



# **SUPERVISION AND THE MAKING OF THE PSYCHOANALYST**

**Imre Szecsödy, M.D., Ph.D.**

# **Supervision and the Making of the Psychoanalyst**

**Imre Szecsödy, M.D., Ph.D.**

## About the Author

Associate professor Imre Szecsödy M.D., Ph.D. is a training analyst and supervisor at the Swedish Psychoanalytic Society. He has conducted extensive research into supervision and the learning process and has long experience of conducting formal training of supervisors. He has published and presented extensively. His doctoral thesis from the department of psychiatry at the Karolinska Institutet, St. Gøran's Hospital, Stockholm, was published as *The Learning Process in Psychotherapy Supervision* (Private Press 1990) and he co-authored with Irene Matthis *On Freud's Couch: Seven New Interpretations of Freud's Case Histories* (Jason Aronson 1998).

Imre Szecsödy was Director of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute 1989-93, president of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Society 1993-97, vice president of the European Psychoanalytic Federation (EPF) 1997-2001, member of COMPSED (committee of psychoanalytic education) of the IPA 2000-2004, member of the Working Party on Psychoanalytic Education of the EPF, Member of the Liaison Committee for the IPA interim Provisional Society Vienna Arbeitskreis for Psychoanalysis, member of the IPA's Research Advisory Board, former chair of the Monitoring and Advisory Board to the

International Journal of Psychoanalysis. He is an adjunct faculty member of the International Institute for Psychoanalytic Training at the International Psychotherapy Institute in Chevy Chase MD, USA.

Imre Szecsödy

Karlavägen 27

11431 Stockholm

[imre.szecsody@lime.ki.se](mailto:imre.szecsody@lime.ki.se)

[i.szecsody@telia.com](mailto:i.szecsody@telia.com)

Copyright © 2012 Imre Szecsödy

All Rights Reserved

This e-book contains material protected under International and Federal Copyright Laws and Treaties. This e-book is intended for personal use only. Any unauthorized reprint or use of this material is prohibited. No part of this book may be used in any commercial manner without express permission of the author. Scholarly use of quotations must have proper attribution to the published work. This work may not be deconstructed, reverse engineered or reproduced in any other format.

Created in the United States of America

For information regarding this book, contact the publisher:

International Psychotherapy Institute E-Books  
301-215-7377  
6612 Kennedy Drive  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815-6504  
[www.freepsychotherapybooks.org](http://www.freepsychotherapybooks.org)  
[ebooks@theipi.org](mailto:ebooks@theipi.org)

## Table of Contents

[About the Author](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Research: Increasing Competence in Supervision and Training for Supervision](#)

[The complex learning process in supervision](#)

[Training of supervisors](#)

[Importance of conducting research on supervision and its training](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Does anything go in psychoanalytic supervision?](#)

[How to gain and evaluate competence of supervisor](#)

[The Experience of Supervisor-Supervisee Pairs Presenting Live Supervision](#)

[Responses from supervisees](#)

[Responses from supervisors](#)

[Quotations and Comments from Supervisees and Supervisors after the preconference event](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Supervision—a complex tool for psychoanalytic training](#)

[The Ambiguities of the Supervisory Situation](#)

[How is Learning Possible in the Supervisory Situation?](#)

[Training of Supervisors](#)

[Summary](#)

[How Is Learning Possible in Supervision?](#)

[The study of the learning process](#)

[Dewald's comments on this session](#)

[My somewhat different conclusion:](#)

[Comparison of the two commentaries:](#)

[Discussion of Findings](#)

[The learning alliance and the supervisory position](#)

[To become or be made a psychoanalyst: Independent studies of the Swedish  
Psychoanalytic Institute](#)

[The tripartite model - and its discontents](#)

[The ambiguities of the supervisory situation](#)

[Three studies on the training conducted at the Swedish  
Psychoanalytic Institute](#)

[Summary of Findings](#)

[Reconstructing our institutional history](#)

## References

[Share this Book with your Friends!](#)

## Acknowledgements

First, I want to thank the institutions of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytic Association for the opportunity to present papers and lead discussion and research on the supervisory process in psychoanalytic training. I wish to express my gratitude to Paul Dewald for his kind permission to apply my methodology from my study of supervision to his published material in his book *Learning Process in Psychoanalytic Supervision: Complexities and Challenges* (Dewald 1987; pp. 188-208) as well as to International Universities Press for their permission to use that published text in my study. I am grateful to trainees Maj Andersen, Christin Andersson, Dora Lindgren and Ingela Johansson who collected material and wrote their graduation theses on psychoanalytic training at the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute, and to Associate Professor Marie-Louise Ögren for supervising their research.

I want to acknowledge with gratitude the following permissions:

Chapter 1 is modified from “More research is essential to increase competence in

supervision and supervision training” (2011) presented at Winter meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, January 2011 and published in *Nordic Psychology* 2012 with kind permission of the journal and Taylor and Francis [www.tandfonline.com](http://www.tandfonline.com)

Chapter 2 is modified from Does anything go in supervision? (2008) *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 28:373-386 by permission of Taylor and Francis.

Chapter 3 is modified from “Report on the follow up responses received from the presenting supervisors/supervisees at the 8th IPA Conference of Training Analysts in Barcelona 1997”

Chapter 4 is modified from “Supervision—a complex tool for psychoanalytic training” (1994) *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review* 17:119-129, by courtesy of the *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*.

Chapter 5 “How is learning possible in supervision?” is modified from a chapter originally published in *Learning and its Vicissitudes*, edited by Brian Martindale, Maria E. Cid Rodriguez, Margareta Mörner and Jean-Pierre Vedit (published by Karnac Books in 1997) with kind permission of Karnac Books.

Chapter 6 is modified from “To become or be made a psychoanalyst” (2003) *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review* 26:141-150, by courtesy of the *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*.

These papers were modified and integrated by my editor Jill Savege Scharff. I am grateful that my ideas from years of studying and teaching supervision have been brought together in this book, which I hope will prove useful to candidates, supervisors, and training institutions.

## Introduction

It is my privilege and honor to be approved as the editor for a collection of selected writings by Imre Szecsödy on supervision. Dr. Szecsödy has studied clinical supervision of psychotherapists and psychoanalysts for many years from his home base in Sweden where formal training for supervisors of psychotherapy was introduced in the 1970s. A decade later this formal training was extended to include supervisors of psychoanalysis. At every stage in the development of methodology for effective supervision, Szecsödy was studying the learning process. He made extensive study of selected transcripts using ratings and undertook independent analysis of the results of the ratings. The first study looked at four transcripts. The second study reviewed fifty-six transcripts. Szecsödy participated in the inauguration of a program of live supervision at international psychoanalytic meetings, where supervisee-supervisor pairs agreed to undertake a supervision session with observers present, to engage. These papers variously cover Szecsödy's findings from research, psychoanalytic practice, and supervision. I have modified each chapter from its original for clarity of expression and flow, and yet I have left in some repetition so that, read singly, each chapter stands

alone. Taken together, the chapters present accumulated wisdom from years of broad and deep experience of clinical supervision.

Szecsödy is passionate about the need for research in developing aims, goals, methods, and quality control in the highly subjective area of psychoanalytic education. As a result, he speaks with authority about the advanced training needs of supervisors and the optimal conditions for candidates learning to become psychoanalysts. From his research he arrived at his concepts of the *extended clinical rhombus* (which refers to the system of inter-relationships among candidate, supervisor, and institution), the *frame of supervision* (referring to its stationary, mobile, and focused aspects), the *style of the learner* (cognitive, working, and defensive), the *nuclear problem*, the *educational diagnosis*, and the ongoing *mutual evaluation process*.

Szecsödy applies his research findings and resulting concepts to show how supervision can enhance the difficult task of learning. The supervisor maintains a position equidistant from the patient-therapist system and the therapist-supervisor system. Having established good boundaries and a stable frame, the supervisor focuses on his task of doing supervision and differentiates it from the supervisee's task of doing analysis or therapy. Supervisors can implement this task more effectively if they recognize the ambiguities of the role of supervisee. On the one hand supervisees are competent therapists and on the other hand they are trainees exposing areas

of ignorance, mistakes, dumb and blind spots in their knowledge and skill. At times they bring affects and perceptions that pertain to their analysis, and supervisors are challenged to deal with the unconscious blocks to learning from their roles as supervisors, not analysts. Tension and conflict in the supervisory relationship are not uncommon and need to be addressed in open dialogue in order to clear the path to learning.

Szecsödy's research has shown that the gifted analytic clinician is not necessarily a gifted supervisor but all analysts can become more effective supervisors through participation in a training program in which they study the processes of learning in supervision. Supervisors are most effective when they operate within an institution that prepares them in didactic seminars and gives them a peer group in which to discuss issues arising in supervision. This volume contributes to a good holding environment for supervisors (and therefore for their trainees) in that it offers didactic instruction on how to be effective as a supervisor, stimulates discussion of actual supervision material, and emphasizes the need for mutual continuous contemplation of the intersubjective forces in the supervisory encounter.

Jill Savege Scharff M.D.

## Research: Increasing Competence in Supervision and Training for Supervision

### The complex learning process in supervision

The position of the trainee in psychotherapy and psychoanalysis is both difficult and ambiguous (Szecsödy, 1990, 1994, 1997a, 1997b, 1999, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2008). It is hard for the supervisee to be a good enough therapist while still in training. It is difficult to be a real person while being related to in different transference roles, and it is challenging to explore difficulties and frailties openly while being evaluated. It is hard for the *supervisor* to succeed in providing optimal conditions for training and at the same time feel confident of safeguarding the optimal conditions needed for the patient's ongoing therapeutic process. The supervisor must respect the complex identity of adult supervisees and allow for the fact that they may be at different stages professionally. Being trusted, being viewed with

thoughtful curiosity, being greeted with respect and insight into the fact that closeness and distance are needed in different ways at different phases of the trainees' development — all this is important for the creation of the trainee's confidence in her ability to learn and change.

Learning is strongly influenced by existing internal psychic structures, conscious goals, and unconscious intentions. Psychological defenses interfere with the processing of information. Anxiety, pain, shame and excessive guilt block learning. Mental pain may lead to disorganization, where the ability to stay open for new impressions is extremely limited. The experience may lead to a loss of self-esteem and cause shame. The quality of relationships with teachers and supervisors affects processes of imitation and identification that are important aspects of learning. The trainee's ability to think over the interaction with her patient — who may arouse strong feelings and sometimes cause bewilderment — demands that the supervisor be able to create and maintain a platform that leaves room for reflection. The ability to "reconsider" is one important criterion in evaluating how trainees progress in training.

In a descriptive, empirical study, I attempted to observe and clarify how learning takes place in the supervisory situation (Szecsödy, 1990). The primary aim for this hypothesis-generating descriptive study was to clarify and better understand the learning process in the supervision of dynamic

psychotherapy. Transcripts of four conducted supervisions of a Psychotherapy Training Course (1980-1982) were studied qualitatively, using conditional predictions and contrasting the "actual" interaction with an inferred "ideal problem-solving route". Qualities influencing the learning process observed and delineated in the course of the descriptive study were formulated as variables and the transcripts of selected sessions were rated following a manual. Ratings were also made by independent judges, and the scores of the ratings were analyzed with the Principal Component Method.

### **Training of supervisors**

The necessity to increase the competence of supervisors via training is being recognized more than ever before. Already in 1974, as the first decisions were taken to organize psychotherapy training in Sweden, a training program for supervisors was suggested, planned and carried through under the auspices of the University of Stockholm (Jansson, 1975). It was run as an experiment in which both trainers and trainees were highly experienced psychotherapists and psychoanalysts who provided training in parallel to creating ideas about the training itself. In continuous case seminars in small groups, the supervisory work of the members was studied, discussed, and evaluated. In small group seminars, available literature on supervision was read and discussed. Towards the end of this experiment a

provisional taxonomy for future training of supervisors was created by the participants. In 1979 formal training of psychotherapy supervisors was made obligatory in Sweden, and in 1987 this was extended to include the training of supervisors of psychoanalysis. The goals for training of supervisors – as suggested in 1975 at the end of the first supervisor training – were formulated as follows:

- To reflect on and understand her own motives for undertaking supervision beyond the desire to be competent and authorized, such to gain status, to compete, to fulfill illusions, to learn about learning
- To form a learning alliance with the supervisee
- To establish a working platform for herself as supervisor
- To establish and maintain phase specific levels of security in the supervisory situation
- To encourage continuous reflectiveness about the ongoing therapeutic relationship
- To formulate educational diagnoses related to lack of knowledge and skill and discriminate between dumb and blind spots that account for defensive warding off of information
- To focus on the mutuality of interaction between patient and therapist, trainee and supervisor
- To focus on patient/therapist interaction in terms of how the patient's personality, past experiences, conflicts and transference enactments are expressed in the interaction

with this particular therapist and how the therapist experiences this, reacts to it, and interacts with the patient

- To recognize the presence and effect of parallel processes
- To increase the dexterous use of theory
- To encourage the capacity for self-reflection and self-assessment
- To increase the capacity for tolerating uncertainties and not knowing by not forcing the experience to fit preconceived ideas and theories
- To understand and deal with the ever present ambiguities in the supervisory relationship

Each trainee supervisor starts supervising a trainee therapist once a week and meets a super-supervisor every second week. After one year, the frequency of supervision is decreased to every second week and that of the trainee to once a month. The training of supervisors covers three academic terms with seminars on various themes

- a) dynamics of training, dynamics of institutions
- b) the learning alliance
- c) group-dynamics of clinical and supervisory situations
- d) transference, countertransference, and their effect on, and influence by, the institution
- e) the study of the supervisory process in relation to the

psychotherapeutic process.

A useful outcome of the supervision course was that the final evaluation of the course led to a discussion of criteria for evaluating supervisors and supervision.

For the **evaluation of supervisors** 10 criteria can be used:

1. Ability to establish for herself a working platform that allows for play as well as work – similar to the one demonstrated by the super-supervisor
2. Ability to reflect on and recognize the different roles he fills in the training organization and in relation to the institution where the supervisee works
3. Ability to reflect on and understand her own motives for undertaking supervision beyond the goal of being trained and authorized as a supervisor, such as to gain status, to compete, to fulfill illusions, to learn about learning
4. Ability to make a pedagogic diagnosis and differentiate learning problems due to deficit versus conflict
5. Ability to follow and identify the process developing between patient-analyst and between trainee and supervisor
6. Ability to contain and deal with the built- in ambiguities in the supervisory situation without resorting to primitive defenses
7. Ability for establishing phase- specific levels of security in the supervisory situation

8. Ability to provide space for the supervisee to bring in his emotionally cathected experiences of the interaction with the patient
9. Ability for tolerating uncertainties and not knowing by not forcing the experience to fit preconceived ideas and theories
10. Ability to explore and play and enjoy the supervisory work

### **Importance of conducting research on supervision and its training**

Training of supervisors worldwide is still exceptional except in Sweden, Norway, England, Australia, and USA. Study of the training of supervisors is even more unusual. An interesting study in Oslo and Bergen (Reichelt & Skjerve, 2002, Rönnestad & Reichelt, 1999) was conducted on students of psychology and their supervisors in training. The researchers noted a discrepancy between the way that supervision of psychotherapy is described in books and how students experienced it. Many of the supervisors in training were astounded to learn how they actually supervised. The greatest problems were caused by hidden agendas—such as when the supervisor did not openly express what she aimed at—and the lack of a symmetrical, mutually respectful relationship with the supervisee. The most important factor for the student was the personality style of the supervisor, the preferred style being non-authoritative, reassuring, supportive, and tolerant. When the supervisor had strong conceptions about supervision or about the patient brought to

supervision, trainees felt managed.

There are now many Swedish studies on supervision and training of supervisors (Richter, 1980; Holmstedt Lothigius, 1986; Alexius, 1994; Ögren, Apelman & Klawitter, 2003; Boalt Boëthius & Ögren, 2003a, Boalt Boëthius & Ögren, 2003b; Ögren, Apelman & Klawitter, 2003, Ögren & Boalt Boëthius, 2005; Boalt Boëthius, & Ögren, 2006; Ögren, Boalt Boëthius & Sundin, 2008; Sundin, Ögren & Boalt Boëthius, 2008). These studies show the importance of frame keeping, clear structure, openness and directness, tolerance, and serving as a good model for identification. The supervisors saw the need to change their style from being more pedagogic at the beginning to becoming more and more process oriented. The super-supervisors acknowledged that supervision is a profession and requires a specific training.

At Ersta-Sköndal Academy, Stockholm, Sweden, where there is training of supervisors in parallel with training of therapists, four psychotherapy students chose to write their exam theses on their studies of supervisor-training. Two supervisor trainees agreed to give material for these studies. They were interviewed, and three supervisory sessions at the beginning and at the end of training were audiotaped. The resulting four studies, each with a different focus, applied different methodologies (Enoksson, Hartelius, Jonsson, Macek & Szecsödy, 2011). Review of the four studies reveals a remarkable difference between self-report on interview versus independent

review of transcripts. One study based on the interviews reported that both of the supervisor trainees claimed that they had made a change in focus from either patient or therapist to the interaction of patient and therapist and a change in position to that of “being the third”. Both had wished to be collegial with the supervisee at the beginning, but became more conscious of the differences in roles and power towards the end of training. They felt that this made both supervisor and supervisee more relaxed, confident in their position, and therefore more open to give and receive critique. In another of the four studies, interviews and transcripts from one supervisor was compared with the other. One of the supervisors became more active and more educational towards the end of the supervision, feeling more responsibility for the work of the supervisee. The other supervisor became quieter, listening, giving fewer suggestions or instructions, focusing on the here and now, and elucidating transference issues. Two of the four studies looked at the transcripts in depth. One study found that one supervisor was guiding and steering the trainee, could not “let go” and remained rather controlling to the end whereas the other supervisor became more active and cooperative, on a more equal footing with the supervisee, deepening the alliance and focusing on reflecting and understanding the interaction and the countertransference.

It is fascinating, that what trainee supervisors do and what they think

they do differ so much, seen when transcriptions of audio taped therapies and supervisions are compared to self report from trainee therapist and trainee supervisor. The overall impression is that there is a discrepancy between the literature on supervision and the reality. The ideal is that the influence of the supervisor decreases during the process. Several other studies (Reichelt & Skjerve, 2002; Rønnestad & Reichelt, 1999; Szecsödy, 1900) confirm the finding that it is difficult to loosen control in supervision. It is encouraging that trainees were willing to be part of these studies.

## Conclusion

To close I wish to stress the importance of learning more about how supervision is conducted. It is my hope that individual supervisors as well as institutes responsible for the training of psychotherapists and psychoanalysts as well as those who train them, will be interested in pursuing the topic. I suggest the use of the Tuckett (2005) model of the frame that I apply to supervision (Szecsödy 2008).

Here is a summary of the proposed frame for supervision

1. *Participant-observational frame* refers to the construction and maintenance of an interactional space, openness to the study of narrative of therapy, learning problems of supervisee, and use the supervisee makes of supervision.

2. *Supervisory conceptual frame* refers to the supervisor's conceptualization of the learning and teaching process and its compatibility with the trainee's thoughts about therapy and supervision
3. *Supervisory interventional frame* refers to the handling of the learning alliance and the transference-countertransference dialectic in the therapeutic and supervisory situation
4. *Evaluation frame* refers to the way in which evaluation is handled during and at the end of supervision

It is possible to use Tuckett's frame to study live supervisions, audiotaped or videotaped supervisory sessions, and self-report of supervisory sessions by supervisors and supervisees. I wish that every supervisee, supervisor, and trainer of supervisors would audiotape or videotape their sessions now and then – all sessions or perhaps every fifth session – not only to collect them for research, but also for review and assessment of the progress of supervisee and supervisor, and for a continuous openness to learn and deepen their competence. It is essential to go on with studies on training of therapists, supervisors and trainers of supervisors, to learn from it and share this knowledge.

## Does anything go in psychoanalytic supervision?

The supervisory situation should provide conditions in which learning can develop and the candidate can integrate his personal and professional experiences, theoretical knowledge and his personality for a competent handling of the psychoanalytic situation. The supervisory process is complex and multi-determined, influenced by many factors, including the personality of participants, their previous experience, the structure of the training organization, and inherent ambiguities such as autonomy versus subordination and openness versus fear of being evaluated and assessed. The supervisor has to establish a working platform differentiating his own motives from other manifest and often conflicting interests in the supervisory system. I call the system of relationships and interests of analysand, analyst, supervisor, and Institute the *extended clinical rhombus*. Psychoanalysts need to study how to conduct supervision, how to train supervisors, and how to work within the extended clinical rhombus.

The aim of supervision is for the candidate to acquire *core competencies* for conducting psychoanalysis on his own. There are many articles and books published about psychoanalytic education and not a few of them are critical of it. Challenges to models of training are often heated, divergent, and repetitive. As Kernberg (1986) wrote in *Problems of Psychoanalytic Education*:

“Idealization processes and an ambiance of persecution are practically universal in psychoanalytic institutes. Psychoanalytic education is all too often conducted in an atmosphere of indoctrination rather than of open scientific exploration. In conclusion, the changes in the structure of psychoanalytic education proposed, tending to strengthen the university college and art academy models - at the expense of reducing the technical school and, particularly, the monastery or religious retreat models - should go a long way in reducing the pervasive idealization and persecution processes that plague psychoanalytic institutes” (1986 p. 833).

In his paper *Does Anything Go?* (2005) David Tuckett held that judgments about candidate's competence are mainly based on implicit global criteria. He suggested using a three-frame approach with explicit and transparent indicators of competent practice. The use of this framework would allow institutes to know what criteria a person must fulfill to be judged as ready to qualify as a competent psychoanalyst. Deborah Cabaniss (2000, 2004) and her colleagues at the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research conducted studies on how candidates' progression was experienced and evaluated at the larger institutes of the American Psychoanalytic Association. They found that there is a lack of clarity

of the criteria to be used in judging the competence of candidates. Candidates must get credit for cases in order to graduate. The cases must continue for a long enough time period (average 18.3 months) and demonstrate "the presence of analytic process". Furthermore, supervisors are the ones who decide whether a case counts. Instead of being defined by vague criteria, competence could be defined as the capacity to work within the three linked frames that Tuckett described specific to psychoanalysis:

- i) *participant-observational* (ability to construct and maintain a specifically psychoanalytic setting in the analyst's mind),
- ii) *conceptual* (ability to identify and conceptualize the development of the analytic process)
- iii) *interventional* (ability to make appropriate psychoanalytic interventions).

The European Psycho-analytic Federation Working Party on Psychoanalytic Education (WPE) organized a number of workshops to test how to use these frames on examples of supervisory sessions, presented by analysts from different European societies.

Parallel to Tuckett's work, members of the WPE Gabor Szönyi and Bien Filet started a study on psychoanalytic competencies. They defined 27 core competencies. They collected the items on the list from several resources, which used competency lists taken from lists gathered for other purposes. So

the items reflect terms from different origins and degrees of complexity without re-definition for relating to psychoanalysis. They used the list to generate questions for a survey of an ample number of psychoanalysts, candidates and psychotherapists, to learn what they regarded as the specific, essential qualities for analytic work. As a second step they linked these competencies to the different components of training. They emphasized that explicit criteria are relevant to all aspects of the educational and training process including the selection of students, theoretical teaching, ongoing assessment, and final evaluation. They meant that it is important to be explicit about the competencies of training analysts, teachers, and supervisors as well as candidates.

### **How to gain and evaluate competence of supervisor**

The number of publications that focus on the systematic study of supervision are rather few, and hardly any of them were done by candidates (Cabaniss 2000, 2004, Caligor 1984, Dijkuis 1979, Fleming & Benedek 1966, Gross-Doehrman 1976, Kline 1977, Kubie 1958, Martin 1978, Reichelt & Skjerva (2002), Sandell 1985, Szecsödy 1990, Wallerstein 1981).

The supervisory situation should provide conditions in which learning can develop, which is quite difficult and can be complicated by trainee as well as by supervisor. In *“Psychoanalytic models of supervision: issues and ideas”*

(an internal working paper of the EPF-WPE compiled by Mary Target and Eva Aronowitsch 2002-02-22) Anders Zachrison wrote about the learning process:

"Learning of skills calls for training, the development of an analytic attitude calls for education. Education implies growth, autonomy and creativity (ego and ego ideal functions); training implies acquisition of dos and don'ts from an authority (superego functions). In a good supervision process these aspects of the learning process are integrated in an enriching and fruitful way. Another way to describe the process is as a progression from imitation, via internalization to identity. If imitation is the end product, the result is lack of autonomy (a cloning of the teacher). But imitation may have a place as the first step towards an analytic identity. This identity is achieved after the teacher's attitudes and ways of thinking have been assimilated and integrated with one's own understanding and thinking. This process, however, has to build on the acquisition of knowledge and skills. And it is important that the candidate has 2 or 3 supervisors to provide him with more than one model of thinking, and more than one analytic dialect, out of which to develop his own identity. The analytic attitude requires the ability to distinguish between professional, personal and private, most importantly between private and personal. Because transference/countertransference material is at the heart of the analytic process, the analyst needs to be able to make this distinction in order to avoid blurring the process with private matters. Being personal is different from being private. The analyst's personal presence (as more than a mirror or screen) is a prerequisite for a deepening of the contact with the analysand" (p.5).

In my opinion, even if imitation, identification, internalization do play a part in acquiring competence, it is more important to receive continuous stimulus and support so that the candidate can integrate his personal and professional experiences, theoretical knowledge, and his personality for a competent participation in the psychoanalytic situation and in the art of

helping people examine themselves and their respective situations so that they will eventually be able to come to decisions that make sense, given their particular personalities and their circumstances (Field, Cohler & Wool 1989). The more skilled and learned supervisor can propose ways to understand the "material" but it should be combined and based on mutual reflection on what is going on in the analytic as well as the supervisory situation. I would question the term "psychoanalytic identity", as each of us has our own identity, rooted in personal experiences, training, and professional work.

The supervisor's conscious, intentional influence on the supervision and the supervisee, together with what is unconscious, ought to be given more attention than it has previously received. Besides the fact that the complex, multidimensional, heavily charged emotional interaction between analysand-analyst and supervisee-supervisor is a challenge to the supervisors' ability to contain, understand, and assist the candidate in his development, supervisors must in addition reflect on, and admit, that they may have had a negative influence on the process. Well aware that their competence and status will be disputed and questioned if the supervision or the supervised analysis comes to nothing, they may defend themselves without being aware of it by re-establishing a position of power and interpret their own teaching problems in terms of the analysand's and the candidate's resistance, anxiety, and limitations rather than observing and recognizing them in themselves. These

influences are multiplied by the fact that supervisors are obliged to control and judge the work conducted by the supervisee in the best interest of the patient, the profession, and the institute.

There is still a certain antagonism between adherents to an 'experiential' model which expects the supervisee to observe, accept, and understand her own role in its conscious and unconscious aspects in relation to both the analysand and to the supervisor, and the didactic model in this supervisors expect to increase the candidate's competence without concern for problems arising from reactions and limitations with roots in the candidate's personality which they believe should be taken up only in the candidate's analysis. In my opinion, it is undeniably important for the candidate to own his history, to have insight into his idiosyncrasies, his reactions to aggressive and sexual challenges, his handling of circumstances where he has been dependent, rejected, offended, exploited or appreciated and loved. Problems that have not been worked through can block learning and infringe on supervision. But, referring the candidate to his analyst can be interpreted as the candidate being rejected, and this may damage the continuing work of the supervision. Many times the supervisor may observe, in co-operation with the candidate, the way in which a recurring reaction or behavior, seemingly with roots more in the candidate's own history than in his patient's, affects his relation to the patient. A respectful analysis of this

can stimulate the candidate to make a decision about a renewed or deeper analysis for himself.

Fortified by my studies of the learning process during psychotherapy supervision (Szecsödy 1990) I recommend a facilitating as opposed to a confrontational stance. The candidate's learning problems are always allied to his goal of interacting analytically with his patient, and that is where the supervisor can help for the benefit of the patient and the candidate. One must observe the student's mistakes and think with him about what happened. I favor a technique, where the student's countertransference is presented as part of the therapeutic paradigm, which means that the reactions of the candidate are a natural part of the analytic process and not a reflection of his pathology. It is also better to stimulate the candidate to think about the significance of the interaction than to make suggestions about how he should continue, for this may intensify his uncertainty and anxiety before he has enough information and understanding. The supervisor needs to exercise caution in approaching the candidate's participation in the tumult of interactions during analytic and supervisory sessions. Rather than giving premature explanations, the supervisor should try to explore what he tried to ward off using different defenses to do so. Many supervisors become unduly supportive or actively intervene, explaining, giving corrective information about the patient, relevant psychoanalytic theory and treatment strategies.

According to psychoanalytic theory, the patient in analysis is directly and indirectly, manifestly and latently expressing wishes, needs and intentions towards the analyst in the narrative of the interaction.

Concomitant with this, the patient reacts to his thoughts and feeling and elicits responses from the analyst, which often form a repetitive pattern. To recognize and work with these patterns in the psychoanalytic interaction is a general aim of psychoanalysis. The unconscious, intentional influence of the analyst in perceiving and selecting these themes has to be acknowledged, recognized and understood, so that analysis can be conducted in the primary interest of the patient. In my study of supervisory processes, I found that changes in the trainee's level of understanding occurred regularly in a context that I wish to call a 'mutative learning situation' drawing on Loewald's term for change in psychoanalysis (Loewald 1960). These changes happen when the trainee experiences something contrary to expectations and sees the difference between the expected and the actual experience.

Our basic frame of reference is there to facilitate our work but can also restrict understanding if we interpret our experiences within the frame according to our theories and expectations seen through colored glasses.

Leuzinger-Bohleber (1984) studied how 80 analysts judged a videotaped interview. Interviewing the analysts during and immediately after the viewing of the tape, she collected and systematized information about the

observing and decision making process. Her study suggested that an important quality distinguishing analysts is their readiness to "reconsider" in contrast to need to "justify" their judgments of selections and interventions. This ability to "reconsider" is an important criterion in evaluating the progress of candidates.

Both supervisor and supervisee operate in the context of a formal organization, which relies on preconceived notions of what is right and wrong. The narcissistic needs of the educators to gain power and receive admiration are secured by the idealization of hierarchic structures for the preservation of "the true gold of psychoanalysis". As confirmed in the studies conducted on the training in the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute, idealization is extensive and permanent (Szecsödy 2003).

In his valuable book, *Hate and Love in Psychoanalytic Institutions. The Dilemma of a Profession*, Jürgen Reeder (2004) emphasizes the integral ambiguity of training institutions, in which explicit and implicit power is used to convey and preserve certain values. He describes the professional and institutional superego activated in psychoanalytic institutions and culture. This superego is related to the almost incestuous intimacy that prevails between trainers and trainees, the wish to strengthen individuality despite uncertainties; the idealization of the masters; the need for continuous self-reflection and self-questioning; and the need for support yet the impossibility

of getting said support because of the need to protect confidentiality and avoid being judged or seen as deviant. This superego is also rooted in the soil of transferences, rivalry, and power-struggle both in reality as well as in the pre-oedipal and oedipal dynamics of individual development. Reeder repeatedly mentions that our educational models tend to indoctrinate rather than rely on epistemological search! Our reluctance to scrutinize our educational programs and our reluctance to be cognizant of the limitations of our knowledge is a serious problem for our profession (Eisold 2004).

As Victor Calef (1972) reported after the 4th Pre-congress on training in Vienna, the capacity to take responsibility is an important quality in the candidate and future analyst. I believe that the involvement of the candidate in his own assessment is essential. Greater freedom to question and explore, together with a wider circle of input and feedback, can contribute significantly not only to that candidate in particular but to increased organizational flexibility and growth in general. We need to devote more attention to making explicit our educational goals and the rationale behind them, and to question the underlying ideas that shaped them, the influence of theoretical, ideological, educational, cultural and historical forces on stated as well as latent goals, and the detail and overall structure and performance of training.

We have to differentiate between evaluation and assessment.

*Evaluation* emphasizes mutuality, reflection, feedback, working alliance, clarification, and working through of problems. In evaluation, internalization of an analytic attitude occurs at the level of ego and ego ideal.

*Assessment* emphasizes the certification of competence, and thereby functions rather more at a superego level. Supervision can be confidential without becoming secretive, and transparent, explicit criteria can be maintained. The presence of the third (the Institute) can and should be made transparent.

Writing after the EPF-WPE retreat on supervision in Amsterdam, Aronowitsch (2002) held that evaluation can and should be a continuous and mutual one, following the training of the candidate throughout. Already the process of selection enhances the feeling of “being chosen.” It would be better not to convey at admission a promise that one will be made a psychoanalyst. But as it stands, the sense of specialness is increased throughout training – as psychoanalysis is often viewed as elite, as if better than psychotherapy. We need to reflect and understand why and how each seminar, analysis, supervision and so on went the way it did. The entire training should not become a secret place where nobody is allowed to interfere. We have to work against the idealization of the profession and of training by trainers and candidates. It is best for candidate and for institution if the candidate is included in evaluating how learning proceeds and becoming more aware of

the positive and negative influence candidate and trainer can have in this learning (Szecsödy, I. 1999).

One could argue for separating training, evaluation of learning, and certification of competence. One could argue that external judges should make the assessment. At the least, we have to be open and transparent in our evaluations – to engage candidates actively in the evaluation and planning of training, and to engage ourselves in research and theoretical work within our societies and in co-operation with other sciences and the academic world.

As Kernberg's papers (1986, 1996, 2000) are familiar to most, I will refer to the lesser known article by Silke Wiegand-Grefe (2004); she made 12 suggestions for change which can be paraphrased as follows:

1. Make training more professional and transparent
2. Change the hierarchical structure into a democratic one in which all discussions, evaluations and decisions are transparent and candidates take part in all committees
3. Include research and scientific work as an ample part of training
4. Stop emphasizing the generic term "psycho-analytic identity" and accept that each analyst had his own identity, rooted in personal experiences, training, and professional work.
5. Strive against idealizing psychoanalysis and psychoanalysts by continuously looking objectively at all parts of training – personal/didactic analysis, supervision, and seminars

6. Do not use diagnostic terms during admission and selection but make admission a mutual process of selection and goal definition
7. Base training on scientific ideals, supervision with a transparent and mutual evaluation process, and didactic analysis consisting of a maximum of 300-400 sessions, conducted outside the institute
8. Thoroughly revise the whole training, take into consideration the candidates' former education and training and keep it to 5 years in length
9. Consider a separate curriculum for some depending on former training and future plans of practice
10. Define the competencies of supervisors and seminar leaders responsible for training
11. Organize the institute like a university not a family enterprise
12. Continuously reflect on the organization of the institute and its quality control

The need to increase the competence of supervisors via training is more and more recognized (Szecsödy 1994). Yet there are only a few institutes with organized training for supervisors. Training of psychotherapy supervisors was established in Sweden 1974 and training of supervisors of psychoanalysis in 1987. Individual members of the Society can apply for the training. Formal requirements are 4,000 hours of analytic work after acquisition of full membership. A committee of five training analysts

interviews the applicants. The applicant has to give a presentation of his analytic work intertwining theory and technique. The presentation is discussed with the members of the committee. The applicant is present during the whole discussion, including the evaluation of her/his presentation. The board of the institute's function is to authorize the recommendation as well as to administer appeals. Those who received the assignment as a training analyst can apply to enter the training for supervisors. The training is geared to preparing the supervisor to address the candidates' learning problems such as lack of experience, skill and knowledge, and defensive avoidance of information due to conflicts relative to the patient and the supervisor's problems about the candidate's learning problems (Ekstein and Wallerstein 1958).

## **The Experience of Supervisor-Supervisee Pairs Presenting Live Supervision**

It is often claimed that the tripartite system of psychoanalytic education is the best available, yet, we know that it produces a trade-school atmosphere which spawns practitioners and not scholars or researchers, that it often stifles creativity and questioning. Although many psychoanalysts complain about the system of training, they do not work for reform. Most often at the outset of training much effort is put into conveying the method according to the book as much as possible. Traditions, conflictual organizational dynamics, and primitive defenses contribute to the rationale for how training is designed and defined. Many highly talented and creative candidates become discouraged and disenchanted by the shortcomings of training and the attitudes in the professional psychoanalytic community. Though psychoanalysis faces a crisis, there are few systematic studies on the process and outcome of psychoanalytic training. It would be instructive to gather

data on the process and its results during the training and devise some studies to see what kind of analysts emerge from the different training modalities at the end of it. From the results of our assessment, we then need to build innovative training models.

“Learning in supervision: a mutual experience” was chosen as the theme of the 17th IPA pregress for 1997. This chapter is based on a report of the follow up responses received from supervisors and supervisees who presented at the 8th IPA Conference of Training Analysts in Barcelona 1997 and who responded to a questionnaire concerning their experience. By including supervising analysts and candidate supervisees, the organizers intended to focus on learning and to create a mutual assessment of this aspect of supervision. They invited 24 pairs of supervisors and candidates or recent graduates to present material from, and thoughts about, their work together in terms of: a) the configuration of the supervisory setting b) the creation and maintenance of the learning alliance c) ambiguities in the supervisory situation d) promotion or inhibition of development of mutual learning in the supervisor and the candidate, e) the promotion of independent and creative psychoanalytic thinking f) the influence of the institution on mutual learning.

The organizing committee in 1997 received both encouragement as well as criticism for inviting candidates and recent graduates to a conference of training analysts. In his report from the 4th IPA pre-congress on training

back in 1971, Victor Calef had already emphasized that “the capacity to take responsibility is an important quality in the candidate and future analyst, and that the involvement of the candidate in his own assessment was repeatedly urged in the discussion. Greater freedom to question and explore, together with a wider circle of input and feedback, can contribute significantly to increased organizational flexibility and growth.” Nevertheless, in 1997, the view of a significant number of institutes and training analysts was still that they had to protect their candidates from participation in their own evaluation and from taking part in the discussion about how supervision in general and the style of their supervisors in particular influence their learning!

The major concern was that inviting the candidate to participate at a training analysts conference would interfere both with the learning process and with the candidates’ conduct of the analyses involved despite previous positive experience with the method. Supervisee-supervisor pairs from four institutes where supervision was already being studied systematically had given presentations prior to the Barcelona conference, and almost all of the supervisors had emphasized the positive and enriching experience of working with the candidate preparing and presenting their work and only one of them had questioned the value of discussion in the presence of the candidate. Nevertheless concerns reached the organizing committee. So, the

organizing committee for this pregress decided that this time data must be collected. They arranged to do a thorough follow-up, contacting each supervisor and supervisee to learn how they had experienced their participation at the conference – how it was for them preparing their presentations, what it was like actually participating in the Conference, how the presentation was used in the discussion groups, what happened in the aftermath of the Conference, and what influence they noted on their clinical work with the analysand, their work in supervision, and the institute to which they belonged. Similar questions were submitted to the supervisors: how did the participation at the conference influence their work with the candidates and their relationship with their institute? After the conference a questionnaire was sent to all 24 presenting supervisees and supervisors asking them to provide their answers and to add their own spontaneous comments on the experience preparing for and taking part in the conference (questionnaire is attached). Out of the 24 pairs, 23 supervisors (95%) and 20 supervisees (85%) answered the questionnaire.

### **Responses from supervisees**

Responses from supervisees: 12 from Latin America; 6 from Europe, 6 from USA.

No response from supervisees: 1 from US, 2 from Europe, 1 from Latin America

All the supervisees who responded stressed that the preparation for the conference together with the supervisor increased the sense of collaboration and comprehension of the psychoanalytic process, and propelled a mutual effort to understand both the analytic and the supervisory interaction. Most of them emphasized what a useful experience it was to reflect on different approaches to the analytic process, on how learning takes place, and how knowledge is transmitted. Most of the supervisees experienced a transition to greater collaboration and respect in the context of which they felt that they matured from childhood to adulthood. The relationship with the supervisor was enriched and deepened. Many underscored the impression that their identity as analysts deepened. They all emphasized that the relationship with the patient was not negatively influenced - at least on a consciously perceivable level - even though one analysand had clearly perceived the analyst's engagement in something outside the analytic setting. A few referred to the "crossing of boundaries from private to public" as they prepared to present to an audience, and yet they considered this a valuable experience. The triangular dynamics between supervisee-supervisor-training analysts attracted the attention of one candidate.

According to a number of candidates, the quality of the discussion in the small-groups was clearly dependent on the moderator. In most groups the focus was on the aspects of learning and supervisory interaction. 4

candidates mentioned the feeling of being intruded upon, criticized, and super-supervised in the groups. Several respondents mentioned the value of the cross-cultural composition of groups and the importance of respectful listening and acknowledgement of their work.

The institutes of the Latin American societies were strongly committed to the idea and gave support to the presentations of the candidates, while in Europe there was no positive and even some negative involvement from institutes that questioned the propriety of candidate participation and expressed the fear that the experience might negatively influence the supervisory and the analytic process. None of the candidates who answered the questionnaire reported that their participation had any negative effect on their work with analysand and/or supervisor.

The general emphasis was that supervisors should make an effort to increase the competence of the candidate, and to reflect upon how they themselves function as supervisors. For instance, were they able to avoid interfering with and rivaling the supervisees or using them for narcissistic gratification? 6 supervisees had been invited to attend the two group sessions on the second day of the conference but of those who had attended only their own sessions, 6 mentioned that they would have preferred to be included in the whole of conference and they asked to receive the evaluation of the meeting and to read a review of the conference by the organizing

committee. 4 supervisees mentioned that they will continue with the study of the supervisory process, and offered to write up their experience of the conference and the supervisory process, focusing on how learning is facilitated as well as hindered and how knowledge is transmitted. Some of them mentioned the importance of being included in the evaluation process of the problematic supervisor as well as of the candidate.

### **Responses from supervisors**

Responses: 12 from Latin America, 5 from Europe, 6 from USA,  
(one of which did not use the questionnaire)

No response: 1 from Europe

Most supervisors described the preparation of the presentation as a mutually enriching, stimulating, intense, and profound experience. It gave them the impetus to reflect about process, style, and manner of dealing with transference-countertransference issues in both analytic and supervisory interactions. Open exchanges with the candidate as an independent thinker and writing together in partnership were positive experiences. Only a few mentioned a candidate's experience of anguish over the presentation. Discussion dealt with how to work with countertransference reactions and blind spots in the candidate without invading the privacy of the candidate's personal analysis. Some emphasized that they became much freer to include personal elements in the supervisory work. The group discussions were

mostly supportive, nonintrusive, and enhancing of confidence. Some emphasized that teaching and learning are different processes and that it is extremely important for a supervisors to learn how they influence the candidates' learning. One of the discussion groups stayed focused on mutual preconscious contact and influence between the three participants – patient/candidate/supervisor. In all the discussion groups there were different perceptions about what constitutes psychoanalytic knowledge and how to convey it. For the most part these differences stimulated discussion but sometimes hampered it.

## **Quotations and Comments from Supervisees and Supervisors after the pregress event**

### **Comments from Supervisees:**

“Expanded relationship with supervisor (caring, friendship, respect, mutual learning. Enriching for development as analyst, demystified, freer to develop and write from own perspective. Preparing deepened and consolidated relationship with supervisor; discuss, broaden ideas; extremely positive experience. Analysis not influenced directly, but indirectly as analytic identity deepened. Institute not really interested”.

“To prepare the paper, allowed for a wider comprehension of the analytical work; we could establish our different positions and see how mutual learning process influences change of personality. Enriching to acknowledge the difficulties implicit in becoming an analyst, which is not an even and continuous path but full of complexities”.

“The crossing of frontiers was a central experience; clinical work assumed

a different dimension: turning public what is private, observing more carefully my style of making contact with the patient, all the difficulties to present clinical material with always nuances and particularities”.

“The level of discussion in the small group was high; the questions posed were motivating for clinical, theoretical and institutional critical thinking. It was well conducted by coordinator. Negative was to be told we could not attend later sessions. I am not against a hierarchy of institutions; training analysts have to have their private time, as candidates do too. But there is a tendency to infantilize the candidates, treating them as somebody that should not find out about some dangerous topics!”

“The group was relaxed, open to learn from the candidate. Do go on with conferences like this; a good analyst is not always a good teacher; and the candidate too dependent to criticize! Should have criteria for helpful, encouraging supervisor, who does not satisfy narcissistic needs”.

“I had a stimulating and positive reaction towards my supervisor; we did receive support from the Institute but also met with a critical attitude”.

“My attitude to the patient did not change, but the method of following the patient changed to a more complete one”.

“I was first somewhat uneasy to publicly present a private relationship , but it was very positive to show how we agree/disagree and did solidify our intuitive connection and we worked on with continued ease”.

“A valuable experience”.

“After the presentation we had a much better understanding with each other and of how we work together”.

“After the conference we got a closer tie with the institute.”

“Strengthened in my opinion that too much of our training remains unsaid, especially when it concerns supervision; it is important to

bring candidates together; I believe in a constant dialogue. We came to understand the process better during our preparation for the conference, we did find common grounds, did see parallel processes. It was a mutual learning. Our relationship progressed, became more a consultation than supervision; could freely talk about frustrations, and about evaluation. Supervision is becoming gradually more a theme for discussion at our Institute."

"Prepared to present our experience in the institute. I have now more trust in my own learning and a stimulated interest in supervision."

"I am very much interested in how psychoanalytic knowledge is transmitted, and to share experiences with analysts of different backgrounds. It reinforced our relationship, new light, increased interest to conceptualise. We had firm support from our Institute".

"I was enriched by the cross-cultural aspects, but did miss a vision of the whole meeting, as I could not attend the final plenary. The committee could organise a publication containing the papers and the result of this research".

"The first reaction of the group was rather disappointing, they wanted more clinical evidence not our approach to deal with mutual aspects of supervision. I was invited to attend next day, and was surprised by the intensity of my own participation, passionate, positive-enriching experience. Deep discussion concerning ways of working, relation supervisor/supervisee. Strengthened our relationship, to revise/reread, rethink. Decided continue investigate field".

"We could touch on matters of countertransference in supervision. Would have been good/important to remain in the group throughout to think more deeply. I did use my own analysis to understand and work with my reactions to presentation. It was important to reflect on my concerns to protect patient, confidentiality, privacy, still not to overwork the process, to be available for spontaneous discoveries. Much was stirred up that lead to valuable learning".

"The group was very interested in the candidate's perspective on supervision and how supervision can do wrong. I was somewhat disappointed that there was really very little discussion of

mutuality and that supervision is still very much considered as a 'downhill' process from supervisor to candidate".

## Comments from Supervisors

"Discussion extraordinary interesting, intense, profound, sincere, helpful for reflecting more. Valuable experience, able to reflect."

"The major achievement was that the candidate was invited to all sessions; it was the best way for all to learn and share experience and have an open exchange of ideas. Our relationship was well perceived as mutually respectful, open to experiment on a "playground".

"The plenary at the end was somewhat repetitive".

"All in all a very positive experience, solidarity and partnership. The supervisee could bring up more confident material which led to new perspectives on our work. The analysis is evolving well".

"Intense anguish in transference was seen also in supervision. Elaboration of this allowed rethinking and deepening of experience. Reflecting about the analytic and supervisory process provided a maturing experience, patient also benefited, and so did I, the supervisor, mature"

"We did rethink many questions: what is supervision, a training supervision, function of supervision, influence of the and on the emotional experience of the analytic pair. New questions in the group-discussion: emergence of supervisee's identity being respected by supervisor; how to research transference and countertransference phenomena of analyst, how to discriminate supervision from personal analysis, to respect, and not invade it, still demystify the omnipotence and omniscience of training analyst; to differentiate mutual learning from mimetic learning! Discussion is going on at our institute. I do not believe in the absolute neutrality of the supervisor - he should become aware of unconscious rivalry and conflicts with the evolving candidate. Super-supervision is important".

"Preparation promoted special reflection about supervision. Preparing together had increased our capacity to communicate the process to each other and comprehension of process with the patient. The Institute is interested, discussion continues".

"I have serious doubts regarding the utility of this system, in this environment. That the candidate had to leave halfway (even if it permitted a greater degree of freedom in the discussion of the case) was infantilizing for the candidate who already suffers enough of this experience during the usual training process. Preparing was positive, but not transcendental, based on a very good working relationship - without which it could become a distorting experience. No major changes, maybe increased theoretical preoccupation which I do not consider as favourable. Our Institute remained on the sidelines."

"The experience with the group was positive. The supervisee is now a colleague. The Institute was not in favour for the participation, but we did not ask for permission."

"The candidates conduct did not change, but his understanding of the patient improved. Our Institute is involved and interested. Be sure that confidentiality is provided".

"Most important was to get the privileged authenticity of the candidate and ignore the aspect of authority from the didactic analyst and the consequent intrusion of childish aspects in the candidate. We chose to mark the individuality of our jointly work to the congress during its writing, presentation and the congress. The discussion group was receptive, did not overstep in interpretation or criticism the supervisee. It gave also an opportunity to question the way knowledge is transmitted - not to clone candidates and produce childish dependency and imitation. It was interesting to notice the transference remains in every relationship, the unavoidable presence of the personal was noticed as well as the respect for the individuality of the experience. From the institute there was a lack of interest in the IPA activities, with many reactions against the project to invite candidates. In the whole I feel the proposal, the project and debate are a progress in the creative freedom of analysis. Wish would be more frequent experience".

"Teaching and learning two highly different processes and if the candidate

is not included in these discussions, the supervisors who teach do not have data as to the effectiveness of their teaching. Highly appropriate for the learner to be present! Single candidate might be intimidated - but highly advantageous if different candidates can explore different supervisory experiences together with supervisors."

"The presence of the supervisee was an important facilitating factor in the success of the whole enterprise. It was unfortunate that the supervisee was not asked to stay with the group for the next day. The compromise solution arrived at in order to accommodate objections was unfortunate and potentially destructive. The underlying controversy pertains to the different perceptions of what constitutes psychoanalytic knowledge and to the best way to convey it. As an educator Freud operated for the most part within the realm of a positivistic epistemology and therefore it is not surprising that many analysts still operate within the bounds of it.

Accordingly psychoanalysis is in possession of a body of knowledge that can only be revealed within a completely structured situation in which the teacher remain in full control. Under such circumstances supervision resembles the analytic process despite the procedural differences involved. Anything that disrupts the formal structure is considered intrusive and destructive. In recent years many analysts have departed from such notions. The body of knowledge of Psychoanalysis is for them not so well developed and interwoven with personal and idiosyncratic notions. In the supervisory setting the supervisor is perceived as a facilitator or as a constant where the interaction is only partially dialectic. There is a flexible procedural structure".

"The candidate became interested to write a paper on supervision from the candidates perspective.

"The exchange with colleagues and presence of supervisee in the discussions was helpful, promoting a meaningful supervisory exchange. I will write a paper on this".

"We presented our paper for the institute, which resulted in enthusiastic planning to repeat this kind of presentations. Discussion in the institute reduces superego fantasies and stimulates to transmit experience from both parts".

## **Answers to the follow-up study questions**

**Do the presenters confirm/disconfirm the assumption that the participation of the candidate will add new and important information about the supervisory process and increase understanding about what facilitates or hinders learning?**

With two exceptions the participation did add new information and increased understanding. The assumption is confirmed.

**Do the presenters confirm/disconfirm that the participation of the candidate did intrude and negatively influence the supervisory process?**

The participation did not have a negative influence.

**Do the presenters confirm/disconfirm the assumptions that the presence of the candidate will hinder free discussion and reinforce the defenses of the candidates, and that conflicts could be acted out and negatively intervene with learning?**

Two supervisors mentioned that the presence of the candidate did hamper discussion. Many emphasized that the candidate's presence was advantageous for the discussion and two wished that the invitation should have been for the whole conference. In six groups the candidate was invited

by the group to stay for the second day.

**Do the presenters report directly or indirectly that by revealing confidential material they were affected by the transgression of the boundaries around the supervisory interaction?**

Three candidates mentioned that they were concerned about this and worked with the question. In one instance the intrusion of the coming presentation and its effect on the analytic process did become the focus of supervision. None experienced any negative effect.

**Do the presenters confirm or disconfirm that they learned something new from the experience of preparing and doing a conjoined presentation?**

Almost without exception, both candidates and supervisors emphasize strongly, that they did learn from preparing and participating in the conjoint presentation.

**Do the presenters confirm/disconfirm that the presentation influenced the conduct of the candidate's analytic work in any way?**

One presenter emphasized that the presentation was experienced as an intruder both in the analytic and in the supervisory process, perceived in the

dream-material of the analysand; but this did also enrich the supervision and also deepened the analytic process. To break the frame demands a firm and secure structure. According to the other respondent there was a positive influence on the ongoing analytic work.

**Do the presenters confirm or disconfirm that the presentation influenced the conduct of the supervisory work in any way?**

Did not interfere negatively, for the most it had a facilitating influence.

**Did the presentation have any effect on the participant's relation to the institute?**

Mostly not, with the exception of two Latin American, two North American, and one European Institute.

**Did the presenters experience that the discussion in the small-groups was focused on the preselected aspects of the supervisory process?**

According to a majority the focus was on the pre-selected aspects, in three groups it became more a supervision of supervision.

**Do the presenters confirm/or disconfirm that the work they put**

### **into participating in the conference was worthwhile?**

Without exception those who answered felt it worthwhile.

### **Do the presenters agree to collaborate with a follow up five years after the conference?**

All of those who answered are willing to collaborate with a future follow-up.

## **Conclusion**

I would like to close this chapter with a quotation from Leo Stone's 1975 paper: "The scientific group, like the individual whose sense of self and essential worthwhileness are well founded and secure, need not fear contacts with others, nor confrontations with new ideas and new methods" (p. 367). Nor indeed need it fear evolution, modification, and possibly improvement deriving from other contemporary sciences. Cross-fertilization is not to be equated with contamination. Most of the respondents emphasized the importance of becoming more aware of the mutuality of the supervisory process and the positive influence of involving the candidate to reflect on and evaluate how learning proceeds and to become more aware of the positive respective negative influence both parties can have in this. The crisis in

psychoanalysis can stimulate a response that is more profound than the usual individual and group self-examination. We need to respond by relinquishing the residues of a priestly omniscience that refuses to be susceptible to criticism from within or without. Giving this up will be in no sense a regression or a loss. It will be a prodigious advance. Psychoanalysis in its present form still has a plenitude of untapped resources to offer as science, as therapy, and as the parent to other therapeutic methods. It will probably remain the optimum treatment for certain individuals in the foreseeable future and a valuable basic training experience for all psychotherapists. In its present strictly delimited form, it provides a source of data, a model for comparative study, and a basis for experimental variations of incalculable value. But it would be fundamentally wrong to assume that it cannot change, or should not be changed, if adequate reasons for such change are developed. Well considered efforts in this direction should be welcomed with an open and tolerant mind, encouraged, and examined critically to be sure of the path. An important aspect of that change will depend on the place of the candidates in training and within the training institutions moving on from that of pupil to equally responsible collaborator.

## Supervision—a complex tool for psychoanalytic training

The tripartite system for psychoanalytic training has been an official requirement in the training of candidates since 1924 but it was not until 1993 that the topic of supervision was considered at a Conference of Training Analysis. David Sachs opened his introductory paper at the Sixth IPA Conference of Training Analysts in 1993 in Amsterdam with the following words: “Psychoanalytic education rests on a three-legged, educational stool; the training analysis, didactic courses and supervision. Such stools have a tendency toward instability whenever undue weight is placed upon one leg.”

He continued: “Reading the anonymous vignettes which we have received from the participants of the Conference, the Organizing Committee became convinced that the difficulty of the task [of supervision] has been greatly underestimated by the profession. It is remarkable that neither training in doing supervision nor study of the existing literature is required of new

training analysts. Apparently, the traditional assumption has been that the training analysts simply have the ability supervise” Sachs paraphrased a paper prepared by Alicia B Casullo and Silvia Resnitzky, two candidates representing IPSO, the candidate organization, in the following way: “They are concerned that supervisors do not appreciate the complexity of the social structure in which they [the candidates] are living. They want the supervisor to appreciate the relationship they have to the Institute; the economic pressures under which they function; and that their concerns are not [only] ‘neurotic’ but [also] realistic problems which need to be respected.... Their collective experience demonstrates to them that some training analysts are good supervisors and others are poor. The implication is that the price of a poor supervisor is very high for them.”

### **The Ambiguities of the Supervisory Situation**

According to the Webster Dictionary, supervision is: “an overseeing, surveillance. To supervise is to inspect, scrutinize, examine, to have control over, to manage, to direct, to conduct.” The supervised psychoanalytic work, carried through by an inexperienced analyst in training, is done under the control, direction, management, and surveillance of a senior analyst. The supervisor as a member of a training institute has not only status, but also the power and responsibility to judge, evaluate, and influence the status of the

candidate. Another aspect of supervision referred to in Swedish as “handledning” is “to lead by the hand” helping a younger, less experienced, less skilled, less knowledgeable colleague who is an analytic candidate or psychotherapy trainee gain knowledge, skill, and experience. With this attitude, supervisors guide their supervisees through pitfalls, hold them back when they are too eager, help them stay on track, and avoid falling. With the experience of his own psychoanalysis and his theoretical knowledge, the trainee knows to turn to his supervisor for security and help when he becomes overwhelmed with chaos and anxiety when meeting his first patient.

He feels dependent and hopes that his supervisor is dependable. His insecurity and doubts can make him hide his questions, squash any criticism, and possibly even obscure what he actually is doing. He might want to and often does imitate his supervisor and might oppose him in different ways. He might “transfer” onto the supervisor, his infantile wishes and conflicts, feelings about authority, competition and submission, and expectations of omnipotence and omniscience. He may deny his problems. He may cancel appointments, lose patients, or promise them more than he can fulfill. He may show many “blind spots” (Wallerstein, 1981) such as defensive unawareness about his patients, or himself. He may identify with his patients and mirror their unconscious processes towards the supervisor (Arlow, 1963; Searles, 1965). He might also mirror his interaction with his supervisor in his therapy with his patients (Bromberg, 1982; Caligor, 1984; Dewald, 1987;

Epstein, 1985; Gediman & Wolkenfelt, 1980; Grey & Fiscalini 1987; Gross-Doehrman, 1976; Sachs & Shapiro 1976). Last but not least, the trainee can provide a tough challenge or a pleasurable and interesting learning experience for the supervisor.

The supervisory situation should provide conditions in which learning can develop. To achieve such a situation is not easy and can be complicated by trainee as well as by supervisor. Parallel to the wish to learn and change, lies the fear of the unknown and the tendency to stay with the accustomed and remain untouched by change. The position of the trainee is both difficult and ambiguous. He has to be open to acknowledge his lack of knowledge, skill and understanding on the one hand, and at the same time to try to meet his patient's reasonable expectations of an analyst who has the competence to give him an optimal experience of psychoanalysis. Similarly, in relation to his patient, he has to be a real person with a cohesion, stability and maturity of personality and at the same time be viewed, experienced and used by the patient in playing different roles according to intrapsychic scenarios. Within the supervisory interaction, the candidate reconstructs the process he is part of. He is also a trainee, who has to expose himself to the supervisor who aids, teaches and judges him. The supervisor's responsibility for providing optimal conditions for learning has to be correlated with safeguarding the patient's need to receive optimal care (Szecsödy et al. 1993).

Supervisor and trainee can meet in a well-isolated, secluded room with the intention of working on their task; the trainee to learn and the supervisor to teach. Nevertheless, they are part of the organization they work in and are influenced by it and are influencing it (Szecsödy, 1986). It is important to differentiate supervision according to the trainee's interest in increasing knowledge and skill, on the one hand, and acquiring a profession on the other. Depending on these two motivations, the supervisor can be expected to be experienced as a teacher, tutor, mentor, someone to relate to, rely upon and identify with, or as a judge who exercises control in the interest of the trade, the body of professionals, and the training institution. In this sense, he can be a rival to fight with, or someone to whom the trainee must submit. These are more-or-less realistic expectations and experiences connected with the participants' culturally defined status and roles, which obviously have great potential for satisfying unconscious fantasies and transference scripts.

The supervisor has to be prepared for and be aware of all these ambiguities and the problems they arouse. He has to work with them in different ways. The complex interaction between trainee and supervisor is influenced by many factors: the personalities of the patient, trainee, and supervisor, and the effects on them of the organization in which they work. On the other hand, teaching and learning in supervision are not standardized. There is no "code of procedure." This ambiguity is aggravated by the yet

unanswered question as to whether the participants adjust their working strategies to the specificities of problems before them, or whether they impose their standard strategies regardless of the issue at hand.

### **How is Learning Possible in the Supervisory Situation?**

It is interesting and intriguing that supervision, which is used in all training and at all training institutions, is hardly questioned with regard to its usefulness. Nor is it, with few exceptions, systematically studied. There are hardly any studies about the ill effects of supervision. Training is considered by many to be mainly a process of personal development. In most psychoanalytic institutes, senior analysts, who have gained recognition for their theoretical papers, their lecturing, or their large analytic practices become training analysts, which gives them the status and the right to have candidates in training analysis. To work as supervisors follows more or less automatically from this status. Pedagogic competence is neither emphasized nor acknowledged as a prerequisite in order to work as a supervisor. This may be due to an idealization of analytic work and be based on the idea that because one has gained an understanding of and skill for the work as such, one also acquires the capacity to convey and facilitate this knowledge and skill in others. This is also mirrored in the large amount of literature, written anecdotally about supervision, expressing more-or-less individualistic and

idiosyncratic views as generally valid observations. Even those studies that systematically investigate supervision focus more on how one teaches and less on how one learns in supervision (Szecsödy, 1990).

How can supervision enhance and safeguard the difficult task of learning, to help the trainee to understand the patient and his own involvement in the intricate interaction that evolves between patient-analyst and trainee-supervisor? Most supervisors agree it is of primary importance to create a setting in which the capacity to learn can develop. As yet, too little is understood about the learning-process, especially in adults. It is assumed that adults are capable of selecting and evaluating their own information (Dijkuis, 1979). This is assumed contrary to our knowledge of how selection of information is influenced by unconscious fantasies and emotional factors relating to the object of learning. According to a basic psychoanalytic assumption, humans organize their actions to reach certain goals in accordance with their interpretation of a specific situation. Disturbance in the relationship between trainee and supervisor can hamper both the acquisition and retrieval of knowledge.

It is also important to distinguish between learning and teaching. Teaching is done and can be studied in *statu nascendi*, and the teacher can be questioned about his aims, intentions and concerns as well. Learning is more subtle; it is difficult to determine if it has occurred, if it is functional and

whether it is an illusory “reduction of cognitive dissonances” (Festinger, 1957). Corresponding with Piaget's (1958) definition, one can expect that trainees can learn in two ways: by assimilation and by accommodation (1958). Assimilative learning means that the new information is added to the previous, increasing already existing knowledge. The candidate who learns by assimilation adds newly gained experience, observations, information and theory to the store of knowledge he already has, which thereby becomes enriched differentiated and consolidated. Learning by accommodation means that encounters with new information result in a fundamental modification of the existing cognitive schema, so that the new encounter can be dealt with.

The candidate who learns by accommodation actively restructures previously held knowledge, points of view, and theory.

There are few available systematic studies of the supervisory process. Fleming & Benedek (1966) and the San Francisco Study Group's (Wallerstein, 1981) ambition was to accomplish a descriptive, hypothesis-generating study.

Fleming & Benedek (1966) designed a schema to differentiate steps in the supervisory interaction and systematized a number of teaching tasks. They provided rich clinical material and described how the choice of supervisory technique was influenced by an educational diagnosis, “requiring the supervisor's system-sensitivity and system-responsiveness”. They assumed that the learning need of the trainee may represent either a deficiency of

knowledge and experience or an error in analytic behavior. These two types of learning problems are also defined by the San Francisco group, calling them “dumb”- and “blind-spots”. Gross-Doehrman (1976) emphasized the facilitating potential of evolving tension in the supervisory relationship, but also found substantial evidence for the fact that trainee and supervisor often reacted to tensions by developing a “neurotic bond”. This had to be observed, understood and resolved between trainee and supervisor, to enable the progression of a therapeutic process between patient and therapist.

Fleming & Benedek (1996) reinforced the concept of the “analyst as an instrument”, referring to Freud (1912) concerning the necessity for the analyst to free himself from resistances, which would select and distort what he unconsciously perceives. This implies the promise of an unclouded understanding that carries with it the risk of idealization. “But whether we like to recognize it or not, I believe all of us have our own (mainly unconscious) hierarchical organization, perceiving, screening, measuring the relevance of observational data, and finally leading to action for that moment in analysis” (Jacob, 1981, p. 197). Studying trainees and trainer, it is possible to discern some stable and characteristic differences according to: a *cognitive style*, which is a stabilized disposition of perception and cognition; a *working style* related to the selective use of basic concepts and theories; and a *defensive style* composed of character traits, transferences, counter-

transferences, counter-resistances, counter-identifications, etc. (Jacob, 1981).

The important questions remain: Can we as supervisors discern a reasonable strategy for our students? Or do we impose our favorite strategies? What in the process can lead to change? What conditions or strategies are optimal for learning?

In a descriptive, empirical study, I attempted to observe and clarify how learning takes place in the supervisory situation (Szecsödy, 1990). I could recognize instances when learning did develop, without posing difficulties for the trainee or supervisor. Supervisors provided complementary or more complete information the trainees needed and could use. Trainees followed up on observations that helped them to form hypotheses and strategies that seemed relevant and useful within the context of the supervisory session.

The above notwithstanding, work between trainees and supervisors was often influenced by conflicts, connected to the ambiguity and complexity of their task. The supervisors less often followed an implicit, consistent and successive focus than might have been expected from their answers in interviews. Supervisors did not seem to work according to an explicitly or manifestly conceptualized difference between the two kinds of learning problems (dumb spots due to lack of knowledge and skill and blind spots due to conflict and resistance to and avoidance of information); nor did they adhere to any differentiable strategy to deal with various educational tasks. If

they did so intuitively, they seemed to be susceptible to missing the target and changing strategy. Frequently, supervisors seemed to act according to an assumption that giving information was always useful and even optimal and was, without exception, something that the trainee could use. They seemed to adhere to this assumption, in contrast to theories they had about dealing with defenses and resistances in therapeutic interaction. Trainees and supervisors showed some propensity for reacting to the innate discomfort of the supervisory situation by becoming abstract or vague, unduly supportive or critical. All trainees retained an insecurity and vulnerability and had a tendency to react defensively. Their learning problem seems to be always connected with their other function, that of interacting therapeutically with their patient.

It was noticeable that learning did occur most frequently, when the supervisor kept an equidistant position. This position is not only an open, non-judgmental, non-competitive attitude but, also includes the keeping of a continuous and stable focus on the candidate's reconstruction of his interaction with the patient by viewing the candidate-patient interaction as a 'system' with its own boundaries and frame. In analytic work, we focus on the patient's use of the analyst in his unconscious wishful fantasies and thoughts as they appear in the present in the transference. The relationship to the analyst is molded by comprehensive unconscious expectations. As

Loewald (1960) emphasized: the patient can discover new material in the object as the analyst fails largely or completely to meet the patient's expectations in certain areas (particularly the area of difficulties) which have previously always been fulfilled by virtue of unconscious steering mechanisms. Similarly, dynamic factors that often stimulate conflict seem always to be present in the supervisory system and influence the learning and teaching process. Nevertheless, it is possible and desirable to maintain the frame and boundaries both around the patient-analyst and candidate-supervisor systems. For this reason, in addition to the *stationary* and *mobile* aspects of the frame of supervision, I wish to propose a third, a *focusing* aspect of frame. This is the overall and continuous focus the supervisor has to keep (explicitly or implicitly) on the patient-analyst interaction, assisting the trainee to notice how the patient's personality, past experiences, conflicts and enactments are expressed in the interaction with the analyst and how he or she experiences this, reacts to it, and interacts with the patient in response (the transference and countertransference).

It is possible and even advantageous to define this third aspect of framekeeping with the help of boundary maintenance. The *stationary* aspect of the frame refers to agreement on goals, payment, methods, and general rules for supervision and supervised analysis. The *mobile* aspect of the frame refers to the continuous, reflective review of working together. The

interaction between candidate and supervisor must be maintained by the supervisor through a continuous attention to the primary task. This can serve as a boundary or frame that is not rigid but cohesive within which supervisor and supervisee can differentiate intentions, reactions or interpretations that belong to or are foreign to the two systems. The supervisor has to keep a clear frame by separating his task of doing supervision from the task of the trainee, which is to conduct analysis of therapy.

### **Training of Supervisors**

Since 1987, the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute has arranged training on supervision for members who applied for and were accepted to become training analysts. Formal requirements are 4000 hours of analytic work after acquisition of full membership. A committee of five training analysts interviews the applicants. The members of the committee are elected, three by the board of the Institute and two by the board of the Society. The applicant has to give a presentation of his analytic work, intertwining theory and technique. The presentation is discussed with the members of the committee. The applicant is present during the whole discussion, including the evaluation of her or his presentation. The chairman of the committee conveys the recommendation (qualified or not qualified to become a training analyst) of the Committee to the Board of the Institute. The Board's function

is to authorize the recommendation as well as to administer appeals. The Dean of the Training Course of Supervision is then responsible for composing the course by bringing together eligible applicants and staff that he has selected for the Course. The Dean and two Assistant Deans for this training are elected by the Board of the Institute.

Those entering the course have received the assignment of training analyst and start treating and supervising candidates. As the Swedish Institute is a non-reporting institute, the work as a training analyst is not supervised, only discussed generally during seminars. On the other hand, there is a continuous, mutual evaluation and discussion of the supervisory work conducted by the trainees. Each supervisor-in-training starts supervising a candidate once a week, and meets a supervising supervisor every second week. After one year, the frequency of supervision of the candidate is decreased to every second week and that of the trainee to once a month.

During the two years' duration of the training, there are 14 seminars organized with the following themes.

- Dynamics of training.
- The role of training analysis and supervision within organized training; organizational aspects, dynamics of institutions and "the clinical rhombi"; learning alliance.

- Training analysis compared to non-training analysis
- Transference, countertransference and institution.
- Termination of training analyses.

Connected to presentations of supervisory sessions, the following questions are discussed.

- How do we establish a platform for teaching and learning?
- What is the value and practical use of an educational diagnosis?
- How can we work with different learning problems such as “dumbness”, “blindness”, and “deafness”?
- How do we deal with transference-countertransference issues in the analysis as well as in the supervisory relationship?
- How do we recognize and deal with parallel and reflective processes?

The following topics are covered:

- Group dynamics in therapeutic and supervisory work
- Supervision as a process and as a mutative learning situation
- The study of the supervisory process
- The analytic process
- Research perspectives

At the end of training, all trainees and supervisors together with the Deans conduct an evaluation of the course. They focus on issues that promoted or obstructed learning, and then make recommendations about the taxonomy of training. Those who received training can function as supervisors and are listed as such by the Supervisory Committee. Candidates can freely choose listed supervisors, but the choice has to be approved by the Committee. No supervisor can at any time have more than five candidates in supervision.

### Summary

The task of supervision is to provide conditions in which learning can develop. To achieve this is not easy and may be complicated by trainee or supervisor. Dynamic factors and inherent ambiguities in the supervisory situation frequently stimulate conflicts and influence the learning and teaching process. On the one hand, the supervisor can be experienced as a mentor, someone to relate to, rely upon, and identify with. On the other hand he can be expected to be judging, controlling in the interest of the professions and the institution of psychoanalysis. A study of the learning process, which consisted in analyzing transcripts of supervisory sessions, has demonstrated that learning occurred frequently when the supervisor was keeping to a continuous and stable focus on the trainee's reconstruction of his interaction

with the patient, viewing the trainee-patient interaction as a 'system' with its own boundaries and frame. Therefore, the optimal learning takes place when the supervisor has participated in a supervisors' training program such as the one at the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute to prepare him or her for the challenges of serving in a supervisory position.

## How Is Learning Possible in Supervision?

Being engaged for many years in the training and supervision of psychoanalysts, psychotherapists and also in the training of supervisors, I became more and more interested in how learning takes place in supervision. This interest stimulated me to start a study of the supervisory process. My point of departure was that psychoanalysis and dynamically oriented expressive psychotherapy are applications of the same basic science. The aims of both psychoanalysis and psychotherapy are to enable and facilitate change, growth and emancipation for the troubled individual. For the purposes of this chapter I will use the terms analysis and psychoanalysis to refer both to psychoanalysis and psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy, and the term analyst will refer to both psychoanalyst and psychoanalytic psychotherapist. I will, however specify psychotherapy and psychotherapist to refer exclusively to psychotherapy and psychotherapist.

The analytic task is to establish a specific relationship within a specific

frame, in which the patient can gain insight into his consciously and unconsciously enacted experiences, expectations, wishes and fears. Insight presupposes accommodative learning which goes, beyond the assimilative type, and can lead to change, which is further facilitated by what many call a corrective emotional and ideational experience (Appelbaum 1978). Within the boundaries of the analytic situation the individual's history is re-experienced, re-structured and, above all, narrated. It acquires new meaning and regains old meanings that were lost. Uniting seemingly separate events into meaningful sequences establishes coherence, a new order by way of understanding. "It is a final act of self-appropriation, the appropriation by oneself of one's own history" (Marcus 1985).

In his work, the psychoanalyst has to take part with his whole personality. He has to follow and understand the conscious and unconscious aspects of the interaction, both cognitively and emotionally, thus he has to be able to experience and observe at the same time. He has to gain skill to apply specific methods (among them clarifications, confrontations and interpretations) to facilitate insight. It is no wonder that this work often is compared to that of an artist and is often viewed as a personal attribute rather than as something that can be acquired with training. Training is considered by many to be mainly a process of personal development. In most psychoanalytic institutes, senior analysts who have gained recognition for

their theoretical papers, their lecturing or for their large analytic practices become training analysts, which gives them the status and the right to have candidates in training analysis. To work as supervisors follows more or less automatically from this status. Similarly, in psychotherapy training the more experienced therapists take on the responsibility of supervising trainees. Pedagogic competence was neither emphasized nor acknowledged as a prerequisite to work as a supervisor. This may be due to an idealization of analytic work and based on the idea that because one has gained an understanding of and skill for the work as such, one has also acquired the capacity to convey this knowledge and skill to others and to facilitate its acquisition by them. This idea is also mirrored in the large amount of literature, written anecdotally about supervision, expressing more or less individual and idiosyncratic views as generally valid observations. Even studies that systematically investigate the supervisory work tend to focus more on how one teaches, and less on how one learns in supervision. I am referring to the research in the field of psychoanalysis by Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958), Fleming and Benedek (1966), Goin (1976), Gross-Doehrman (1976), Jansson (1975), Kline (1977), Martin (1978), Richter (1980), Wallerstein (1981), and Szecsödy (1990) and the "client centered psychotherapy research of Lambert (1980). Other authors including Dewald (1987), Langs (1979) and Rioch (1976), present a descriptive, intensive study of one or two supervisions and formulate their ideas and theories from those.

It is intriguing that supervision, which is used in all training and at all training institutions, is hardly questioned in regard to its usefulness. There are few studies about the "ill effects" of supervision other than the work of Heising (1976) and Sandell (1985) who write about the "dysfunction of supervision." Their findings suggest that supervision can have positive effects on therapy outcome generally, but not always on the cases that are supervised.

To provide conditions in which learning can develop is not easy and can be complicated by trainee as well as by supervisor. Parallel to the wish to learn and change, there is the fear of the unknown and a tendency to stay with the accustomed and to remain untouched by change. The supervisor has to be prepared for and aware of all the ambiguities that are inherent in the supervisory situation. There is "a crowd present" in the supervisory room: a mentor, teacher, evaluator, judge, supervisor, future colleague, a staff member who is dependent on the candidate's acknowledgement and successful development, as well as the candidate himself who has to accept and carry a number of different roles. Thus it is important to differentiate between the trainee's interest in increasing knowledge and skill on the one hand and acquiring a profession on the other. As a result of these two motivations, the supervisor can expect to be experienced as a teacher, tutor, mentor, someone to relate to, rely upon and identify with or as a judge; controlling in the

interest of the body of professionals and as a delegate of the "institution". In this sense he can be a rival to fight with, or to whom the trainee must submit. These are more or less realistic expectations and experiences connected with the culturally defined roles and status of the participants. These roles obviously have great potential for satisfying unconscious fantasies and transference scripts. The intriguing question is: Is learning possible under such complex and conflicting conditions?

### **The study of the learning process**

The task for supervision is to create a setting in which the capacity to learn can develop. As yet too little is understood about the learning-process, especially in adults. It is assumed that adults are capable of selecting and evaluating their own information (Dijkuis, 1979). This is assumed contrary to our knowledge of how selection of information is influenced by unconscious fantasies and emotional factors relating to the object of learning. In the 1980's I started a descriptive, empirical study, with the aim of observing and clarifying how learning takes place within the supervisory situation (See chapter 3). As the focus of this chapter is on the clinical applications of my research; here I only wish to outline the design of that earlier study (Szecsödy 1990, 1992, 1993).

The assumption that the interaction between trainees and supervisors

is guided by the theory and rules of psychoanalysis and dynamic psychotherapy was implicit in the study, both in the formulation of inferences and in organizing the data. Notwithstanding the multiplicity of intentions influencing the interaction between trainees and supervisors, they have a common goal and intention, that of increasing the trainee's ability to understand the interaction with the patient. To approach this task trainees and supervisors may have different and diverse strategies but will presumably use data and rules of connecting them corresponding with the theory and rules of psychoanalysis and/or dynamic psychotherapy which are in varying degree familiar to both parties. Corresponding with Piaget's definition one can expect that trainees can learn in two ways by assimilation and by accommodation (1958). Assimilative learning means that the new information is added to the previous one, increasing already existing knowledge. The therapist can add newly gained experience, observations, information and theory to those he already has, resulting in their enrichment, differentiation and consolidation. Accommodative learning means that encounters with new information result in a fundamental modification of the existing cognitive schema, so that the new encounter can be dealt with. To deal with the information, the person must actively engage himself in warding it off or accommodating to it by restructuring previously held knowledge, points of view and theory.

Fifty-six transcripts of recorded supervisory sessions formed the basis for my study. I applied the concept of educational diagnosis that Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) and later Fleming and Benedek (1964) introduced for use in clinical supervisory work as well as in research. For each supervisory session that was studied, I formulated an *educational diagnosis arrived* from reading the transcripts from the perspective of my prior clinical knowledge and supervisory experience. In an attempt to further elucidate these impressions I formulated a focus, the *nuclear problem*, as a hypothetical task for the supervisory work in the observed session. I differentiated types of learning or teaching difficulty into two major types: *lack* or *conflict* previously described by Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) relative to the patient (learning problems' and those relative to the supervisor (problems about teaching). Lack refers to lack of experience, skill and knowledge (dumb spots), while conflict refers to the defensive avoidance of information (blind spots). Based on the educational diagnosis and the hypothetical task connected to the nuclear problem, I conceived of an *ideal problem-solving route*. This route was formulated in accordance with the diagnosed problem of the trainee and the primary task for supervision. The ideal problem-solving route was constructed as a "thought experiment" (Greenberg 1984) in which I described possible strategies, based on clinical supervisory experience, by which these problems and/or questions could be approached. After formulating an educational diagnosis, a nuclear problem and selecting an ideal problem-

solving route, I divided the transcripts into consecutive sequences. Following the transcripts, each sequence was studied and the descriptive analysis of the interaction between trainee and supervisor was supplemented by *commentary* based on my clinical and theoretical knowledge. According to this analysis, inferences were made about what manifest and/or latent problems and questions had to be dealt with and how these could be handled by the supervisor – the *ideal problem-solving task*. I then followed the dialogue between trainee and supervisor step by step to see whether the actual interaction was corresponding with or differing from the *ideal route*. The underlying methodological assumption is that the ideal route can serve as an indicator, or as a thought experiment, to study the actual interaction. Comparing and contrasting the actual discourse with the hypothetical, ideal one made explicit the rules by which the inferences and judgments were applied.

An additional way of probing this method of analyzing the transcripts was to apply it to a study of the learning process in supervision, which was explored by an independent author. Dewald (1987) published an extensive individual case study from the supervision of a candidate in psychoanalytic training in which transcripts of supervisory sessions are followed by the detailed comments of the author/supervisor. His comments were then compared with the constructions, inferences and judgments I used in the

analysis of the sessions. Another attempt to safeguard the study against the systematic bias of the impressionistic interpretations made in qualitative research was to approach the data with a quantitative method (Szecsödy 1990). Certain qualities of the trainee-supervisor interaction were delineated and formulated as variables. A manual was constructed from the collected examples that were used to illustrate and differentiate these variables.

Transcripts of a limited number of supervisory sessions were rated by independent judges and the scores were then analyzed with the Principal Component Method (Wold 1983, Armelius & Kullgren 1986) replicating the search for recurrent and specific patterns in the supervisory interaction. (In PC-analysis, that is a complex factor analysis, the multivariate properties of a large number of variables can be used for a detailed description of the observations by means of a few latent dimensions or principal components that account for, and describe, the systematic variance in the data.)

With a short description of a supervisory session and how it was commented upon by the supervisor and myself as the researcher, I wish to show the intricacies of the learning/ /teaching process. The session was recorded at the end of the second and beginning of the third year of a supervision conducted by Paul Dewald. He originally described and commented upon this session in his book *Learning Process in Psychoanalytic Supervision: Complexities and Challenges* (Dewald 1987; pp. 188-208) and the

analysis of this session was presented in my study (1990).

S is the supervisor. T is the trainee. P is the patient. T is obviously an ambitious candidate, in the process of preparing a presentation before a site visit and exhibiting a very clear and concrete wish to get on with her training. This is her first analytic case under supervision, a second one is already taking place parallel with this, and she is planning to start the third one.

T: "I'm unprepared for this - but I did do my case summary for the site visit. I think I just want to let off steam about how frustrating this lady is. She is so withholding that at times she could incite me to riot if I didn't do it outside of sessions. She and my twenty-month old daughter have a lot in common. I cannot decide if she is teasing me. I don't think she is doing any of this consciously, but the effect on me is telling me something. She'll come and she'll get into something and really start to work. There is a particular session I could read you that would illustrate this, but in short there was a lot of affect and it wasn't phony. But then she would not come until it's all cooled down. And I know that part of that is diluting and that part of it is her reaction to one of the things she is real mad about. She'll come to two sessions and skip another two. Then she comes enraged, she was so mad at me I am just a cold tit. And I was just like her mother. One of the things that's making her mad is that it feels to her like it's on my terms. Like her mother I was not available when she needed me. She had to catch her when her mother was not depressed or when her mother was available. And so is it with me. And then she does not come. Doing it at her convenience proves to me she does not need me, that she can - and proves to herself that she does not need me -- that she can do things when she needs to do them. And about withholding: she'll give me herself when she wants to. She was coming more frequently until - I used her words for it, though I can't remember what they were. Whenever she started to deal again with her fantasies of castration and oedipal phantasies and the urethral stricture, suddenly she got very busy at work and stopped being able to come so regularly. When she comes infrequently and brings tons of material when she does come, I think she knows I can't catch it all. How do I say this?"

S: "And this pattern occurred after she'd begun to talk about the urethral stricture?"

T: "After she'd begun to talk about it again. It's not only that she does not want to talk about it because I may cram something down her throat, but also because she doesn't want to explore something new. That happened one week and that was it. Then she started skipping."

S: "You see, when you run up against a pattern like this and it seems to be this stubborn, you've got to ask yourself: what other potential meanings does it have?"

T: "That's why I'm blowing off steam here."

S: "What's it say? One of the things you described is that she doesn't come for a while and then she gives you everything."

T: "She floods me."

S: "And floods you."

T: "And I feel flooded."

S: "Do you think she is reenacting the urethral stricture?"

T: "Is she doing it to me?"

S: "No, no."

T: "Is she - okay, go ahead."

S suggests, that P reenacts a painful anticipation.

S: "Holding back - have it all out at once. Floods you and it hurt terribly for a short time but then you wait and try to make it as long as possible before you have to go again."

T: "And you hate that you have to go."

S: "So you are beginning to think along those lines as to what kind of meaning this has?"

T: "Uh huh."

S: "Because among other things her mother can't stop the pain. You see, this way she has the fantasy 'If I could tell mother then she would stop the pain'. But to tell her mother and mother still can't stop the pain means, 'either mother hates me or wants me to suffer or that she is as helpless as I am'."

T: "So the turning around things is a kind of defensive maneuver that's pervasive in this lady. I need her, her seeing that I need her, and what she is mad at is that she needs me. So that perhaps the feeling that if she calls me on the weekends I would be disappointed in her is that she would be disappointed in me! If she begged her mother or told her mother it was hurting and her mother couldn't fix it, the disappointment would be too much because ..."

S: "That's it."

T: "Another thread through this is that her parents and I have been disappointing in our lack of omnipotence."

S: "I see. If she tells mother that it hurts, and if her mother is omnipotent, than her mother will stop the pain. She tells mother it hurts and mother can't stop or doesn't stop the pain, or mother gets more and more uptight - because you see, what you're feeling now is how frustrated, how on edge, how angry you feel at her, how you want her to get on with this thing. You must think what the mother must have felt when this girl would scream and scream and scream. The mother is trying her best to stop the pain, feeling upset, increasingly uptight and the child can't be soothed and the mother feels increasingly helpless."

T: "And they had been through that once before. This is the second time. Not with the urethral stricture, but with her bowel habits. They had been through the pain of elimination and her mother saying 'If you eat more you'll be able to go to the bathroom'. Then the kid trying, supposedly, and withholding at the same time. So she has the base of experience before she even gets to the urethral stricture."

S: "Right. So all of this, you see, is what this behavior pattern is all about, and it serves several functions simultaneously. Among other things, it frustrates you and gets even with you; it creates a situation of distance and tension between you. It also, however, preserves her hope that you could stop the pain if you knew. But she is never going to ask, so therefore 'if you don't stop the pain, it's not because you're not omnipotent; it's because you don't know. And if I ever did ask you, then you could do it'. It preserves that image. But it also serves getting back at you, serves to frustrate you; it serves to make you suffer with her."

T: "Why does she have the fantasy that if she calls me, she knows I would not see her? Like if she calls me on Friday and says, 'I have to see you tomorrow'. She knows I'm not going to see her. That's why she doesn't call me. I'd be mad at her. But then she says that it would really scare her to death if I did see her. And I think she's right. I mean I don't think that that's all fantasy. A long time ago I changed an appointment because she wanted it changed and it was no skin off my nose - in fact, I think it was more convenient. And there was trouble. I can remember thinking, I'm never going to do it again. And you and I talked about it, but maybe that has meaning in another frame, in terms of getting what she wants and how far will I go to give her what she wants, a kind of ultimate seduction."

S: "Yeah, I think you can see a relationship. As you listen to this girl and observe how she behaves, try to keep in mind the picture of a little girl in chronic pain, helpless to do anything about it herself, and with a mother also helpless to do anything about it. What must the little girl feel and what must the mother feel and what must the little girl then think about what the mother feels? Many people who are actual child abusers, for example, tell you that what happens is they got increasingly uptight because the kid wouldn't stop crying. They had to shut the kid up at all costs because to hear the kid go on crying and screaming made them too uncomfortable. I would suspect that something like that happened between your patient and her mother."

T: "And that then may be the basis of some of this, some of her sense that mother kept going away."

S: "Yeah, but may also be partly a sense of, 'I don't want my mother to come'. If she asks you to come and see her on Saturday, it's like mother being called into the bathroom one more time, or mother

being called into the bedroom one more time, because the girl is still screaming and the mother getting furious and saying: 'Now stop it', and slapping her or doing some other horrible thing. 'So don't come in. I don't want you to come because that's what I get if you come'."

T: "Well, and that's her experience, but it's not those details yet, but that's the experience of her memory, the way she relates it. When she did tell her mother, her mother called the pediatrician and took her to the urologist, who then hurt her with the mother watching. So he was the mother's arm."

S: "So 'I want mother to be there to do something for me and when mother is here, it makes it worse. It just hurt more'. But also I would suspect, as I say, the mother must have been at the end of her tether with this kind of pain and inability to do anything about it and the child screaming and hurting and dribbling a little urine and having enormous pain, the mother finally getting furious. I'm basing this, you see, on your own feeling that you're ready to blow off steam at this girl, this is what she induced in you and that must be what happened when she was a child."

T: "Well and I think it's - if I base it on my feeling, what I think happened when she was a child is that her mother got furious with her for not telling her."

S: "Uh-huh, that's possible."

T: "For not giving her the chance to help her."

S: "Exactly."

T: "For letting it get so bad that it was an emergency not in the sense of her not wanting to take care of an emergency but not having been able to take care of the child because the child did not tell her, because that's how I feel. Here is a girl who's in trouble, she's hurting, she's got a lot of things, gone in a lot of different directions, she brings it in, she splurts it over the office and I feel like I could help her. You know like the process would help her."

S: "If she only would let you."

T: "If she would let me. But then she goes beyond reach and she doesn't bring it to me anymore and -- I don't know, I'm powerless."

S: "Yeah. You see, this is what I think of as the creative use of the countertransference, where feelings get evoked in you and you ask yourself: Is it part of what the patient is seeking to do? Is this part of an early constellation of interaction and experience being reenacted here? And if so, from where? This is an illustration of how you can use these feelings that are engendered in you constructively, to reconstruct what it must have been like when she was growing up. Then you use that as a basis of your --"

T: "How do you use it technically?"

S: "By grasping it."

T: "As the basis of my understanding."

S: "That's how you use it. And from there on you interpret in that framework."

T: "Okay. You wait for data then and use that framework of understanding."

### **Dewald's comments on this session**

The candidate arrives in a state of affective arousal planning to use the supervisory session to "let off steam" in response to frustration experienced as part of the analytic process with the patient. Her capacity to announce her intention to use the session in this way indicates that the learning alliance is well established and that she feels free to use the situation as her needs dictate. The supervisor recognizes the intense counter-transference and her needs to express feeling. Intermittently as she describes P's behavior and

associations, the candidate is capable of her own synthetic formulations, and she recognizes and tolerates the P's transference experience of her in critical, contemptuous and hostile terms. She is capable of recognizing when the P is using, and reenacting patterns of behavior from the relationship with her mother. Throughout the supervisor is aware of the intensity of the candidate's affect and her continuing needs to express her reactions directly.

Eventually the supervisor begins to reflect back to the candidate and to encourage a more cognitive focus on the material. As part of the candidate's efforts at formulation and understanding, she mentions that some of the patient's behavior seems to have evolved after the patient brought back material about the experience of the urethral stricture and the severe trauma it occasioned. This material had previously been worked on. At this point the supervisor begins silently to develop an understanding of the material in terms of the urethral stricture and its consequences and begins to call attention to the topic. The candidate responds by reminding the supervisor of the ideas previously connected to the stricture, once again synthesizing the material and recognizing that the patient started skipping sessions after the issue began to come up again.

The supervisor suggests to the candidate ways of thinking about the process when intense resistances such as the one described begin to occur.

The candidate admits, "That's why I'm blowing off steam here". The

supervisor reflects to the candidate a way of summarizing the patient's behavior. The candidate's response "she floods me" indicates that the maneuver by the supervisor is successful. The supervisor presents a formulation in which the patient's behavior is seen as a transference reenactment, but the candidate is initially confused. As the supervisor rephrases his formulation and shifts from an abstract conceptual statement to more immediate clinical description the candidate begins to respond in an animated way. The candidate becomes increasingly capable of producing and correlating further material, rather than merely reacting to what the supervisor has said. The supervisor, responding to the candidate's elaboration of the data, once again interacts, attempting empathically to reconstruct the patient's childhood experience currently being re-enacted in her nonverbal behavior. The candidate identifies with the supervisor's immediate style and mode of communication, emphatically recognizing the patient's childhood experience -"and you hate that you have to go".

The candidate's elaboration stimulates the supervisor to encourage the candidate's empathic identification with the mother in hopes of encouraging the candidate to use her countertransference experience as a source of awareness of what the mother-child interaction may have been, and how the analysis is repeating the earlier pattern. The candidate's response, that the interaction around the urethral stricture was itself a repetition of a pattern

evident in the patient's toilet training, opens channels of association and communication of material not previously expressed or correlated by the candidate. The supervisor shifts to a more cognitive and conceptual level in demonstrating the principle of multiple function without specifically naming it, thereby encouraging the candidate to generalize this clinical experience. The candidate responds with active attempts at learning, beginning with her question about the motivation behind the patient's fantasies. At the same time she demonstrates that she has been able to use her own earlier experience with the patient to shape her intervention and can appreciate the importance of abstinence. This is followed by an interchange in which each builds upon the contribution of the other toward a deeper empathic understanding, appreciation, and reconstruction of what had been an important and recurrent traumatic experience for the patient in childhood.

The supervisor returns to the candidate's original countertransference experience of frustration and tension, using it to illustrate how an analyst can appreciate the meaning and basis of behavior by being sensitive to countertransference feelings. The candidate partially accepts the supervisor's suggestion, but corrects it, based on a more accurate and detailed description of her own countertransference experience. The candidate's curiosity about how countertransference can be used technically allows the supervisor to describe the framing of interpretations. This supervisory session effectively illustrates various aspects of the teaching-

learning experience. There is a balance here between affective experiential elements and those in a more cognitive style. There is also a mutual interaction between candidate and supervisor, a shared experience of creative discovery and deepening awareness.

### **My somewhat different conclusion:**

T is openly and manifestly expressing how much she feels frustrated and irritated by P. She does not immediately define this as a problem for supervision, as she "is unprepared, did work on her summary" and wants to let off steam. P is frustrating like T's daughter of 20 months. With quite some intensity T describes how P is acting out, denying her own needs to have anything from T. T on the other hand seems to have difficulties being in the role of the "not accepted, or the rejected, giver". It seems important for T to be experienced as being able to give, understand and help. She formulates it first as a 'lack' of experience, knowledge, words, and experience, asking "How does one say this"? Instead of answering with any kind of advice S encourages T to investigate, reflect by asking about connections. T does feel "flooded" by P - which can be interpreted as T's capacity to hold and contain being impaired. Even if T does expose some lack (the lack of skill and knowledge) her problem is mainly a conflict due to some strong feelings that T has and has difficulties dealing with. Her irritation is open, but some part of

the experience is warded off.

S is encouraging T to reconstruct, reflect and organize information. S explores how P reenacts the past in the present, while T is experiencing and suffering the present, what P does to her in the 'here and now'. T's associations can be an expression of her state of being "flooded" by experiencing the latent or deeper meaning of the interaction with P; but also a sign of the 'metabolizing' process, bringing the content of the mutual influence between P and T more into consciousness. S is very much in the "here and now." Even if he talks about P as a child, he does bring in the feelings of P to be experienced and reacted to by T "here and now". T does take up the line - but still with some defensiveness. T can formulate P's disappointment with her lack of omnipotence, but when S reiterates - clear and close in the "here and now" - the emotional experience of the mother and connects it with T's feelings and reactions, T retreats to the past. The two do not participate in the dialogue on the same wavelength. T is trying to deal with her problem of being rejected by P and put in the position of the dangerous, hurting or penetrating parent. S is giving T 'more of the same' information but also indirectly encouraging T to reflect and open up to the experience, that of being put into the position where she actually would want to "harm" the patient. This information still seems to evoke T's defenses - as she puts the problem into the patient - its being P's difficulty in accepting

what she has to offer. T reiterates that the trauma was that mother kept going away. This differs from the focus of S, who tries to convey that T actually might offer something that can be or is expected to be hurtful and bad for P. T displaces the hurtfulness into the urologist who was the mother's hurtful arm, away from the mother and from herself. S reiterates once more how P does expect to be hurt by mother and T, and that he actually bases this idea on T's own feelings "that you are ready to blow off steam at this girl". But T keeps avoiding the essence of what S conveys; she interprets her own and P's interaction as a reenactment of how mother (and T) became furious because P did not tell them, did not let them help. If she would only let T help her, but no, P goes out of reach, and T feels powerless and furious. S seems to accept this interpretation and encourages T to continue to use her countertransference reaction in a creative way. T's question "how does one use it technically" can have the function of confirming and sanctioning the "good trainee - supervisor relationship" and keeping distance from the "bad" therapist image.

### **Comparison of the two commentaries:**

The supervisor and researcher both recognize the intense countertransference and T's needs to express feelings, "to let off steam", but differ in judging the trainee's difficulties in containing, accepting and using

the information of being seen as hurtful and dangerous.

Dewald is "aware of the intensity of the candidate's affect" but sees his task to help T recognize her difficulties in accepting the role of the rejected giver as a means "to afford the candidate a more objective and cognitively organized opportunity to formulate her perception of the analytic process".

Dewald's focus is to increase T's capability "to synthesize affective experience with understanding of P's difficulties and to help the candidate empathically reconstruct and understand how P's childhood experience is currently re-enacted in her behavior". According to his judgment, T does "demonstrate active mastery and an ability to integrate the material as an organized process".

The researcher judges T to be defensive in that she is connecting P's rage with an experience of a 'basically good but unavailable object', rather than with fear of a 'bad, evil and dangerous object'. This difference in judgment between the researcher and Dewald is maintained throughout. Dewald's view: "The candidate's responding with active attempts at learning, demonstrating that she has been able to use her own earlier experience with the patient to shape her intervention" contrasts with the researcher's commentary: "To focus on P's difficulty in accepting what she has to offer is a defensive interpretation by T". One "opens channels of associations", the other indicates a "defensive retreat to the past". To judge T's attitude as

"open", as compared with "defensive", in regard to the central meaning of her transference predicament can be due to the difference of positions of the supervisor and observer.

Dewald accepted T's reformulation of a "more accurate and detailed description of her own counter-transference experience", while the researcher judged this as a defensive avoidance of being seen as "evil", that is a "bad mother/ therapist/ trainee". To recognize the complex and ambiguous positions trainee and supervisor have to deal with is easier for and more obvious to an observer. This candidate did from the beginning exhibit her wish to be seen as capable and eager and had strong ambitions to get ahead with her training as well as with the analytic work with her patients. She expressed her frustration and rage about the patient's unwillingness to use her and accept her help. To feel exposed as "evil" with intentions of hurting the "baby" who confronts her with pain can dangerously deviate from the *nil nocere* position expected of an analyst. Being both, a trainee who needs help and a candidate who is evaluated, can stimulate defensiveness. As a parallel process, the supervisor can have difficulties in being identified as evil. To insist and confront the candidate with "evil intentions" of hurting the baby who cannot be soothed can expose the supervisor as one with evil intentions.

## Discussion of Findings

Humans organize their actions to reach certain goals in accordance with their interpretation of a specific situation. Their understanding and ways of dealing with tasks and problems depend on whether they consciously/unconsciously experience some kind of control over the situation. Strategies are ways to organize actions to attain specific goals in accordance with the interpretation of the situation. Some strategies are task-oriented, others mainly defensive. Most of the methodologies by which therapeutic or supervisory processes are studied are based on the rationality of interactions. Manuals to describe, define, or categorize the interaction between therapist and patient, or supervisor and trainee seem to be based on the notion that therapists or supervisors do or can work according to pre-formulated principles and strategies.

### **The Prevalence of Conflict**

In reality, work between supervisor and trainee was often influenced by conflicts connected to the relationship and their personalities but also to the ambiguity and complexity of their task. Reactions and defenses stimulated by these conflicts showed a rich complexity. For practical purposes it is possible to group them as strategies that can hamper or facilitate the achievement of workable, as well as meaningful, solutions. There are some stable differences in the way trainees and supervisors work together that can be placed under

the heading "cognitive and working style" (Jacob 1981). The **cognitive style** is an ever-present general influence on the screening and organizing process due to stabilized dispositions of perception and cognition embodied in the personality. The **working style** is close to this, but not synonymous, because it varies according to how and what basic psychoanalytic or pedagogic concepts are preferred and how they are integrated into the actual work situation. The method of my study seemed rather to focus interest on **defensive style**, Jacob's (1981) third category for differentiating problems between supervisor and supervisee, which is related to the ways control is used (Jacob 1981).

Studying the extensive material of 56 supervisory sessions it became obvious that the supervisory interaction involved both trainees and supervisors emotionally as well as intellectually. It was possible to find many instances, where learning did occur without posing difficulties for the trainee or supervisor. Supervisors complemented or completed information the trainees needed and could use; trainees did rearrange or follow up on observations that helped them to form hypotheses and strategies that seemed relevant and useful within the context of the supervisory session. On the other hand, it happened in less than one third of the recorded sessions that trainees and/or supervisors formulated an explicit question about a problem! A somewhat unexpected finding was that each session contained instances of

some kind of conflict that was mobilizing defenses.

One impressive and recurrent finding was that all supervisors showed a predilection for dealing with learning problems by giving information and suggesting strategies to the trainee. It is important to emphasize, that all of them were familiar with supervisory literature and previous research and knew how to differentiate didactic and facilitating methods. They were theoretically aware of Jacobs' categories in which "*didactic*" teaching is used to correct *working style errors* (dumb spots) and "*other forms of teaching*" are used to deal with *defensive reactions* (blind spots) (Jacobs 1981, p.201).

Nevertheless, these "other forms" of teaching were used unpredictably by supervisors in this study. It is difficult to formulate a general statement about why supervisors dealt with learning problems contrary to expectations and contrary to the strategies they probably use in therapy. Both the microanalysis of the material and the pictures of the work yielded by the Principal Component analysis suggest that supervisors frequently retreat to explanations after they had approached the trainee's conflict and were met with defensive reactions, in contrast to the strategies they would apply in psychotherapy. A plausible reason might be the conflict supervisors have about tolerating the trainee's need to 'learn by experience and trial and error' and the responsibility they feel for safeguarding the patient's need to receive optimal care.

## **Ambiguities of the supervisory relationship**

The findings reconfirmed the necessity of considering the ambiguities in the supervisory relationship:

- The trainee is a beginner, without much knowledge and/or skill. He has to be open and honest about this in his supervision as well as with himself. On the other hand he is expected to be an optimally good therapist for his patient.
- In the therapeutic relationship the trainee is a 'real person' with his professional and personal characteristics as well as being a transference 'object' for the patient. As a transference object he is placed in different, and for him often foreign, roles.
- Within the supervisory interaction, the therapist is reconstructing the process he is part of. He is also a trainee, who has to expose himself to the supervisor who aids, teaches, and judges him.
- The supervisor is directly responsible for providing optimal conditions for learning. This has to be correlated to the responsibility the supervisors feel for safeguarding the patient's need to receive optimal care.

These positions for trainee and supervisor stimulate different emotions and reactions, rational and irrational, conscious and unconscious. It appeared necessary in each and every recorded session, to make inferences in the

educational diagnosis of both types of learning problems. Whether the difficulty emanated from inexperience or avoidance, the trainee had to face and experience the state of inadequacy or incompetence. How trainee and supervisor deal with this is of crucial importance. In my opinion, the supervisor should always keep in mind the combined learning task and the combined learning difficulties of both types, namely lack and conflict.

### **Strategies that inhibited or disturbed the learning process**

It was possible to follow the learning process step by step and observe when it was interrupted. Supervisors suddenly changed focus, tempus, broke the frame, became defensively abstract and unduly critical or too supportive.

It was possible in many instances to understand the probable meaning behind a change of strategy, which was not infrequently due to some realistic or also irrational fear of losing control over the situation. It was frequently observable that supervisor and/or trainee changed focus when they were approaching or dealing with a theme or area of conflict. They frequently turned to the patient's past or pathology in abstract theoretical terms or to the patient's external surroundings, spouses or parents as objects in external reality. This reaction is similar to externalization. Supervisor and trainee often conducted the dialogue in the 'then and there', which served defensive rather than learning purposes. All supervisors showed some predilection for

reacting by giving corrective information or for interfering in some other way, thus risking or endangering the alliance. Meeting resistance in the trainee, supervisors became unduly supportive or vague and ambiguous in the way they expressed themselves. Focus changed from looking at connections to explaining singularities. These reactions often corresponded with some break in the supervisory frame. All trainees maintained an insecurity and vulnerability, probably due to the immaturity of their professional selves.

Confronted with ambiguity, resistance, something they missed, or when feeling questioned directly or even indirectly, they defended themselves first and reflected only as a second step.

### **Important favorable interaction in optimal conditions for learning**

The *here and now* context can facilitate the re-experiencing of the interaction the trainee had with the patient and can enhance the supervisor's opportunity to contain, observe and understand the way the trainee reacted or reacts to it. Within that context, certain qualities of the interaction did seemingly facilitate learning within the supervisory session. Increasing the trainee's skill and knowledge to form meaningful hypotheses about the way the patient influences him was at such occasions enhanced by enabling him to gather more information and encouraging him to reflect about, to observe and to understand how he is influencing the patient and their interaction. To

acquire this skill the trainee must develop qualities of interaction.

*The trainee must become:*

- interested, willing to search for more and better understanding;
- reflective and open to considering that there can be more than one way to understand the meaning of parts or the whole;
- dependent on the supervisor but retain autonomy to structure and use knowledge and skill on his own;
- aware of the limitations of his own knowledge;
- capable of exploring (by clarification, confrontation, tentative interpretation) rather than explaining
- accepting of the innate discomfort of the therapeutic as well as supervisory situation (of being questioned, criticized, judged) without disqualifying the other or by avoiding questions or the discomfort with undue supportiveness.

The supervisor needs to monitor the interaction in order to support these qualities in the trainee.

*The supervisor must:*

- maintain the boundaries;
- encourage the trainee to organize information and consider ways to connect issues and reflect about his own influence before giving information or explanations;

- focus on the connections, aiming for an understanding as to how this unique patient expresses herself within the interaction and how this unique trainee reacts to it, influencing the interaction in certain specific ways;
- use clear, concise expressions that are nuanced but not ambiguous or abstract
- be interested, curious, concerned but reasonably critical

These attitudes or techniques often appeared to be more helpful than giving support, information, theoretical and/or practical explanations or exploring the relationship between trainee and supervisor. It seems possible and reasonable to differentiate supervisory techniques accordingly as:

- those that are optimally encouraging the trainee's accommodative learning
- those that interfere with learning, by missing or increasing defensive attitudes.

### **The learning alliance and the supervisory position**

Kubie (1974) called the human individual's efforts to expand his inner world, to explore new areas, respond to new stimuli, and use curiosity in the search of new knowledge as "prerequisites for survival" and regarded them as an "ego drive." Human interest, however, does not seem to survive under all circumstances! Beyond any negative influence that the recordings could

conceivably have had on the supervisory processes, there was a more or less omnipresent, pre-existing possibility of experiencing danger of some kind to which the participants reacted with defenses or avoidance. My findings substantiate Myerson's (1981) recommendation to use an enabling, in contrast to a confronting method, utilizing the trainee's mistake as an impetus to reflect on reasons for the mistake. Myerson advocates a technique to demonstrate the trainee's countertransference as part of the therapeutic paradigm, that not only is the patient's reaction to the therapeutic situation inevitable, but also the responses of the therapist are expectable and comprehensible rather than being a reflection of something pathological. It is also better to stimulate the trainee to reflect rather than to give suggestions about how to proceed, as these suggestions can intensify anxiety before enough is understood.

Systematizing and interpreting my findings I wish to bring these ideas sharply into focus. The trainee's problem of learning in supervision sessions is always connected with his other function, that of interacting therapeutically with his patient in clinical sessions. To be able to question his ways of understanding, acting and reacting in the turmoil of interactions both in the therapy and in the supervisory sessions demands certain precautions and conditions to be met.

### **The importance of the supervisory position**

Learning occurred frequently when the supervisor kept an **equidistant position** in relation to the patient-therapist system and the therapist-supervisor system. This position is not only an open, nonjudgmental, noncompetitive attitude with a continuous, stable focus on the trainee's reconstruction of his interaction with the patient, viewing the trainee-patient interaction as a system with its own boundaries and frame. The implicit and explicit rules of psychotherapy or psychoanalysis create a basic hold or frame for the therapeutic interaction for both patient and therapist. "Rules create an identity of meaning, because they ensure that phenomena following rules can be sought out as constants from among the multitude of events" (Thomä & Kächele 1987, p. 216). Thus, delineating rules for therapy and rules for supervision can create a distinctive set of conditions that differentiate it actually and functionally from the conditions outside the frame. Inside the supervisory system, dynamic factors frequently stimulate conflicts and influence the learning and teaching process. It is desirable to maintain the frame and boundaries around both the patient-therapist and trainee-supervisor systems.

In a different supervisory session under study, the nuclear problem was the trainee's difficulty to recognize and deal with the emotional impact of being compared with another therapist who happened to be his own therapist. The woman supervisor S took an equidistant position from the

beginning and kept it throughout the session. Pointing to the fact that the trainee T might feel some competition with his former therapist, comparing himself and feeling compared with him by the patient P, she focused on his actions and reactions during the therapy session, connecting it sequentially with the manifest and latent content of the dialogue between T and P. T was able to understand how he was influenced and was influencing the interaction, due to his feelings about his own therapist.

In another case S was working with a different trainee, a woman T. T felt satisfied with the way she had been able to confront P with her angry disappointment related to a canceled session. Without disqualifying T or what she achieved, S focused on the steps and the tempo that led to the confrontation. This seemingly stimulated T to recapture and recall the discourse she had with P and to investigate more closely her own reactions, resulting in a deeper understanding of the uneasiness she had and has about strong feelings of hate and love.

In the following and contrasting example the supervisor, a man, S did not keep an equidistant position. T reported that he felt tired, discouraged and hopeless in the presence of P. P just explained that, as her fiancé refuses to have a child with her, she feels there is no point in continuing the relationship with him, the treatment, or the task of understanding herself better. T tried to examine how P relates to her fiancé on the one hand and to

therapy on the other. Working with this report, S emphasized separately that: a) P uses the refusal of her fiancé as an excuse to resist her work with her own problems about sexuality, and that b) for P sexuality is only approved of when it is in the service of generativity, and that c) P relates to T in certain ways that lead T to feel tired, hopeless, and discouraged and that d) he, S, feels also tired and paralyzed during the supervisory session. S does not connect these parts but changes perspectives, from looking rather at P's external relationship than at P's intrapsychic reality and the interaction between P and T. An optimal position would be attempting to connect P's enactment and T's reaction, encouraging T to organize and combine information about the patient, the patient's personality and the dynamic of her conflicts as they are expressed in the interaction with T. In this instance it may be formulated as: P wishes something similar to an idealized pregnancy from T. This would reduce her feelings of being unloved, ashamed, and inferior, feelings that T and she had tried to work with previously. Since T did not give 'it' (a baby) to her, she accused T for refusing her, treated him as she treats her fiancé, and wanted to break her engagement with both of them.

Three aspects of the frame support the supervisor in maintaining the optimal position. These are the stationary, the mobile and the focused aspects of the frame. The stationary aspect refers to the agreement on goals, payment, methods, general rules for supervision as well as for the therapy

that is the object of the supervision. The mobile aspect refers to the continuous, reflective review of the working together. The focusing aspect refers to the overall boundary maintenance and continuous focus of the supervisor (explicitly or implicitly) on the patient-therapist interaction. The concept of boundary is used as a metaphor, separating a person, an interaction, an organization from the surrounding ones by means of explicit or implicit agreements about values, goals and means. Boundaries around the interaction between trainee and supervisor, should be maintained by the supervisor through a continuous attention on keeping to the primary task of focusing on how this patient's personality, past experiences, conflicts and transference enactments are expressed in the interaction with this particular therapist and how the therapist experiences this, reacts to it and interacts with the patient. This well-bounded, cohesive but not rigid frame enables the differentiation of intentions, reactions or interpretations that belong to or are foreign to the two systems. Studying the supervisory interactions and relationships it became obvious how strongly the holding aspect of the supervisory relationship (Szecsödy 1974) was connected to good boundary maintenance.

### **Mutative learning situation**

Learning that led to a (more or less explicitly confirmed) change of

understanding in the trainee, occurred regularly in a context that I call a *mutative learning situation* analogous to mutative situations in psychotherapy (Loewald 1960). A mutative learning situation occurs when the trainee (and/or patient) experiences something contrary to his expectations while at the same time becoming aware of the coexistence of the expected and the actual experience. Working with a task according to the rules in a system, one can take a stance some distance from the performed task and make observations about it. One steps out of the system and then looks for the rules of the system that define the way the task has to be achieved (Hofstaedter 1980).

"Man uses and creates theorems (statements made of the universe according to certain rules or theories) to organize his experience of living. These experiences are stored and stratified as 'strings' or memory traces. These strings can be non-verbal, verbal, signs, pictures. Through the constant interaction, with others within the culture, these strings are organized according to certain rules, rules that are formed by and within interacting subjects (such as mother-child) which then define the ways strings can be organized, and become the rules of the system" (Hofstaedter 1980)

For the most part, like fish automatically living in water, we live unaware of the rules of our systems. Unlike fish, with the help of our intelligence, we can grasp the boundaries and rules of the system of which we are a part. It is essential to make the step 'out' of the system to be able to observe it. Our difficulties in learning by accommodation are connected with our limitations and resistance to leaving our stereotyped ways of abiding by

the rules of perceiving and reacting to the systems of intrapsychical and interpersonal relationships.

The recognition of the regularity of change connected to mutative learning situations led me to define a formulation about the primary task for supervision: The specific task for supervision is to help the trainee to comprehend the system of interaction with his patient. This also means that the trainee has to be able to 'step out' of the system of interaction he has with his patient, to be able to observe and understand it. This can be facilitated with the creation of a 'formal system for supervision'. This means, that trainee and supervisor agree not only on theories about development, psychopathology and therapeutic technique but also on the rules of their interaction. These rules are the consistency by which the frame is kept and the boundaries maintained. To establish these rules the supervisor has to keep a clear frame by separating his task of doing supervision from the task of the trainee, which is to conduct therapy. By focusing continuously and consistently on, and helping the therapist to reflect about, the combined interaction with the patient, the supervisor maintains the formal system and enables the trainee to step out of and observe his own system.

## **To become or be made a psychoanalyst: Independent studies of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute**

Psychoanalysis is unique in that competence in the field can be achieved only through applying the method to oneself. Different psychoanalytic schools differ in their understanding of the unconscious, about how to approach it, or how to define the specificity of the psychoanalytic interaction.

Consequently there are differences in the criteria for the definition of the 'good enough analysis'. There are many different opinions about how to select candidates, organize the curriculum, and determine the length of training. To define psychoanalytic talent is difficult; to define criteria to use for selection is of uncertain value; the problematic overlap between personal analysis and training is constantly present; and to achieve conditions in which learning and creativity can develop is complicated by trainee, supervisor and their relationship to the Institute. Confrontations about training are often

heated and divergent, as well as repetitive. Systematic studies about psychoanalytic education are few. After a short discussion of the different concerns about selection, personal versus training analysis and the ambiguities of the supervisory situation, I will review three studies on how psychoanalytic education – as viewed by trainers and trainees - is conducted and experienced at Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute.

### The tripartite model - and its discontents

Psychoanalytic training was institutionalized in 1922 at the Berlin Congress. It was built on the tripartite model: *personal analysis* as the basis so as to learn the method first hand and get in touch with the influence of the unconscious on everyday personal and professional life; *didactic training* to learn the theory; and *supervision* to integrate experience and theory with the candidate's personality. It may be of service to remember that as soon as training becomes organized it poses a problem for trainer and trainees as to what the content of a training program should be, who should be selected for such training and according to what kinds of principles, and last but not least, what the most productive teaching methods might be. Various psychoanalytic schools differ in how to understand the unconscious, how to approach it, and how to define the specificity of the psychoanalytic interaction. Consequently there are differences in the criteria for the

definition of the good enough analysis. There are many different opinions about how to select candidates, organize the curriculum and length of training, and confrontations about training are often heated and divergent, as well as repetitive (Watillon 1993). Nevertheless, the majority of discussants stress the complexities of training for the ‘impossible profession’, the ambiguous position of the training analyst, and the difficulties of finding scientific or objective criteria for selection and evaluation.

To define psychoanalytic talent is difficult. In his report on the 4th IPA pre-congress Victor Calef regretted, that the study of the “good analyst” has not gotten off the ground. Only in 2002 did the Working Party on Psychoanalytic Education of the EPF start a study conducted by Filet & Szönyi who looked at how analytic competence is thought of and defined by different European psychoanalysts. In his study, Kappelle (1996) found that selection is strongly influenced through the interaction of applicant and selectors, selection methods are proved to be largely intuitive, and many of the respondents had difficulty in defining the criteria they used. Discussion regarding the place of personal or training analysis is continuous and divergent. In a majority of societies candidates had to have their analysis with a training analyst, and in those societies with a closed model, this analysis had to be concurrent with the analytic training and not terminated before completion of the training. There is an emphasis on the delicate

nature of the task of conducting training analyses: one is analyzing a future colleague with whom the analyst already has or will have all kinds of extra-analytic contacts, connections, and bonds. It is then necessary to select analysts who have the experience and understanding of these complications as well as the ethical standing to deal with them.

There are societies who prefer to abolish the title of training analyst and to leave it to candidates to choose an experienced analyst for training purposes. They hold that there is no generic difference between training and therapeutic analysis; analysis should be removed from the educational process and undertaken by any experienced analyst, as the qualities required to analyze anybody, whether a candidate or not, are not didactic. They warn against the problems that arise when power is in the hands of a group of analysts who are given the exclusive right to analyze candidates.

As I see it, the problematic overlap between analysis and training is constantly present. It has been referred to as syncretism, ambiguity, contamination, interference, dual role, dual objective, and dual loyalty. To become a training analyst is to not only fulfill a function, but also acquire the status of a higher authority. Conflicts are unavoidable, as analysts may act on innate aggressivity, rivalry, and acquisitiveness. Conflicts due to theoretical or ideological differences are often based on personal differences. Conflicts also arise from idealization of the analyst, the profession, and the analytic

society. All of these conflicts are perpetuated by establishing two 'classes' of psychoanalysts. I am in support of the idea that a thoroughly trained analyst, with years of clinical experience (5 years minimum), and no history of ethical lapses or other professional misbehavior and inadequacy, should be automatically qualified to conduct analyses of candidates.

### **The ambiguities of the supervisory situation**

In Chapter 4, I discussed the difficulty of achieving a good context for supervision, the perceptions and motives of supervisors and the fear of candidates working together in what is an ambiguous situation (Szecsödy 1990, 1994, 1997). Within the supervisory interaction, the candidate is reconstructing the process he is part of. He has to expose himself to the supervisor who aids, teaches and judges him. The supervisor is directly responsible for providing optimal conditions for learning while safeguarding optimal care for the patient. I also outlined the contrast between the experiential model and the didactic model of supervision. The supervisor's model and conscious, intentional influence on the supervision and the supervisee, together with what is unconscious, ought to be given more attention than it has previously received. Supervisors may utilize their position of power and, without being aware of it, be tempted to interpret problems in terms of resistance, anxiety, or limitations in patient and

candidate, rather than observing and recognizing their own difficulties in teaching. “To feel affirmed as a good teacher is a legitimate need of the supervisor, that is, an appropriate narcissistic need which can evolve into supertransference only when it becomes excessive” (Teitelbaum 1990, p. 245). The supervisor may then become overprotective or excessively critical, may use his theories as unimpeachable dogma and identify with the myth that the supervisor always knows best. We need to devote more resources to studying the supervisory process and learning how to train the supervisors (Szecsödy 1994, Szecsödy 1999).

The capacity to take responsibility is an important quality in the candidate and future analyst. Candidates’ involvement in their assessment is essential. Greater freedom to question and explore, together with a wider circle of input and feedback, can contribute significantly not just to the candidate’s individual professional development but also to the organization’s increased flexibility and growth. We need to devote more attention to making explicit our educational goals and the rationale behind them. And we need to encourage research.

### **Three studies on the training conducted at the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute**

Stimulated by the preparations made for a study by COMPSED

(Committee of Psychoanalytic Education), the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute became interested in doing a pilot-study for which we had the opportunity to cooperate with the Institution of Psychology, Stockholm University where students were willing to work on this research and write their graduation theses on collected material (M. and C. Andersen 2001, Lindgren 2002, Johansson 2003). The three studies addressed these questions:

- a) What are the essential qualities and competencies candidates have to develop through training?
- b) What are the underlying, governing ideas behind the structure of the institute?
- c) How are these ideas practiced in the structure and procedures of training?
- d) What are the specific advantages and drawbacks of the training system?

I will now summarize my impression of the findings of the three studies.

### **1. Psychoanalytic Identity is Fostered by the Psychoanalytic Community- a Study of Psychoanalytic Education**

The authors chose to focus on how psychoanalytic professional identity and its development is conceived of and experienced by candidates at the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute (M. Andersen & C. Andersen (2001). Of the

group of 19 candidates (9 in the second year and 10 in the fourth year of training) 4 of the second year and 5 of the fourth year volunteered to be interviewed.

The authors found that the admission procedure is seen as a valuable learning experience. One of the reasons candidates apply for training is the wish to belong to a group with a shared interest in and fascination with psychoanalytic thinking and theory. The candidates are highly appreciative of their training – and define the training system as superb. They feel that training is permeated with the psychoanalytic way of thinking and conduct; and that it is open, tolerant and reflective. Relations within the group, the Institute and the Society are complex and complicated, and it is therefore important to have a specific climate that facilitates growth and learning. A candidate in supervision and in seminars is in an ambiguous situation, wanting to give a good impression and yet be open and honest about shortcomings and peculiarities, and therefore vulnerable to the subjectivity of those who judge. Much value is put on how well the candidates perform with their analysands, but the supervisory relationship is continuously open for joint evaluation. Candidates are present when their progress is discussed before the supervisory committee during training as well as at graduation. Evaluation of supervisor and supervisee seems to be mutual throughout training.

The candidates do gradually acquire psychoanalytic language, concepts, and theoretical foundation. They feel that seminars should be arranged in chronological order to understand the dynamics of psychoanalytic theory.

Knowledge gives them a sense of identity. To learn and acquire clinical competence is central, even for those who expect to use psychoanalytic knowledge in other fields and in outreach to the community. The primary task for training is to bring about the personal and professional development of the candidates as people who conduct analyses. Analysts have to possess certain qualities such as curiosity, capacity to contain anxiety and be attentive to others, impulse-control, creativity, honesty, well developed reflective functioning, self-awareness and self-knowledge. If they lack these qualities, applicants are seen as unsuitable. The competencies to be acquired are closely connected to the qualities they should possess to be selected as candidates and qualified as analysts. Most of those interviewed did not differentiate professional from personal identity. They work with their whole person and personality. They regard developing certain traits in their personality is the most important part of training. They are aware of a discrepancy between what they learn and gain competence in and how they can use it professionally in the future. They see the aim for the Institute is to transmit traditional psychoanalytic knowledge to future generations.

In their discussion, the authors of the study emphasize the role of

idealization in the problematic position of candidates and as teachers. They give the caveat that information from individuals should not be used as facts defining the group as a whole. Nevertheless, the candidates that were interviewed all showed an idealized picture of analysis and analysts before entering training and this, as well as the reverence they have for their elders suggests an ever-present idealization.

## **2: The Culture of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute**

In this study (Lindgren 2002) the author interviewed 7 members of the Swedish Psychoanalytic Institute. She found an interesting discrepancy between the clearly stipulated regulations for how training should be organized and the non-existent rules for how teachers conduct their seminars. Individual teachers have great freedom to plan and conduct their seminars. Newcomers build on oral information and tradition, or choose to improvise. It is unclear how seminar leaders are chosen. Individual ambition and engagement in the administration of the organization of the Institute and society do carry weight, but there is no formal regulation governing the method of teacher selection. It is seen as most important to gear the training to provide for the future of psychoanalysis in general, maintain its corpus of knowledge, and assure its influence in time to come. But this need not hinder some experimentation with new and different pedagogic methods and

changes in theory and methodology. Nevertheless, how energy is divided between preserving tradition or changing is thought to “depend on available resources” not on pedagogic merit. Those who have contributed to professional publications and are willing and eager to take part in the scientific meetings and discussions of the Society locally or internationally are well regarded.

All concerned express a sincere desire to work hard on the maintenance of psychoanalysis for the future and to face up to the ever-smaller space society reserves for it. To be deeply involved in the training, possess a strong, relentless work-morale, repay the devotion of former teachers and colleagues with the same passionate involvement in the administration of that training, are important qualities. A central metaphor for the culture of the Institute seems to be that of “gratitude” among members and candidates. All the work on the various committees is voluntary. Teachers and supervisors receive relatively low fees. Most of the seminars, administrative meetings, and post-graduate training events, are carried out in the evenings, during so-called free time.

Theory, praxis, and analytic identity are still based on and connected to their origins in Freud. There is an implicit feeling of continuity and maintenance of historical heritage within the Institute but rather few names of important individuals are mentioned. This may suggest more complex and

conflictual underlying dynamics that cannot be openly expressed and worked with. Nonetheless, preparations before, and discussions during, a site visit from an IPA ad hoc committee in the early 1980s was seen as a turning point that changed a rather orthodox, patriarchal system advocating pure analysis, into a much more open and tolerant climate, where differences are debatable and where the atmosphere is scientific and less tribal and confessional. The cultural climate of the society is pluralistic and open.

The primary task of the Institute is to train psychoanalysts. Some thought has been given to whether to open the Institute for others who wish to receive theoretical training for non-clinical but applied purposes, and a discussion has started. Though members of the Institute are aware of the difficulties that aspiring clinicians will meet in finding analysands, there are no apparent plans to modify the profile of training to meet the changing clinical field. Admission is still strongly influenced by the high value put on those applicants who are willing to commit themselves to becoming psychoanalytically active clinicians. A rather intriguing question then is: Why is it that, although all of those interviewed strongly emphasize the value of working for the future of psychoanalysis, they have no serious plans to modify training according to the changing climate in which psychoanalysts of the future will have to work? The impression from the first study of candidates – who feel they have been “chosen” and must keep up an idealized

image of psychoanalysis and psychoanalysts—is also evident in this study of members.

### **3. Comprehension of psychoanalytic education**

Johansson's (2002) explorative questionnaire study analyses the answers to a questionnaire sent to candidates, teachers-supervisors, and members of the Society who are not actually involved with training. A questionnaire was sent out to 12 candidates, (7 answered, 4 commented) 12 teachers/supervisors (6 answered 2 commented) and 16 members of the Society who are not acutely involved with training (5 answered, 4 commented). Most commentators complained that answering the questionnaire was too time-consuming.

Analytic training does resemble a kind of trade school, master clinicians meeting apprentices, with the goal of training them. Many respondents claim that they do not have enough perspective on the overall organization of training. They believe, however, that discussions in seminars, supervision, and personal analysis together will enable a candidate to acquire knowledge and identity as a psychoanalyst. Though candidates are encouraged to use their knowledge not only as clinicians but also in becoming theoreticians and

in applying psychoanalysis to other sciences, culture, and social organizations, their training and evaluation are mainly focused on them as clinicians. Quite a few mention that they favor the clear, “continuous and coherent structure of training – that has a containing function.” Nonetheless some feel that “the didactic part of training is too closed and clogged” and most are in favor of having more elective courses. Even though teachers are of the opinion that having a shared common base for theory is a must, a majority recommend an 80/20 or 70/30 percent balance between fixed/elective courses. Some believe that candidates should be involved in the planning of training.

According to candidates, integrating psychoanalytic theory with one’s personality is pivotal so as to expand the potential for self-reflection and empathy as well as to deepen critical and exploratory capacity. Some mention the courage to stand up for one’s beliefs and take risks in discussions with colleagues. They find training rather expensive, and they view their future as actively working psychoanalysts as uncertain. They are aware of the actual crisis of psychoanalysis, and connect it with the perceived threat to the method from the public and other professionals. They see isolation as dangerous, and urge psychoanalytic societies to turn towards the outside.

Plans for outreach are important, but so is the imperative to safeguard psychoanalytic knowledge. Candidates, members and teachers emphasize

that personality, training, ideology, social forces and economic factors are deeply intertwined. They find it difficult to separate them or set up a hierarchy of importance among the factors. Still most candidates put personality in first place. Interestingly, economic and social influence seem to be undervalued – supporting findings from the earlier studies, that having been chosen to become a psychoanalyst, personality and personal experience define how practice is formed. There may be problems of equality and gender – which are not openly discussed.

None of the supervisors mention any “virtues” or “values” that candidates should acquire. They identify psychoanalytic knowledge and the capacity to reflect and understand one’s role in interactions as important competencies to be acquired. The development of a psychoanalytic identity is an important goal for training, and training clinicians is seen to be the primary task of the Institute.

The status of training analysts is not questioned as much as appears in the literature. The answers give as many pros as cons about maintaining training analyst status. Appointment as a training analyst secures quality for the analysand and brings prestige to the training analyst but the status produces an unnecessary hierarchy in the institute. Most of all it can create problems when an admitted candidate has to interrupt a personal analysis and start anew with a training analyst.

All respondents emphasize the advantages of deepening understanding about supervision and having an organized training. This is seen as important and positive but is viewed by some as a strait jacket.

The survey posed the question: should the program include training in psychoanalytical psychotherapy? Most candidates emphasize that this is a difficult question. Nevertheless a majority could accept the idea of including psychotherapeutic technique in the training program and even consider it advantageous, while some see it as a drawback. Supervisors and teachers are divided on the question. Not a few stress the importance of keeping training clean, not mixing the analytic model and technique with a psychotherapeutic one. They feel that “it could produce confusion.” They believe that “the personal identification with becoming a psychoanalyst is important.” Others see advantages, in “counteracting polarization, and idealization.” They feel that “it may clarify the differences,” and that it reflects reality “as many of us work both with psychoanalysis as well as psychotherapy.” Only a few analytic candidates thought that having supervision on twice-a-week psychotherapy cases could have a particular value, as it would make it possible to study, reflect upon the experience of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, and enable them to understand how they work, relate, and use theory, transference and counter-transference in both settings.

## Summary of Findings

Training given by the institute is highly regarded by both candidates and teachers/ supervisors. They praise the warm and open atmosphere, the mutual and continuous evaluations, and the deep involvement of all.

According to those involved, training is well grounded in theory and tradition. Nonetheless most do not have a sufficiently clear picture of training as a whole. The candidates feel chosen to belong to a special group who share an interest and fascination with psychoanalytic thinking and theory.” Both candidates and trainers see the development of a psychoanalytic identity as the goal of training, where the competencies to be acquired are equated with important personality qualities. Admission is still strongly influenced by the high value put on those applicants who are willing to commit themselves to becoming psychoanalytically active clinicians. They will nevertheless be in situations that call for using psychoanalytic knowledge in other fields and in outreach to the community, but how to prepare them for those applications is not clear. A rather intriguing question then is: why is it that, although all of those interviewed strongly emphasize the value of working for the future of psychoanalysis, there is no serious plan to modify training according to the changing climate in which psychoanalysts of the future will have to work?

To pinpoint the role of training is a difficult task. It raises complex questions, and to collect data poses serious methodological problems.

Nevertheless we need to develop ways of studying it. We need studies like the three I have described to help us to reflect and think, instead of sticking to our internal conflicts and continuing the fight between those who wish to preserve the old methods and those who urge for change.

The intimacy and confidentiality of the analytic situation, the unclear definitions of professional maturation and optimal competence, the dependence on “masters” with whom the candidates wish to identify, and the complex interconnections and dependencies within the analytic institute and society must be noted and understood in any study of psychoanalytic training.

There seems to be no clear differentiation between the task of achieving psychoanalytic identity and developing the essential competencies for being a psychoanalyst. The fantasy that psychoanalysts are exceptional people stands in the way of radical changes in training that are necessary to develop that competence and safeguard a place for psychoanalysis in the future. The urge to be part of the psychoanalytic ethic, the culture of gratitude within the institute, and the devotion to training psychoanalytic clinicians for the future preserve an idealized, mystical image of psychoanalysis, and that blocks change. To study how to deal with the present and future of psychoanalysis, we should reconstruct and re-examine our institutional history.

### **Reconstructing our institutional history**

It is often said that psychoanalysis faces a crisis. Crisis derives from the Greek *Krinein* meaning to decide or separate. In Chinese the word crisis is made up of two ideograms: danger and opportunity. Crisis can be an important factor in change. It is important to see, that the crisis of confidence in analysis that we talk about in 2012 is not new; it is recurrent. I wish to give only a few illustrations. From the 1974 Fall Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Emde reported:

“Unprecedented pressures are impinging today on psychoanalysis, in terms of both its professional and scientific aspects. There is demand for quicker results and broader involvement with greater numbers of people. Third-party payments are already evidencing prejudices against psychiatric treatment, especially on an outpatient and long-term basis. There are also financial pressures in training and practice and a reputed falling-off of analytic patients”(Emde 1975, p.584).

The 1996 report of the IPA's House of Delegates highlighted the crucial importance of dealing with the crisis faced by psychoanalysis as a treatment method. This situation is even more exaggerated now. There is a downward trend worldwide in the maintenance of psychoanalytic practice. Fewer candidates apply to the institutes and fewer patients ask for or can afford psychoanalytic treatment. Candidates in training find it increasingly hard to find analysands to treat under supervision. Many highly talented and creative candidates become discouraged and disenchanted by the shortcomings of training and the attitudes in the professional psychoanalytic community.

Though we face a crisis, only rarely is psychoanalytic training accompanied by systematic research on process and outcome. Even scarcer are systematic studies on psychoanalytic training and courses for candidates on research. It is often claimed that the tripartite system of psychoanalytic education is the best available. Yet, we know that it stifles creativity and genuine questioning. Balint (1948) sharply criticized psychoanalytic education, including the supervisory process, for being analogous to a “primitive initiation ceremony”. In 1974 at the above-mentioned meeting of the APA it was already being strongly recommended that we should foster in our institutes and societies a more scholarly atmosphere in which members, faculty and candidates can work together to understand, challenge, and extend psychoanalytic method and theory, and where the study of self and active learning is the students’ responsibility. A closer collaboration with the universities was advocated, and throughout, a persistent interest was expressed in a systematic evaluation of the tripartite system, including the curriculum, selection of candidates, supervision, and the training analysis itself. In 1998, according to a report from Schachter and Luborsky, there were only six Institutes of the APA where research was in the curriculum of training. In 1999, Thomä and Kächele still had to stress in their memorandum on reform of psychoanalytic training, submitted to the Executive Council of the IPA (1999 published in the IPA Newsletter) that we should build our psychoanalytic education on the “teaching, research and

treatment triad“ in order to keep psychoanalysis alive for the future.

Auchincloss and Michels (2003) argue that the excessive authoritarianism in education arises not from the existence of hierarchical structures per se, but from two other factors – the condensation of all important functions into the single monolithic position of the training analyst and the lack of agreed upon methodology for determining the validity of theoretical propositions. The solution they propose is “strengthening the intellectual, scholarly and research context within which psychoanalytic education takes place” (p. 387) – a proposition very close to the one from 1974. Auchincloss and Michels (2003) assert to “use the classroom to encourage attitudes of searching enquiry and questioning authority – attitudes of the sort that we encourage in our patients every day” (p. 399). We should continuously discover and rediscover the determinants of the organization of our institutes and the nature of the relationships they offer to candidates and trainers.

There are also some important events that can increase our hope for the future. In 1997 the IPA installed a research fund to which the research committee received over 80 applications, of which a third were judged to be of such an excellent quality to warrant funding. There are ongoing studies on the efficacy of psychoanalysis; on the specificity of the psychoanalytic process and its effect; on comparing the process and effect of psychoanalytic therapy

conducted by the same therapist at different frequency (4-5 times and 1-2 times a week) on how training influences candidates; on how supervision may be conducted by fax, internet and video and how that compares to face-to-face supervision. At IPA congresses research receives more and more space. At the last two EFP congresses, workshops were organized on the theme: How can clinicians use psychoanalytic research? Under the presidency of David Tuckett, the European Psychoanalytic Federation has formed Working Parties on Clinical and Theoretical Issues, and on Psychoanalytic Education. They have the task of “describing the types of working psychoanalytically,” “assessing the effectiveness of working psychoanalytically” and “creating transparent means to assess training outcomes, and publishing studies of the effectiveness of different educational systems.”

We have to modify the existing organization by restructuring previously held knowledge, point of views and theory, and technique and standards of psychoanalytic practice. The question is this: Can and will research, like the studies described here, help us to reflect and think, instead of sticking to our internal conflicts and continuing the fight between those who wish to preserve the old methods and those who urge for change. My sincere hope is that it might stimulate us to continue our discussion and raise further questions for systematic research. As more and more analysts engage in research, within, connected to, or parallel to their clinical work, the

psychoanalysis can become a discipline that does not have to rely on past authority, and instead is one that is completely committed to a process of adaptation based on continual reflection of its own nature and structure.

Research, reflection, and review of our methods and our institutions will show us the way to keep psychoanalysis alive as theoretical system and treatment method into the future.

**Share this Book with your Friends!**



## References

- Alexius, B. (1994). Att reflektera över reflexioner: En studie av elevernas värdering av handledning på handledning under handledarutbildning i psykoterapi och psykiatriskt behandlingsarbete 1988-90. Examensarbete vid handledarutbildning 1990-92, [To reflect over reflections: A study of the students' evaluation of supervision on supervision during a supervisor training program in psycho-therapy and attached psychiatric treatment 1988-90.] Utbildningsenheten, Psykiatriska verksamheten, Västra sjukvårdsområdet, Stockholms läns landsting. [Psychotherapy Training Unit, Western area of medical care, Stockholm County Council. Examination thesis at a supervisor training program 1990-92.]
- Andersen, M. & Andersson, C. (2001) Den psykoanalytiska gemenskapen föder analytikeridentiteten – en intervjustudie med kandidater i psykoanalytisk utbildning. PhD thesis at the Institute of Psychology, University of Stockholm.
- Appelbaum, S.A. (1978). Pathways to change in psychoanalytic therapy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*. 43:239-251.
- Arlow, J. A. (1963). The supervisory situation. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 11:576-594
- Armeliu B-Å & Kullgren G (1986). Soft modeling of the psychological characteristics of suicided and nonsuicided borderline patients. *Umeå: DAPS:report No 14*.
- Aronowitsch, E. (2002). Evaluation and assessment in psychoanalytic supervision. Internal working paper of EPF-WRE, 2002, ed. M. Target, and E. Aronowitsch.
- Auchinloss, E. L. & Michels, R. (2003). A reassessment of psychoanalytic education. Controversies and change. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 84:387-403.
- Balint, M. (1948). On the psychoanalytic training system. *Int. J. Psychoanal.* 29:163-

- Boalt Boëthius, S. & Ögren, M-L. (2003a). *Grupphandledning: Den lilla gruppen som forum för lärande*. Stockholm: Mareld och Ericastiftelsen.
- (2003b). Samspel mellan handledare och handledd i psykoterapiutbildning. I S. Boalt Boëthius & M-L. Ögren (red.) *Grupphandledning: Den lilla gruppen som forum för lärande*. Stockholm: Mareld och Ericastiftelsen.
- (2006). Group supervision from a small group perspective. *Nordic Psychology*. 58: 22-42.
- Bromberg, P. M. (1982). The supervisory process and parallel process in psychoanalysis. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 18:92-110.
- Cabaniss, D. L., Glick, R. A. and Roose, S. P. (2001). The Columbia supervision project. Data from the dyad. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 49:235-267.
- Calef, V. (1972). A report of the 4th Pre-congress on training, Vienna 1971, to the 27th IPA Congress. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 53:37-43.
- Caligor, L. (1984). Parallel and reciprocal processes in psychoanalytic supervision. *Contemp. Psychoanal.* 17: 1-27.
- Dewald, P. (1987). *Learning Process in Psychoanalytic Supervision: Complexities and Challenges*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Dijkhuis, J. H. (1979). Research on training in psychotherapy. In: DeMoor, W. & Wijngaarden, H. R. (eds.). *Psychotherapy: Research and Training*. Amsterdam: Elsevier & North Holland Biomedical Press.
- Eisold, K. (2004) Problems of power in psychoanalytic institutions *Psychoanal.Inq.*24:151-170.
- Ekstein, R. & Wallerstein, R. (1958). *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Emde, R. N. (1975). Report from the National Conference on Psychoanalytic Education. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 23:569-586.

- Enoksson, H., Hartelius, M., Jonsson, K. Y., Macek, I. & Szecsödy, I. (2011). Att utvecklas som handledare. *Insikten*.1:13-19.
- Epstein, L. (1985). Der Reziproke Parallellprozess. *Forum Psychoanalyticum*. 1:131-142.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Field, K. Cohler, B. J., & Wool, G. (1989). *Learning and education: psychoanalytic perspectives*. Ed: K. Field, B. J. Cohler, G. Wool. Madison, WI: Int. Univ. Press.
- Fleming, J. & Benedek, T. (1966). *Psychoanalytic Supervision: A Method of Clinical Teaching*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Freud, S. (1912). Recommendations to physicians practicing psychoanalysis. *S. E.* 12:111-120.
- Frijling-Schreuder, E.C.-M., Isaac-Edersheim, E. & Van Der Leeuw, P.J. (1981). The supervisor's evaluation of the candidate. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 8:393-400.
- Garza-Guerrero, C. (2004). Reorganisational and educational demands of psychoanalytic training today: Our long and marasmic night of one century. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 85:3-26.
- Gediman, H. K., and Wolkenfeld, F. (1980). The parallelism phenomenon in psychoanalysis and supervision: it's reconsideration as a triadic system. *Psychoanal Quarterly*. 44:234-255.
- Glick, P., Eagle, P., Lubet, B., & Roose, S. (1996). The fate of training cases. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 7:803-812.
- Goin, M. K. & Kline, F. M. (1974). Supervision observed. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases*. 158:208-213.
- \_\_\_\_ (1976). Countertransference: a neglected subject in clinical supervision. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 133: 41-44.

- Greenberg, L. S. (1984). Task analysis: the general approach. In Rice, L. N. & Greenberg, L. S. (Eds.) *Patterns of Change. Intensive Analysis of Psychotherapy Process*. (pp 124-148). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Grey, A. and Fiscalini, J. (1987). Parallel process as transference-countertransference interaction. *Psychoanal. Psychol.* 4:131-144[à].
- Gross-Doehrman, M. J. (1976). Parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. *Bull. Mennin. Clinic.*, 1:9-105.
- Heising, G. (1976). Zur Psychodynamik der Supervision. *Praxis der Psychotherapie*. 21: 185-191.
- Hofstadter, D. (1979). *Godel, Escher, Bach: an Eternal Golden Braid*. New York: Basic Books.
- Holmstedt Lothigius, A. (1986). *En retrospektiv studie över en handledarutbildning. Psykologexamensarbete, Psykologiska institutionen, Stockholms universitet*.
- Jacob, P. (1981). The San Francisco project: the analyst at work. In: Wallerstein, R. (Ed). *Becoming a Psychoanalyst. A Study of Psychoanalytic Supervision*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Jansson, V. (1975). Psykoterapihandledningens pedagogik. *UHÄ rapport*. 1975:23. Stockholm.
- Johansson, I. (2003). Uppfattningar om en psykoanalytikerutbildning – en kvalitativ enkätstudie. PhD thesis at the Institute of Psychology, University of Stockholm.
- Kappelle, W. (1996). How useful is selection? *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 77:1213-32.
- \_\_\_\_ (1986). Institutional problems of psycho-analytic education. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 34:799-834.
- Kernberg, O. (1996). Thirty methods to destroy the creativity of psychoanalytic candidates. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 77:1031-1040.
- \_\_\_\_ (2000). A concerned critique of psychoanalytic education. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.*

81:97-120.

- Kline, F., Goin, M. K. & Zimmerman, W. (1977). You can be a better supervisor. *The Journal of Psychiatric Education*. 2:174 -179.
- Kubie, L. (1958). Research into the process of supervision in psychoanalysis, *Psychoanal.Quart.* 27:226-36.
- \_\_\_\_ (1974). The drive to become both sexes. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 43: 349-426.
- Körner, J. (2002). The didactics of psychoanalytic education. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 83:1395-1405.
- Lambert, M. J. (1980). Research and the supervisory process. In: Hess, A. K. (Ed). *Psychotherapy Supervision: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Langs, R. (1979). *The Supervisory Experience*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Leuzinger-Bohleber, M. (1984). *Psychotherapeutische Denkprozesse. Kognitive Prozesse bei der Indikation Psychotherapeutischer Verfahren*. Ulm: PSZ-Verlag.
- Lindgren, D. (2002). Kulturens kraft – aspekter av en psykoanalytikerutbildning. PhD thesis at the Institute of Psychology, University of Stockholm.
- Loewald, H. (1960). On the therapeutic action of psycho-analysis. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 41:16-33.
- Marcus, H. (1985). Freud and Dora: Story, History, Case history. In: Bernheimer, C. & Kahane, C. (Eds) *In Dora's Case*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Martin, G.C., Mayerson, P., Olsen, H.D. & Widberg, J.L. (1978). Candidates' evaluation of psychoanalytic supervision. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 26:407-424.
- Myerson, P. G. (1981). On being a member of a supervision study group. In: Wallerstein, R. (Ed). *Becoming a Psycho-analyst*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Ögren, M-L., Apelman, A. & Klawitter, M. (2003). Grupper i handledningen. I S. Boalt Boëthius & M.L Ögren, (Red.) *Grupphandledning: Den lilla gruppen som*

*forum för lärande*. Stockholm: Mareld och Ericastiftelsen.

- Ögren, M-L. & Boalt Boëthius, S. (2005). Vägen från terapeut till handledare. Handleda och handledares erfarenheter av en handledarutbildning. *Insikten*. 4:14-24.
- Ögren, M-L., Boalt Boëthius, S. & Sundin, E. C. (2008) From psychotherapist to supervisor. Supervisees` and supervisors` experiences of a supervisor training program based on group supervision. *Nordic Psychology*. 60 (1):3-23.
- Piaget, J. (1958). *The Development of Thought: Equilibration of Cognitive Structures*. New York: Viking.
- Reeder, J. (2001). *Hat och Kärlek i Psykoanalytiska Institutioner. En professions dilemma*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag.
- \_\_\_\_ (2004) *Hate and Love in Psychoanalytic Institutions. The dilemma of a profession*. New York: Other Press.
- Reichelt, S. & Skjerva, J. (2002), Correspondence between supervisors and trainees in their perceptions of supervision events. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 58: 759-772.
- \_\_\_\_ (2002). What is good supervision - correspondence between supervisors and trainees in their perception of supervision events. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 58: 759-772.
- \_\_\_\_ (2004): Supervisor competence: Tasks and challenges in the supervisor role. *Nordisk Psykologi*. 56 (2): 75-91.
- Richter, C. (1980). *Handledaridentitet - Utvärdering av en Handledarutbildning*. Examinationsarbete vid Psykologiska Institutionen. Stockholms Universitet.
- Rioch, M. (1976). *Dialogues for Therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rodriguees & J. P. Vidal (Eds). *Monograph on Supervision*. London: Karnac.
- Rönnestad, M. H. & Reichelt, S. (1999), *Psykoterapeututbildning*. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.

- Sachs, D. M. and Shapiro, S. H. (1976). On parallel processes in therapy and Teaching. *Psychoanal Q.* 45:394-415[å].
- Sandell, R. (1985). Influence of supervision, therapist's competence and patients ego level on the effect of time- limited therapy. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 44, 103-109.
- Schachter, J. & Luborsky, L. (1998). Who is afraid of psychoanalytic research? Analysts' attitudes toward reading clinical versus empirical research papers. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal.* 79:965-970
- Schlesinger H J (1981). General principles of psychoanalytic supervision. In: Wallerstein R (Ed). *Becoming a Psychoanalyst*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Searles, H. (1965). Problems of psychoanalytic supervision. In: *Collected Papers in Schizophrenia and Related Subjects*. London: Hogarth Press Ltd.
- Stone, L. (1975). Some problems and potentialities of present-day psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 44:331-370.
- Sundin, E. C., Ögren, M.-L. & Boalt Boëtius, S. (2008). Supervisor trainees' and their supervisors' perceptions of attainment of knowledge and skills: An empirical evaluation of a psychotherapy supervisor training program. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 381-396.
- Szecsödy, I. (1974). Handledning i psykoterapi. *Psykisk Hälsa*, 1, 23-32.
- \_\_\_\_ (1986). Feedback in psychotherapy and training. *Nordisk Psykiatrisk Tidskrift*, 40:193-200.
- \_\_\_\_ (1990). Supervision: a didactic or mutative situation. *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*, 4, 245-262.
- \_\_\_\_ (1990). The Learning Process in Psychotherapy Supervision. Stockholm: Karolinska Institutet. Academic dissertation.
- \_\_\_\_ (1994). Supervision—a complex tool for psychoanalytic training. *Scand. Psychoanal. Rev.* 17:119-129

- \_\_\_\_ (1997a) (How) is learning possible in supervision? In: B. Martindale, Mörner, M. E. Cid Rodrigues & J. P. Vidal (Eds.), *Supervision and its Vicissitudes*, pp. 101-116. London: Karnac.
- \_\_\_\_ (1999) How far do our training-models meet the needs of the candidates of today. *EPF Bulletin 52*, 57-72.
- \_\_\_\_ (1999). Report on the follow-up responses received from the presenting supervisors/supervisees at the 8th IPA Conference of Training Analysts in Barcelona 1997. IPA Newsletter 8(2):20-23.
- \_\_\_\_ (2003) To become or be made a psycho-analyst. *Scand. Psychoanal. Rev.*, 26:141-150.
- \_\_\_\_ (2003b) Zur Dynamik der Interaktion in der Supervision *PsA-Info* Nr 55 pp. 5-17. Berlin
- \_\_\_\_ (2003c) On a reassessment of psychoanalytical education: Controversies and changes. *Internat J. Psycho-Anal.* 84, 1063-1064.
- \_\_\_\_ (2004). How does psychoanalysis work? In D. Anastapoulos & E. Papanicolau (Eds) *The Therapist at Work*. London: Karnac.
- \_\_\_\_ (2008). Does anything go in psychoanalytic supervision? *Psychoanal. Inquiry*, 28, 373-386.
- Szecsödy I & Gyllensköld K (1992). The Learning Process in Psychotherapy-Supervision and in Psychotherapy: Theories and Applications. 1: Nordic Symposium for Supervisors. Stockholm.
- Szecsödy, I., Kächele, H. & Dreyer, K. (1993). Supervision: an intricate tool for psychoanalytic training. *Zeitschrift Psychoanal. Theorie und Praxis*, 8:52-70.
- Teitebaum, S. H. (1990). Supertransference: the role of the supervisor's blind spots. *Psychoanal. Psychol.* 7(2):243-258
- Thomä, H. & Kächele, H. (1973). Wissenschaftstheoretische und methodologische Probleme der klinisch psycho-analytischen Forschung. *Psyche*, 22, 205 - 236, 309 - 355.

- \_\_\_\_\_(1987). *Psychoanalytic Practice. Vol 1: Principles*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer Verlag.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1999). Memorandum about a reform of the psychoanalytic education. *IPA Newsletter 8*: 33-35.
- Tuckett, D. (2005). Does anything go? Towards a framework for the more transparent *Internat J. Psycho-Anal. 86*:31-49.
- Wallerstein, R. (1981). *Becoming a Psychoanalyst. A Study of Psychoanalytic Supervision*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Watillon, A. (1993). *Introduction. Psychoanalytic Training in Europe*. Second Bulletin Monograph
- Wiegand-Grefe, S. (2004) Destructive processes in psycho-analytic training. A plea for a reform on training. *Forum der Psychoanalyse. 20*:331-350
- Wiener, J, Mizen, R. & Duckham, J (Eds. 2003). *Supervising and Being Supervised*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Wold, S et al (1983). Pattern recognition: Finding regularities in multivariate data. In Martens H & Russwurm H (Eds.). *Food Research and Data Analysis*. London: Applied Science Publishers.
- Zachrisson, A. (2002). Psychoanalytic models of supervision: Issues and ideas. *Internal working paper of EPF-WRE, 2002*, ed. M. Target, and E. Aronowitsch. Zimmer, R. B. (2003). Reassessment of psychoanalytical education: Controversies and changes. *Internat. J. Psycho-Anal. 84*:143-155.