to the same place intellectually without that cost for sure and I wouldn’t repeat it knowing what I know now…"
This participant had an extremely positive and formative experience during her psychiatric training which took place in an analytically-oriented environment in a small teaching hospital. The enthusiasm with which she spoke of her most impressive teachers spoke volumes about the importance of observing experienced practitioners in action. "These men were kind, compassionate, thoughtful and charismatic men who never rammed their theories down your throat. It was about how to understand people... He would get up and just get a patient from the ward and in front of everybody and just interview them—an interview that was so beautiful, so compassionate and you would see change happen right in front of your eyes... he was also my supervisor... pearls of wisdom dropping out of his mouth."

Supervision was her most powerful learning experience, due to the combination of a particularly exciting case with an especially knowledgeable theorist. It was the ideal moment of readiness for her, her teacher and her patient. "I learned more from studying masochism, that has taken me through so many patients... He would listen (to my process notes) and then he usually said something brilliant, and he usually predicted something that would happen... (He) was fascinating theoretically."

Ironically, subsequent revelations about unethical practices by this supervisor required her to re-examine her experience in some detail. She also reported extremely negative experiences in her personal analysis and her didactic program. The negative analytic experience, which she endured in order to meet her requirements, and the counter-productive group dynamics of her class, were both significant impasses in her education for which she saw no mechanisms for repair. It was clear from discussion
that she had given a lot of thought to what had gone wrong and what her role in the process was. This suggests that her assessment has not changed as much as deepened over time. Her attitude could be described as regretful and indignant.

**Statements of Reassessment**

"I think at the time, (the training analysis) is very influential in shaping how you deal with your control cases... In very subtle ways: the coming and going into and out of an analytic session influenced me. And has changed a great deal since then. I didn’t like the way he did it."

"I did return after my analysis to discuss this with him... I went back and spoke to him face to face... I really let him know how he failed me. I went through it, the things to which he did not respond to about me, I can’t remember what they were now... And he... said that I was right and he was sorry, and if I wanted to come back... I said I didn’t want to come back or continue anywhere else either..."

"He’s got something about red dresses. I’ll tell you why I know. He just presented a case at the institute, a video of a person with a multiple personality disorder. He remarked in the history when she came in wearing a red dress. As if this was some sort of time that for sure she was an hysteric that day. Well, when I was (in analysis with him) my cousin gave me a red dress. I came in one day, in a red dress. And he said, “wow, a red dress” And I thought, “hmm, this is a criticism.” That felt to me like “what
am I being so flamboyant and hysterical for, when to me it was just a maternity dress that was red. I was really annoyed with him, and he wouldn’t back down. “

(My supervision was) with Dr. Q, and you know what happened with Dr. Q…subsequently I understood why he was passive. Dr. Q. never helped me set the boundaries. Interestingly, he never set them for himself. …And finding out helped me, I thought “ah, that’s why he couldn’t pick that up”.

“There’s gotta be more than that (to supervision). Certainly subsequently from reading literature and going to conferences, I learned that there’s way more to learn. Way more to understand.

Even at the time, I thought, for all the time and all the money, although it’s also about developing an identity. But I’ve often thought that if I had a really good reading list and I picked out a couple of really good supervisors and I had a decent analysis… I happen to know a couple of psychiatrists who have done that who are fabulous and do psychotherapy, if not psychoanalysis as well as or better than many analysts I know.

Subject #5

The enthusiasm with which this subject recounts his education indicates that he found all his training to be an extremely positive and exciting experience. The most useful component of his education was supervision, which he described as a transformative experience. “Lights were going off in the room”, is how he recalls it. Not
only did it show him a great deal about what was to be found in a patient’s material, it also generated new directions in reading and thinking outside the supervisory experience. What obstacles or challenges he has encountered since he attributes to the infinite challenge of practice rather than limitations in his training. He feels equal to the challenges while recognizing that he may be deficient in a specific area, but has no recriminatory feelings towards his supervisors, analyst or teachers. His view of his training has remained constant, and he attributes a large part of its success to the passionate commitment to ideas rather than affiliation with a particular school of psychoanalysis. His attitude could best be described as positive and optimistic.

**Statements of Reassessment**

Another supervisor — he was from Chicago and quoted Bettleheim; Bettleheim used to say — the analyst should be very dumb… that way the patient has to explain himself very clearly — what this supervisor said was: you’re very good at listening to subtle nuances in the material and pulling it together and presenting it to the patient and so forth, but you should allow or force the patient to do more work… I’ve never forgotten it; that along with a second statement he made, which was: be the great helmsman — I think it was a statement from Mao, back in those days — be more directive, less following the material, feel free to be more direct — it was his comical way of putting it; I was kind of left wing in those days and he was probably jibing me or something, but the principal he was espousing has stayed in my mind. “Be the great helmsman” was almost the opposite of what the one supervisor was saying… Although they are diametrically opposed, it’s a useful paradox, in a sense. Sometimes either one of them or both of them
will come to mind at certain times as reminders, as introjects, introjected clinical wisdom; it maybe never gets resolved, but I guess if I have a tendency to go in either direction the other will act as a corrective. "

Subject #6

This candidate commuted between two cities; attending the didactic program and meeting with her supervisors in one, and conducting her analysis and seeing her patients in the other. Although the split city experience was complicated, she found the effort to be extremely rewarding. Her didactic program included four years of reading Freud and essays pertaining to Freud, plus a variety of other seminars. The seminars were open to other individuals besides candidates, and were attended by graduated analysts, training analysts and other mental health practitioners as well as some candidates, creating a diverse and well-versed class. She also studied with a faculty of diverse backgrounds, including those who had trained in Paris, New York, at the Menninger Clinic, in London and elsewhere. Despite being stimulated and well grounded by her training, she found early practice extremely difficult, and made many subsequent adjustments to her approach, in part due to subsequent continuing education. A critical turning point was a year long sabbatical at a major analytic clinic in the United States, where she was exposed to a variety of extremely challenging cases and an accompanying diversity of technical and theoretical approaches. This inspired some important review, reassessment, adjustment and fine-tuning of her approach, which was enriching but demanding. Her attitude to her training could be described as appreciative but qualified by experience.
Statements of Reassessment

"I’m much more variable with my patients, which happened when I went to the AR Centre, where we discussed very difficult, severe, borderline, schizoid, psychotic, severe symptomatology...there was such a broad range of technical styles, technical parameters—do anything to keep this patient in the work and get them through an impasse."

"I was moving between supportive psychotherapy in my thinking and this more French style of psychoanalytic frame, where you’re very careful about what the frame is and how the frame is put in place...what’s happening is that I’m now moving back, not with every patient..."

"The reassessment was a kind of broadening. I’ve always valued the training I got, the thinking...there was already a certain flexibility of technique at the Montreal Institute. AR Centre wasn’t that different, but the pathology was so severe that you learned all the reasons for needing the shifting frame and how to bide your time and bide your time and note down all the particularities of how certain patients couldn’t tolerate some aspects of the classical frame...I’m not so nervous of letting it be idiosyncratic."

I have learned since that, I have a different attitude...what I’ve learned is that how many premature terminations there are in everybody’s practice...there are things you don’t know and things you don’t control"
“I remember one moment when I was working with a very difficult patient and I was asked to do some translating with a South American analyst on Heinrich Racker’s 1950 paper on countertransference with clinical material, and I remember at that moment being absolutely struck by a different approach...and it was such a different focus, my supervisor was saying watch for the transference, in Montreal, and I didn’t know how to do it, and the penny dropped and I started to practice and practice and practice to see if it worked or not, and that’s been part of my technique ever since...”

Discussion

The material above indicates that practitioners reassess their education as a result of certain experiences which act as a retrospective impetus...

Revelations about a teacher: Subsequent to their training, both subject 1 and subject 4 learned that one of their supervisors had been guilty of conduct unbecoming to a practitioner. This was widely publicized and caused significant dismay throughout the analytic community, with particularly acute reactions being felt by former students and analysands. How each of these subjects reacted indicates a great deal about the significance of identification with and idealization of the supervisor during analytic education.

Candidates often form their first sense of professional identity by identifying with their supervisor, who discusses cases with them as if they were equal colleagues. This experience is also tinged with conflict, as the candidate tries to develop his or her own identity and struggles to avoid idealization or devaluation of the senior practitioner. (Jacobs, 1995: 48). Simultaneous with this experience, the candidate is also engaged in
the analytic process, complete with its transferential implications, creating a heightened state of emotional lability. "But therapists struggle in supervision as well with distressing feelings, memories, personal fantasies, and upsetting impulses aroused by their work with patients." (Ibid: 116) The interaction with the supervisor can be equally challenging.

Subject #1 described a prolonged, difficult and painful supervisory experience with this supervisor, which included identifying and resisting identification with the supervisor. "There I was, in my silk tie, trying to be Dr. Q," he recalled, with an unmistakable note of self-reproach at his mimicry of his teacher. Learning of Dr. Q’s misdemeanour put some of his conflicts into perspective. He experienced it as a liberation, and it reinforced the ideas he had developed subsequent to his supervision, which added to his confidence.

For the second candidate who admitted to “looking up” to this teacher, it caused disillusionment, but was also extremely explanatory of a serious shortcoming in the management of her supervision. This provided perspective on unfinished business and, in a sense, created an opportunity to revisit the learning situation which had remained unresolved. Coming to see an idealized figure in more realistic dimensions is in itself educational, not only about that individual, but about the learning shared with that individual. While neither subject acknowledged this, it was an important developmental opportunity.

Although the material revealed about this supervisor happened to be negative, the same process of reassessment can be sparked by learning something positive or just a piece of private information that reflects back on the candidate’s experience.
Intense clinical struggle: Encountering clinical situations for which he felt he was unprepared caused subject 1 to reconsider virtually every dimension of his training. As extensive and demanding as this process was, and as deficient as it suggests his training may have been, it can only be understood in the context of this individual's educational history. Being a lay analyst, he did not start from an experience of intense immersion in clinical work, such as a psychiatric or clinical psychology residency, and was not exposed to the variety of treatment demands that such candidates would have been. Encountering the new and different is a daily event in medical training, and it takes place within the context of the teaching institution, where the shock is modified by the presence of more seasoned veterans. For this candidate, the unforeseen event occurred when he was practicing in isolation as a recent graduate. The psychiatrist psychoanalysts interviewed could not remember any incident where something they’d never been prepared for occurred, and furthermore, saw new developments as evolution, not rupture. The advent of anti-depressants such as Prozac, for example, which has caused much debate amongst analysts, has not caused any reassessment in the subjects interviewed for this research. This suggests that lay analysts operate at a disadvantage in the early stages of their practice, and might benefit from a transitional year program before entering an analytic institute. In addition, the institute and supervisors could be more aware of the need for admitting a balance of lay and clinical candidates so that the social context supports both groups.

Subject #6, another lay analyst with a non-clinical background, also encountered many situations in practice which had not been addressed in training. “(I experienced this) lots...little but that. For years and years and years...things were happening that I
was not grasping securely." But this did not cause her to reassess her training. Instead, she re-examined her own views of the nature of psychoanalysis and her expectations of herself as a practitioner. “How could you possibly after four years of brief seminars begin to digest what the pressures of certain kinds of—you don’t know, in a lifetime, which kinds of patients are going to walk into your office and which buttons they are going to push in you... but the lack of power, the castration, the fact that you’re limited in the face of huge psychological forces... there are things you don’t know and things you don’t control.” Encountering a gap between training and practice was equally distressing for both practitioners (“despairing sometimes” as subject #6 put it) but reassessment of training was the response of only one of them. This indicates that personal expectations of self and others as well as other aspects of character too complex to consider in this study are extremely important factors in assessment.

Learning from peers after graduation: Subjects 3 and 4 have both continued to meet with a group of peers to consult on cases and read analytic literature. Both commented on how useful this has been, and in some cases, more useful than the original training. Working independently with peers after being subject to the demands of an institute is an opportunity to share impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of the educational process, and thus invites reassessment, particularly in the early post-training period. Meeting with a peer group may or may not suggest a deficiency in the training. In the case of subject #3, who commented that his peer group is more useful than a “stack of supervisions”, it implies that supervision was not educational enough. It is also
possible, however, that a peer group could be formed out of a recognition that the social aspect of the learning process during training was beneficial and worth recreating.

As discussed in the literature review, access to an analytic milieu is a critical component of learning and creating an analytic identity. The prevailing social conditions will play a significant part in the nature of that milieu. For those candidates who trained in Toronto, the culture was a very small number of colleagues, most of whom had done their previous training in Toronto, were analyzed by men who had trained in Toronto and were now dispersed throughout a large city managing a busy practice. Contact outside of the classroom component of the program would be minimal.

This is vastly different from the situation described by one candidate who spent a number of years in a rural setting in the United States. “It was a community unlike this one, where everybody was stuck in the plains of (the mid-West), so we got to know each other. So we were talking to each other all the time.” Subject #4 describes the same phenomenon: “…in a small setting like that you really get to know people well. We socialized. That doesn’t really happen here. (My teacher) told anecdotes, and JL was so well read, so well rounded. His office was filled with books of every kind…but he was also a cowboy…a farmer,…he was very erudite.”

Subject #5 also studied in a setting where people from diverse backgrounds lived and worked closely together and conducted many aspects of their lives besides their training together. As a result, analytic sensibilities could be expressed, observed and shared in many different ways, and opportunities for dialogue and learning abounded, as well as the chance to create a sense of solidarity. There would be less need to create peer support groups in such a setting because peers had access to regular interaction. This
echoes the experience described by Deutsch, Mahler, Grotjahn and other European analysts, and is clearly essential to maintaining analytic growth throughout a career.

The peer groups mentioned by these subjects also attest to the importance of the social context of learning. These analysts are capable of reading independently and could also seek further supervision, should they choose. Yet they feel the need to learn within a group of colleagues. This suggests that the social environment of each class should be carefully fostered and monitored, so that a positive atmosphere develops.

_Becoming colleagues with former training analysts:_ Joining the analytic society and attending its meetings on an equal footing with former analysts, supervisors and teachers, is a transition which allows candidates to review their current feelings and former impressions. As subject #4 described it, her former analyst’s presentation on a hysterical woman wearing a red dress was an echo of an important moment in her own analysis, and confirmed an impression that had been with her for many years. This is a variant on the revelation of information about a teacher discussed above. However, this experience also affords the former candidate the opportunity to consult, interact, collaborate or even instruct an individual who once instructed him or her. They can reassess the teacher and also observe themselves in interaction with the teacher. “Self-reflection means being aware of one’s activity: of the interplay of listening, applying theory, identifying with one’s teachers, and developing one’s own independent clinical impressions.” (Jacobs, 1995:118) This is another important opportunity to continue to process of de-idealization of teachers which enhances the candidates sense of independence and self-sufficiency.
Those subjects who stayed in the same place as they trained have all had a chance to interact this way, often becoming teaching colleagues as well. Those who move away do not have the same opportunity, but often seek it indirectly. Attending conferences, corresponding with former teachers, and simply having chance encounters can initiate a process of reassessment.

*Accumulating experience:* Subject #4 now recognizes that she was somewhat intimidated by her teachers, and tried to match her manner to theirs rather than developing a personal style. She describes this as “too passive” and has observed it in others as well. What has caused her to reassess their style and change hers has been the experience of independent practice, which has not only afforded her the chance to try things her way, but also *required* that she do so. There is simply no authority to which she can defer even should she wish to do so. “You leave analytic training thinking there’s so many things you’re not supposed to do. If anything’s shifted, it’s not the theoretical shift, but not so much is forbidden… I probably enjoy (practice) more and take more risks.” Making independent judgements in practice is a form of taking clinical risks, and causes the practitioner to reassess his or her own performance and the performance of the teacher. Subject #3 addressed the same process when describing his initial tendency to model his interpretations after his own analyst and the subsequent change in style. He describes this as “drawing on my own idiosyncratic self”, which implies drawing less on the model of his teacher or analyst.
Successfully applying the teacher's model: As subject #5 describes it, there are times when drawing on the teacher's approach works well and continues to work well as "introjected clinical wisdom". This does not preclude trial and error and the development of personal style, but adds to the picture of how a practitioner reviews his or her teacher's influence. In some cases, it is useful and supportive, and in other cases, a need is felt to innovate. The use of an introjected supervisory model may also reflect the vestiges of a transmission metaphor of learning. The authoritative supervisor passing wisdom to the receptive student can be a reassuring memory to the isolated practitioner, especially if his training was a positive experience, as it was in the case of subject #5. Shared learning in partnership can be a very powerful experience for both parties, and the content of that learning may become associated, forever more, with the relationship in which the learning was achieved. Subject #4 will always think of her supervisor when she encounters a patient similar to the one she discussed with Dr. Q.

Continuing Education: Many practitioners participate in continuing education venues as a matter of expanding and extending their skills rather than as a reaction to their basic training. Even so, it can result in a process of reassessment, when new concepts are encountered, or old concepts are challenged. It can also work in concordance with a current clinical situation to create a powerful moment of learning readiness, as described by subject #6. In what felt like a sudden flash, the practitioner recognized a new approach to a clinical problem which she was struggling with in the present and which she had also struggled with during the course of her training. Both her current practice and her past training were thrown into reassessment, resulting in a new
direction. As she herself speculated, "whether I was prepared after a number of years of work... and the penny dropped", her mind was prepared for change, and the educational opportunity came along. This does not necessarily cause the practitioner to devalue the original training, even when a new departure results.

Research Conclusion

In the narrow sense of the term, practitioners do reassess their education on an ongoing basis, but they seldom change their original assessment in a radical way. Generally speaking, it appears that this reassessment is an intermittent remembering and reflecting on the experience, inspired as most memories are by random events and unconscious influences. Where more extensive, conscious reassessment does occur, it is due to encountering problems in practice.
IV: Conclusion

I formulated this study as a reaction to the consistently negative comments about analytic training that I heard from practitioners in the field. My purpose, in part, was to reassure myself that what I was hearing was only a partial truth, and that good training was equally as common an experience as bad. Such reassurance was not forthcoming from my interviews.

This is not because all the research subjects reported consistently bad training experiences. Two of the four participants were extremely positive about their training. While the other four would have rated their training as less than adequate, by and large they could identify something positive in one of the three components of their program. Two of the six subjects were unequivocal about the poor quality of their training, which is disheartening, but not conclusive. Given the variables of analytic education discussed in Chapter II, it is reasonable to assume that these two individuals were less fortunate in the random factors that affect each student. The compatibility of classmates, the kind of control cases that the candidate can arrange, the level of theoretical ferment in the analytic field or the social conditions influencing the status of psychoanalysis are but a few of the vicissitudes that prevail during a candidate's tenure. In addition, the personal circumstances of the candidate, which were only briefly touched on in the interviews, will have a major impact on the entire process. It is beyond the scope of this study to truly assess all the factors that affected the quality of each participant's experience.

The memoirs by analysts to which I have referred provide an important perspective on the comments of these contemporary analysts. Abrupt terminations, dramatic crises, intense personal conflicts and prolonged clinical quandaries were
common aspects of their training. Combining their accounts with an understanding of the complex demands of analytic training provides a compelling picture of the training reality. As Freud suggested, it is the combination of two impossible pursuits: education and psychoanalysis. This combination entails the necessary failures of attempting new cognitive tasks and technical challenges as well as the taxing process of personal self-scrutiny that is the lot of every analysand. While all learning involves risking the possibility of failure along with the reaction of shame or despair, psychoanalytic learning exposes the candidate to the normal risks of skill acquisition plus the psychic vulnerability that accompanies the loss of lifelong emotional defenses. Understanding this is the practitioner’s best way of putting his or her education into perspective.

But to say that psychoanalytic education must accept limited success is not to say that it can’t be improved. A number of problems reported by the research subjects were less matters of psychic complexity than issues of proper educational management. Three situations reported which caused significant distress to the candidates might well have been corrected if the Institute involved had considered its role as an educator of adults and looked for professional solutions to these problems.

One instance involved the development of an extremely counterproductive classroom dynamic that persisted for the entire four years of the candidate’s program. As discussed in Chapter Two, management of the social context is the primary (but not sole) responsibility of the teacher. Consigning classroom conflict to dynamic forces is not an adequate response, and drawing on educational approaches to classroom management can repair dysfunctional situations.
Being in a training analysis that seems of no benefit, (as highly subjective as this judgement may be) is another reported problem. The candidate who realized that the training analyst was regularly falling asleep needed some way of correcting this situation besides confrontation within the consulting room. The possibility of a non-productive analytic team is real, and some mechanism for change would provide both parties with a mature recourse.

Only one candidate reported losing a control case patient before the required number of clinical hours had accrued. The standard practice of discounting that case completely is both punitive and without pedagogical rationale. Surgical students who experience the death of a patient are not required to extend their training. They are expected to carefully examine the cause for the loss and learn from the experience. The factors are often both within and beyond the student’s control, which can easily be the case for an analytic candidate. Demanding that candidates find ways to prolong their patient’s therapy to meet Institutional requirements necessarily intrudes on their clinical integrity.

In every case mentioned, the underlying problem is one of negotiating educational impasses. When candidates are expected to tolerate these problems without recourse while undergoing the personally threatening analytic process, a positive educational experience can not be the result. This, in my view, is what contributes to the lingering bitter tone of the practitioners I encountered. The deeply taxing challenges of the process are not what discourage the candidate. They can be exhilarating and illuminating as well as difficult. But the absence of respect for the learner as an adult in the real world is never forgotten.
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Appendices
Appendix A: An Example of Coded Interviews

The following is a selection of excerpts taken from the interviews with the interpretive codes inserted in the transcription. The underlined passages precede the relevant code.

Classroom Experience:

#1

I was grossly deficient in clinical experience, (state of readiness, learner's attributes, previous education) and the other psychiatrists were superior in this area; I defended myself by being intellectually arrogant, but we accepted each other and they had stuff to teach me; I learned more from them than from the supervision (learning from peers)

Did you have any great teachers you still look back on?

Sorry to say, no... I read like mad, (learning by reading) but Toronto is a backwater. The lack of sophistication compared to places like N.Y and Philadelphia is sad, but I was in no position to know this at the time; (retrospective evaluation) I looked up to those people, I idealized them; I was a raw beginner, (view of self, learner's attributes) But I was so delighted to have been accepted because I was a lay candidate that I was willing to bend down and kiss the floor of the institute; I was so happy to be there I wasn't being critical at all; I didn't care that the classroom component wasn't strong; I ran into trouble in the supervision, but like a child with deficient parents, I blamed myself, (learner's agency, view of self)

#2

In the classroom component, were there any teachers who were really outstanding?

Generally the classroom was a disappointment, (classroom learning, program deficiency) Probably X. I still like X despite his problems. ...No, there really wasn't... I remember IG and H H because they'd been at Topeka. (previous
education) One session with HH, he took on JM. He challenged him. I thought they would come to blows. I was wearing a tie, so I took it off, because if you're in a threatening situation someone could choke you, so I took off my tie because I thought they would come to blows. I do remember that session (story, group process)

#3

We had what was known as a good class. There's good ones and bad ones—it's almost part of the culture (analytic culture), at least in this town. A good class means we were all willing to participate, and leave room for each others thoughts and idiosyncrasies and to feel somewhat comfortable sharing our foibles and vulnerabilities. (learning from peers, group process) I think the previous class had been locked in some ideological struggle and so on and so forth. We weren't all M.D. we had three or four non-M.D.s in our group, and probably two thirds one third male female. And so that—the question of male female issues and perspectives was never really much of an item. Part of that experience—thinking more on that. I found the amount of reading onerous. It was almost like the experience of going into medical school where they made a point of—until recently—subjecting people to the experience of the cadaver the first day so that you somehow had to have this painful passage and knew if you could deal with this thing you could withstand the rigours of practicing medicine. It some of that kind of flavour to it. (ritual, program deficiency)

You mean onerous in terms of the quantity?

The volume, and it was repetitive. (Program deficiency) And you were running up these huge photocopies—stacks and stacks of paper. I have them under the basement stairs now. I use them in supervising my students—especially the old and dusty ones. I give them as remote and old a paper as I can. There was a great emphasis on "let's blow through the readings" (ritual). In my class we were expected to present the readings. Now the classes have asked that the teachers present the readers. My take on that is there isn't as much reading getting done by the candidates. We were expected to participate, and I'm not sure if we were welcome at the scientific meetings until the second year

Did you have any educator who were outstanding or mentors anywhere in the program?

One or two (tape change here)
What were the qualities of those individuals?

They took an interest in my development. (supportive teacher) This was in contrast to the official framework, more personal and direct. So that was welcome. But it went both ways. There was so much strife, around whether analysis could happen in this culture at this time, and we were all thrown into it directly and had to deal with it. (supportive teacher, influential teacher, analytic culture)

#4

The classroom component. Did you gain a lot from discussion with your classmates?

No. Not at all.

How do you account for that?

A lot of antipathy between people.

A so called “bad class”?

Yeah. You know about our class?

No, I don’t know about your class in particular. I just know that people—the last person I interviewed said he had a ‘so called good class’ and the classes are divided in the analytic culture.

Oh. Well that person certainly wasn’t in my class. (group process, learning atmosphere)

You were known as a bad class?

I think we found that out later. We did not function well as a group. I don’t think we listened to one another very well. There was divisiveness in the group. They should have—they may have tried to too late in the game—they should have shown some leadership in trying to eradicate that. (group process, classroom learning, resolving impasse, learning atmosphere,)

That was what was coming into my mind again, was another impasse.

Yeah.

And really there’s nothing you can do, and part of what they are obliged to do is provide an environment in which you can learn.

The problem is this though, the divisiveness is often over theory and people’s background. Now you have teachers who area also divided over theory and background. They are not a cohesive group either. So what will happen is that you’ll get one teacher who’s allied with these people because they think the same. And then the next person who comes along is allied with others—so there’s more schisms. (theoretical dispute, group process)
What were the schisms?

Basically the self-psychologists and everybody else. (school of psa, theoretical dispute, group process)

And was that a happening thing at that time, so feelings were running high?

Yeah. They’re a pain in the ass. Such a pain in the ass.

Were there any teachers who really stood out for you?

No. The teaching was really mediocre. No. (inadequate teacher)

Shortcomings

#1

You think there were serious deficiencies in your training, and you were aware at the time?

Yes. I was reading Winnicott and Kohut (learning by reading) and trying to get my analysts to discuss this and they wouldn’t. (responsiveness to individual needs, resolving impasse, inadequate teacher) I felt almost from the start that I was practicing handicapped. I didn’t understand my patients. As an outside OHIP junior analyst I was getting very sick people and I couldn’t help them. (view of self; prevailing conditions)

Did you follow the basic techniques you learned?

Yes. but that fits the neurotic patient, but with a borderline patients that goes out the window. You’re getting emotional induction, projective identification, they stir you up in all sorts of ways, they operate through inducing emotions in you—they aren’t conscious of this; your job is to process this and understand what’s going on; this requires that you pay attention to your own feelings and understanding that. (emotional demand) and the Freudian ego psychology training just wasn’t useful for that. (program deficiency, school of psa)

Freud said there were transference neurosis and narcissistic neuroses and only the transference neurosis were analyzable; but Kleinians always said everybody was suitable; (theoretical dispute) to me if they can show up and pay they are
suitable for analysis. I just shifted to the Kleininan model (learner's agency, learning by reading, continuing ed, lifetime learning)

You don't appear to draw on your training on a conscious way

I have to credit the training for giving me the foundation, it gave me stuff to read that I wouldn't have discovered on my own; it put me in a position to carry on my self-education as an analyst afterwards, and that is a major function of training (essence of psa training, retrospective evaluation)

It did not give me the tools to be an analyst (retrospective evaluation, program deficiency)

I was aware that I was not adequately trained, but I figured nobody else was either, but I had the advantage of intellectual sophistication because of my academic background; I was asked to teach at the Institute after I graduated, so I felt confirmed by that, but clinically I knew I was not effective, but I figured nobody else was, and I was right (contemporary evaluation, retrospective evaluation, learner's attributes)

I struggled a lot with confidence, I found clinical work to be narcissistically wounding on an ongoing basis; (emotional demand) much of my practice was with disordered people and I was in impasses, nothing was changing

I have to share some of the responsibility for that: I wasn't in analysis by then and I could have gone back in but I didn't; (learner's agency, self blame) I went back to another analyst later precisely to deal with that case

#2
So your training must have been difficult.

It was very difficult. I had four kids, I played golf, flew a plane, my wife tried to fit into the system, and eventually I divorced. This may have been a factor. It may have been a bit too much.

And you didn't feel you were significantly benefitting from it.
No. A bit from discussion. But if I hadn't been to Topeka, if would have been better, cause I looked at this as a modification of the Topeka experience. *(previous education, superior ancestry, self blame.)*

#3

*It sounds to me like your experience overall was fairly positive. Didn't ingrain iatrogenic problems, or doubt or insecurities or even grudges.***

Yeah; it certainly wasn't bruise-free. you know what I mean: there's lots of lingering questions about the cost of it for me and the kind of where I got to intellectually and I think one could get to the same place intellectually without that cost for sure and I wouldn't repeat it knowing what I know now. but it's done and I got what I could out of it*(retrospective evaluation, cost/benefit ratio, resignation)*

#4

*Analytic training: would I do it again? Probably not. *(retrospective evaluation)* Even at the time, I thought, for all the time and all the money *(cost benefit ratio, contemporary evaluation) —although. it's also about developing an identity. *(analytic identity, view of self)* But I've often thought that if I had a really good reading list and I picked out a couple of really good supervisors, and I had a decent analysis—*(essence of psa training)*

*Self training*

Right and I happen to know a couple of psychiatrists who have done that who are fabulous psychiatrists, and do psychotherapy if not psychoanalysis as well as than many analysts I know. Because you forget so much of what you read theoretically, unless you're going to be at the pinnacle of theory development which means reading everything, being a thinker, being a writer. I don't see myself as a writer. My first case they thought I should write up and publish, my supervisor was always telling me this. But it's not me. I'm supervising a woman now who has a fabulous case. There's so much I can teach her and she's leaning because of the case and I told her the same thing, to write up the case. But she's not going to. It's just —those are the cases you see written up. When you see Greenson write up a case— it's this kind of case that lends itself, when you say something, something develops. But a lot of analysis are boring. Would I do it again? I think I should have been older. I would have enjoyed it more, if I was 10 years older. I would have related to the staff differently, to the teachers differently. *(retrospective evaluation, view of self)* I wanted to do analysis—but I could have done what other people do—have my patients lie down on the couch. But I didn't think that was right. I had to have things by the book. Another interesting things is how you're interviewed when you apply.
because you meet three analysts. You get a very odd view of analysis. The people who interview are some of the weirdest people, some of them. I had a motley group. Highly weird. Two of the three never taught us again. I thought “huh”? I’d met enough analysts to now it wasn’t like that, especially in London. Then I had the weirdest people asking me the weirdest questions. One of them made the case that I had an eating disorder because I’m slim. I could see just where he was going, “do I like chocolate?” HH just asked me about my mother, what a Freudian, I thought. But he was so odd it was fun. (story, analytic culture) In the end it all comes down to who you are in the end. (essence of psa) Last year Orenstein and Kemberg came, and what you saw was two brilliant, compassionate, empathic individuals. Great people, who cared about people. Then you have people in the audience, embarrassing, lambasting them for their theoretical positions. I see this all the time with visiting people. People stand up in the audience and you see they are people who have thought a lot about their patients and who have tremendous ability to understand people, and the theoretical positions are not that critical.

Supplementation and Compensation

Interview #2

. Does my training help me in critical situations? At this stage of my life I have to say that I have to help myself. I get stuck. I read. I’ve read so much now that I know where to look. My son threatens to get me onto the internet too. (retrospective evaluation, continuing ed, lifetime learning, learning by reading )

It sounds to me like the analysis had some personal impact but didn’t change the way you practice; but you already knew how to practice, so you learned from trial and error and your seminars?

Yes and from general learning. I never read just what I was supposed to which is a bad habit. It interferes with your sleeping.

It’s better to be well read than well rested.

Can you remember an issue that arose that you hadn’t expected—an issue that patients brought to treatment, that you hadn’t been prepared for?

The only thing I hadn’t been prepared for is the difficulty of treatment. (re-evaluation) We were told for example that hysteria is relatively easy to treat. I find it very very difficult to treat. I find people with hysteria, particularly at the
character level have gone through so much agony that a good many are terrified to give it up because it would mean
dealing with all the pain they have gone through. It’s a terrible disorder. I started writing a paper on “the horror of
hysteria” but not being an academic, and a clinician, it was too difficult. People who write want to propagate their own

Did anything that you were reading then help you with your consultation?

Oh yes, but at this point I don’t know what it was. I’m one of these people—everything I read I believe. Even to this
day something I read or the thing I went to on Friday on Soul Murder—he was excellent because I read about him and a
very humane guy. I wonder why I blocked on his name. But that gives you another concept. Just from last Friday I
began to look at my patients—some of them I’ve been with for a long time—and his concept of Soul Murder is true for
all of these old timers because they’ve been burned out as kids and they basically have no identity. (continuing ed,
learning from peers, learner’s attributes) I’ve just finished with a person whose thinking of terminating but is terrified
of leaving me because of her soul murder type background. I learn something everytime.

So you don’t feel a paralyzing loyalty to the framework you developed at Menninger.

Karl felt that—he told us in his typical way—if you guys have a choice between reading psychiatry or seeing a play or a
movie, see the movie. In the end this will hold you in better stead. In other words, develop yourself. A good person is a
good psychiatrist. A good psychiatrist is a good psychoanalyst. That has never left me. I agree with him. The loyalty
the Menninger is loyalty to what I learned there, which is loyalty to being a humanist. (influential teacher, essence of p3a)

#4

Do I feel deeply analytically trained? No. (view of self; re-evaluation) I feel that I read what I can that’s interesting.
I now participate in a group of analysts and discuss cases. I have been at times in a study group. Some of the good
classes have kept together and done study groups. In my study group there’s five women who meet every month. There
is one person who’s opinion I value. We’ve been meeting a few years. It’s a very supportive group. It’s talking about
cases, very very helpful. The last meeting we had was a few nights ago, and I realized I had an issue coming up with a
patient. We discussed it and it was great, and I felt I had a solution, because we have a long summer break coming up.
The one person I value put a very positive spin on what is happening, and I think what’s happening is terrible, so I told
her that I would take her spin. I go to the scientific meetings. Usually they’re disappointing if they’re people from here,
I only go to people who aren’t from here, and then they’re go. They show that our caliber is not the same. (continuing ed, learning by reading, learning from peers, social interaction)

The Ph D analysts were great teachers. That’s one good reason to accept them in the program, because they can go on and become great teachers. One of my residents is going to OISE to learn how to teach. But it is so crucial because psa is so hard to teach. Our positions are so passive and responsive we are not out there talking about things. (essence of psa education.) At conferences you hear great speakers however.

Encountering the Unexpected

#2

What about the SSRI’s?

All of these psychotherapies are forms of teaching that modify things at the basic, gene level. But the teaching, whether it’s effective enough, you have to have contact, you have to have transference. If there’s too much structural damage you have to use ssri’s or some sort of chemical intervention to augment the important part which is the relationship which is the psychotherapy. The best teaching method is a pretty classical psychoanalysis but the person has to be pretty approachable. I use it at certain stages when people get into depression and begin to lose me and I temporarily prescribe something and get back into the teaching situation.

So when the ssri’s came along you combined your medical training and your analytic training and came up with your view of it. So your training served you well—30 years after you graduated. It wasn’t a crisis for you.

In 1958 the first anti depressant came out. I started at the drug era. They’ve got too many drugs now. I’ve been past president of the Ontario district of the American Psychiatric. Both my addresses have been bewailing the lack of psychotherapy. The kids today just learn pharmacology. But I really believe that the essence of psychotherapy is a very good psychoanalysi which is very very hard to do. (essence of psa)

#3
You mentioned you were quite surprised by how much patients were talking about sexual abuse. That’s one of the things that you didn’t expect to encounter from your patients. The other one is Prozac and related drugs. Can you comment on these things, and how your education prepared you to deal with these—did you need to reeducate yourself or augment it?

That’s interesting. And I may yet take this up because I still do some teaching there. At the Institute and the University.

The issue of medication is interesting. You read a paper on depression and its purely psychoanalytic. Flip to the back of the journal and there’s a panel on medication and there’s no question that people are prescribing. And the whole question of medication has been overtaken by the realities of the time. And yet there’s this kind of split image if you will, this maintenance of “we will preserve the theoretical ideal” it troubles me—I’ve been meaning to address it.

There’s a false situation (new development in the field)

A desire to appear pure?

Yes.

And it’s threatening to the profession to think that drugs could solve some of these problems and that makes it difficult to be objective.

I think that’s true, but personally I think they’re crap, and I don’t think we said it loudly enough. It’s almost as if people feel left out if they are not on any of these agents—it’s gotten to that level. I don’t know anymore what people are on. People are getting it from their friends, and in idiosyncratic ways. If they don’t get it from a psychiatrist they get it from a g.p. It’s completely beyond having any control over it. I’ve noticed in the last 5 years that people have become more surreptitious, more circumspect about naming names, as if it might be written down. It’s an urban phenomenon. It’s palpable in the last few years (new development in the field)

That really affects your work.

It really does. They don’t want to divulge names.
If they're consciously editing themselves all the time—

—just what are we doing? What sort of arrangement is it? Yet that is the zeitgeist. Confidentiality is a huge problem.

And what about the sexual abuse issue, compared to when you were training—is it more of an issue that you hadn’t expected to see?

Yeah. I think that’s true. I don’t think we had any particular training issue in it, raises the issue whether we should. (program deficiency) We did break down into “obsession neurosis, hysterical neurosis, and 50 various things into these large, rather difficult categories, might be interesting to deal with it in a topic basis: I’ve learned more about it by having to deal with it and having to make my own observations about it which has worked for me. (learning from experience) Most experienced practitioners, my supervisors included, had experiences dealing with it. They respected the force of it, which I still think is rather poorly understood. (learning from experience)

What about the fact that it was such a central quandary for Freud himself—did that affect your thinking—the question of whether something is environmental or unconscious—how do you come to understand that when you’re seeing so much more than you expected?

Maybe I get around it by taking material as it comes but not having to decide what the truth is. This is really common. I can think of cases just in recent weeks where this has come up and I’ve done well by not dealing with theory or ideology, but just take the material at face value, but in some cases I suspect that we are talking about a non-event, that this is a retrospective falsification secondary to psychotherapy. We’re seeing more of those cases now.

You mean it was iatrogenic

Yeah, but there’s all kinds of things happening like that—peculiar iatrogenic phenomenon. The question of multiple personalities has erupted in the last 5 to 10 years—people wondering if they are multiple: did my training prepare me for that? Not specifically. But it helps to have a core therapeutic identity and I think I have that and I’ve approached the
material more or less in the same way—respectfully with an eye to the ideograph, the unique historical aspects (new developments in the field, retrospective evaluation, analytic identity.)

#4

Did any paradigm shift happen over the years that made you reevaluate your approach?

Like everybody, you become less rigid. You are able to introduce parameters that you wouldn’t introduce before. You leave analytic training thinking there’s so many things you’re not supposed to do. If anything’s shifted, it’s not the theoretical shift, but not so much is forbidden. So that I can interact with the patients more easily. (sense of mastery, view of self.) I think that theoretically I’ve always been eclectic, I tend towards drive theory more than self psychology. It’s natural for me to use what is in self psychology. I’ve had a hard time wrapping my mind around the words in Kohut. I read a lot of different articles now, and I don’t find them strongly theoretically based. I read from the Am. Journ. Of Psa and you often don’t know what the writer’s bent is, and I like that. (learning by reading) I probably enjoy it more and take more risks, whether its being quieter when I think I should be — it’s — how can I put it: it’s like having a bigger palette. Your palette is rather small when you graduate (skills and techniques, sense of mastery) . I can learn from my cases. Learning to let myself experience my cases differently as very different people, not having to worry about nailing them down from a certain theoretical perspective. Letting things unfold more, and I read more than I did, that helps me. I think more about them than I did when I came out. (learning from experience, learning from reading.)

Miscellaneous

#2

Given you had the Topeka training, what made you want to add the analytic training?

I think analysts are born, not made, and you’re attracted like a moth to a light. That’s what happened.

Basically, you’re half self-taught, half Menninger taught. In the self half taught have you changed much.

I would think that it’s become more classical as a result of dealing with my patients. I read but I don’t believe a damn thing until it comes up in my practice. Then I start thinking about it really seriously. (learning from experience) I think I’ve become more classical. The basic psa did that Freud did modified by ego psychology and a little object relations from the British school and attachment theory, which is not really classical. (school of psa) but I see the culture, by the way, as an extension of dreaming. My notes are notes of dreams. Some patients are so rigid that they dream very little. They’re sessions are very practical — strokes from their last golf games, I believe in the preeeminence of two things. The dynamic of the unconscious and clinically the importance of dream work and within that the importance of transference. If you don’t have a transference, you don’t have dreamwork, you don’t believe in a dynamic unconscious, you have no analysis. (essence of psa)
What about things like analyze resistance before content, things like that, are you classical in that respect.

Well, modified by experience. (learning from experience) You work at both angles. These soul murdered people—all you see is resistance—for years. You’ve analyzed resistance 200 times—doesn’t do anything, so you have to live with it.

You modify by experience. (learning from experience) Freud—I admire the old bird—he did very well with what he had at his disposal, but it’s not the whole picture.

#4 Sounds like you felt you were pretty well ready to meet the challenges of being an analyst when you finished the program. What interests me is that after you are analyzed once, you are an analyst to so many different people. Did you feel you had your bearings when you started analyzing?

I had my bearings. I saw many different kinds of people. I had a very busy practice. I didn’t feel that I couldn’t handle people. And I felt that—what going to school does is that it gives you an identity. You get into the skin of an analyst. What do I remember? Probably not that much, like any school experience. Do I remember what I read, what I said? A few things, but when I think of all that I read, I’ve forgotten so much of it. But I felt in the skin of an analyst. I felt, “yeah, I can do this,” not cocky, but just, yeah, I’m o.k., I can do it. (retrospective evaluation, analytic identity, sense of mastery)
Codes
1. Date
2. previous education
3. educational institution
4. seminal influence
5. transformative experience
6. school of psa
7. world view
8. influential teacher
9. personal contribution, learner’s agency
10. analytic culture
11. program deficiency
12. superior ancestry
13. lifetime learning
14. continuing ed,
15. analytic identity
16. educators attributes
17. peak experience
18. learning by observing
19. learning by being observed
20. learning by imitation
21. learning by negative modeling
22. social interaction
23. learner’s attributes
24. essence of psa, essence of psa training
25. classroom learning
26. state of readiness
27. formal requirements
28. prevailing conditions
29. learning atmosphere, (positive or negative)
30. program change
31. change as a learning opportunity
32. retrospective evaluation
33. theoretical dispute
34. skills and techniques
35. ritual
36. responsiveness to individual needs
37. supportive teacher
38. cryptic teaching
39. learning by reading
40. toxic teacher
41. adequate teacher
42. inadequate teacher
43. learning from peers
44. view of self
45. pragmatic considerations
46. learners attitude
47. emotional demand
48. theoretical understanding
49. sense of mastery
50. ideal fit
51. description of process
52. traumatic event
53. comparing styles
54. lost opportunity
55. necessary but not sufficient
56. self-blame
57. group process
58. resolving impasse
59. cost/benefit ratio
60. new development in the field
61. learning from experience
62. personal analysis
63. previous therapy
64. story
65. learning from practice plus feedback
66. power structure
67. unprofessional conduct
68. coercive practice
69. contemporary evaluation
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Robin Roger
Department of Adult Education, Counselling Psychology and Community Development
OISE/UT

Dear ———

I am an M.A. candidate in the Department of Adult Education at OISE/UT. My program requirements include a thesis on a subject pertaining to the education of adults. For my thesis topic I have chosen to combine my interests in the nature of the learning experience and psychoanalytic thought by studying the process of analytic training itself. The working title of my thesis is *Retrospective Assessment of Analytic Training by Practitioners in the Field*. I am interested in how analysts in practice remember, evaluate, apply or modify their skills as years go by. In particular, I would like to learn how analysts draw on their training when they encounter the unexpected in their work. Have they acquired the generic skills to adapt to significant shifts in their work, or must they innovate for themselves or even return for further training?

Just as analysts learn about their patients by listening to their histories, I believe the best way to learn about analytic training is to listen to analysts recount their educational histories. This will provide a detailed, nuanced account of the complex process of becoming an analyst.

I would very much value your participation in my study. This would entail a one-hour interview with me, to be scheduled at your convenience. During this interview I would like to explore your training experience, looking at all three components of your program. This will involve discussing some sensitive issues such as the management of countertransference challenges during supervision, and the relationship between your training analysis and your subsequent acquisition of analytic skills. I feel quite confident that these issues can be discussed without requiring you to reveal any material that would make you uncomfortable, or that you would not reveal to any other colleague in your field. I will not ask you to identify any of the educators or analysts involved in your training.

This interview will be taped, transcribed and excerpted in the body of my thesis. I will store the tapes on my premises, and will erase the tapes upon completion of my thesis. If you would like a copy of your interview, or a transcription, I would be pleased to provide it. You are also most welcome to read my thesis after it is approved. The interviews will not be quoted in any other materials. To ensure anonymity, all subjects will be identified by pseudonym. I will not reveal the identity of the subjects to other participants in the study or to my thesis advisor. Should you have some reservations about your participation in the study following our meeting you may withdraw your participation at any time without any consequences of any sort.

By agreeing to be a subject, you will be helping me create a thoughtful statement on the challenge of becoming an analyst and what constitutes proper preparation for this impossible profession. I would be very grateful to you for adding your unique perspective to this study.

Yours truly,

Robin Roger
Statement of Informed Consent

Date

Robin Roger has requested that I participate in her research as an interview subject for her M.A. Thesis. I have been informed in writing of the thesis topic, the nature of the interview questions, the potential areas of sensitive material to be discussed, and the means of protecting my identity and my privacy. I am satisfied that she will use a pseudonym to identify me and will not reveal my name or the fact of my participation to other individuals. The interviews will not be quoted in other materials. I will be provided with my own copy of the transcript or tape if I wish to have one.

I am confident that these measures are adequate and hereby consent to participate in the research.

Research subject