

## THE AESTHETICS OF TEACHING THROUGH SELF APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING

**Raymond W. Peterson**

*Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Oregon*

**George A. Maciejewski**

*Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Oregon*

### Introduction

In this criticism of contemporary education, Gregory Bateson (1972) lamented that obsolete teaching methodology was severing an essential qualitative "bridge" in learning relationships. Education has often relied too strongly on a linear, cognitive process: the teacher teaches, the student learns (Havre, Clarke, and DeCarlo, 1985). All too often, however, the student finds that theories that make sense in the classroom are difficult to apply in the real world (Maciejewski, 1986). Traditional teaching passes on important information and even knowledge, but it is limited in its ability to transmit the deeper, more intuitional resource we call wisdom.

Bateson prescribed a metalogue of "double description" through which education could restore an understanding of a "pattern which connects." By developing "conditions for discovery," what is "taught" in the classroom would come out of a student's own experience and would therefore guide him as he reached higher levels of understanding and skill. It would grow in the classroom but would not be created there; as an integral part of the student, it would inform his work in the real world. As he worked more effectively in the real world, he would bring back what he learned to the classroom, which would help him progress to ever higher levels of learning. Ideally, through this recursive process, the teacher does much more than pass on information or even knowledge; she actually helps the student discover and develop his own wisdom, which will, in turn, help him become a more versatile and effective therapist (Bateson, 1972; Bateson, Mead, and Brand, 1978).

Learning through experiences gleaned from various perspectives, roles, contexts, and orders of recursion constitutes the Self Apprenticeship Training format (Peterson, 1974; Peterson, Young, and Tillman, 1988), a structured elaboration of Bateson's conditions for discovery, or "learning to learn." SAT is not meant to replace traditional

methods of teaching, but it can be a valuable adjunct to them (Peterson, 1978). I would like to define Self Apprenticeship Training and discuss the model it is based on as well as the theory behind it. This discussion will help you develop an introductory background and language for the classroom, a sense of the aesthetics of teaching using the SAT format. Actual methodology, which I touch on only lightly here, will be developed at length in a later article.

### **Self Apprenticeship Training**

Briefly stated, SAT is the practitioner's disciplined apprenticeship to herself as her own mentor; it is a structured system for learning how to learn from herself, her clients, and the personal and professional context of which she is a part (Peterson, 1974). A teacher of the SAT format will guide students' study of their own lives, emphasizing the use of self as the primary "tool of the trade." Students learn by systematically applying techniques and clinical dilemmas to their own experiences and utilizing work with others to formulate their own intervention strategies and concepts. In this way, she can discover and design concepts, theories, and techniques which are at once personal, flexible, and effective (Peterson, Young, and Tillman, 1988).

Learning from the established literature and methodology must be a strong element in clinical training. However, as a primary source for teaching therapeutic relationship and clinical judgment, it does not necessarily foster an attitude of caring, empathy, independent thought, and creativity. Often, students disassociate their learning about therapy from their learning about life. But therapy is about life. As Maier pointed out in 1987:

Attention will need to shift from a preoccupation with the selection of course content and the constellation of courses to be mastered to an emphasis on patterns of thinking and skills to be acquired in training that will enable workers to interconnect their ongoing experience. How we organize and deliver the material will be as important as what we include. Such a focus transcends the old tension between "facts" that need to be learned on the one hand, and crucial sensitivities and "process skills" on the other. That has ceased to be an issue because we recognize that both are essential. Rather, it speaks to the need for analytic, contextual thinking in place of traditional, linear patterns. (p. 203)

Within the SAT format, much of the learning is interactive, both in and out of the class setting, and requires the development of team-

work capabilities and interdependence. This process mirrors the team orientation of child and youth work.

Gaining competence with one's own beliefs and attitudes, from the vantage of "multiple description," is necessary in order to be fully effective as a practitioner. By apprenticing themselves to themselves — as well as to their teachers and the children they care for — SAT practitioners develop skills of empathy, rapport building, and creative response within the context of their own, real-life experience. Discovering and becoming fluent in one's own intrapersonal processes seems to be left by conventional training programs to the student-practitioner's own initiative or luck. Carl Whitaker (1982) reflects on the evolution of a therapist's personal growth during training:

... One of the key problems with most therapeutic training programs is that they overemphasize the technical components ... leaving the trainee to develop ... [a] communication style without any adequate general framework ... [yet] the dynamics of therapy are in the person of the therapist ... Growth is neither an increase in technical competence nor an increase in intuition or clinical judgment ... the development of a whole person (and therapist) necessarily involves a kind of metalogue across the corpus callosum between the intuitive Gestalt right brain and the analytical, socially adroit left brain. (p. 405)

A primary advantage of the SAT approach is that it facilitates such a metalogue by combining methods of confluent education (Brown, Phillips, and Shapiro, 1976; Shiflett and Brown, 1972), providing "emotionally instructive" experiences, and facilitating self-referential analysis. The SAT system induces practice-oriented introspection, self-awareness, and "multiple descriptions" through such methods as clinical simulations, video training, critical incident analysis (Beker, 1972), and role play. Individualized plans of self-change utilize "genogram" self-assessment of family and ethnic background and values clarification. Other practice-related structured experiential learning techniques include self-intervention, such as the "Action Focused Choice-building Techniques System" (Peterson, 1974), and increasing clinical competence through "Cybernetic Situational Analysis" techniques. SAT attempts to systematically organize learning so that the opportunity emerges for student-practitioners to experience how they learned to learn (the optimal outcome of "self-apprenticeship," Learning III) in the class, personal, and work settings. It fosters the understanding that effectiveness in professional practice involves operating within various contexts of second-order learning (Maier, 1987), what Bateson termed

Learning II, or “deutero-learning” (Bateson, 1972, p. 293; Watzlawick, Bevens, and Jackson, 1967). This is as critical in understanding oneself as it is in facilitating a “corrective emotional experience” for another.

In short, SAT is a structured system to help student-practitioners learn how they learn from their clients, their colleagues, and their own lives. SAT is a method of “learning from experience.” As a concept, it is simple; as a technology, it is profound.

### **The Model of Learning Behind Self Apprenticeship Training**

Chart 1 diagrams some of the multiple aspects involved in the orchestration of SAT learning experiences. Although my description of the model is, by necessity, linear, it is helpful to visualize the teaching/learning process portrayed in these pages as a “dancing double helix,” in which individual strands of a “double description,” (on one side the “learning outcome”; on the other, the “learning process”), interact interdependently, recursively, and synergistically with each other during the course of learning. I hope that child, family, and youth care work practitioners, trainers, and educators alike will be drawn to the feeling of adventure and creativity implicit in a dialogic exploration of this approach to clinical training.

The recursive process of learning described here is based on an assumption of on-going adult cognitive development and the circular interaction between an individual’s readiness (“learning outcome”) and the challenge provided by the teaching/learning environment (“learning process”). As an individual reaches a new level of achievement or readiness, the process of instruction needs to be more developmentally challenging. With each cycling, a new level of opportunity for learning emerges and a different, higher order of recursive teaching is called for in the domains of awareness, empathy, and ethics (Chart 1).

As you look at the model, it is helpful to keep a familiar analogy in mind: Give a man a fish (external resources) and you’ve fed him for a day; teach him to fish and you’ve fed him for a lifetime. The SAT model strives to go even further than simple teaching — which may still leave the student with a dependent attitude on the teacher (external resources) — in order to help the student develop unlimited skills of self instruction (Chart 2).

#### **Level O: Concrete Learning**

Although graduate student-practitioners will have already passed through the level of concrete and formal operations, it helps to begin a description of the learning process from this well-established position.

A basic task for someone at Learning Level O (Concrete Learning) is to change what he thinks (what he constructs as a world view); accumulation of content is still a dominant activity. The outcome domains of Learning Level O — awareness, empathy, and ethics — are at a rudimentary level. Awareness can be undifferentiated and diffused, and behavior may appear repetitious or random, as if the person were behaving without learning. All too often the experience of children in heavily authoritarian institutions never moves beyond this level because of the emphasis on rote learning, overt compliance, and conformity. At this level, for instance, a person responds to hunger by saying “I’m hungry,” or going to the refrigerator. He has little recourse if a food supply is not at hand. Levels of empathy are largely egocentric or mostly reactive in nature, functions of a projected self. The development of ethics is in its earliest stages, founded in authoritarian-centered, absolutist concepts of good and bad, or fearful of consequences.

At this level of learning, the challenge is to encourage and support trial and error experimentation; we seek to generate awareness of the effects of the child’s behavior and help him begin to recognize others’ experience. As the child matures toward Level I thinking, he looks for explanations or new methods, tests them in the “real” world through trial behaviors, and evaluates their accuracy.

### Level I: Abstract Learning

The process of First Order Change focuses on changing what we think (what we construct as a world view). Through drawing generalizations, creating “maps,” using symbols, and contrasting/comparing, we “de-center” from personal subjectivity. The outcome of First Order Change is Abstract (Level I) Learning, where awareness becomes differentiated and sequential, yet usually remains linear; empathy shows at rudimentary level as socialized concern for others and an emotional sensitivity to their plight; and ethics grow from rigid, black and white concepts to include situational or relativistic forms.

The teacher at Learning Level I sets the stage for resource gathering and unconscious learning (Keeney, 1983). She “feeds the students.” The traditional teaching strategy of the lecture can be a good place to start. Although it is a conventional approach, it serves a purpose; you can use passive absorption to engage the conscious minds of students, setting the stage for deeper access to well-established patterns of experiencing. A period of traditional lecture and note-taking creates a “pace” with the Students’ previous learning experiences; since it is familiar, it can be “nourishing” while they become comfortable in a new learning situation. However, too much reliance on “feeding” lectures can increase dependency and make some student-practitioners

lose their enthusiasm or lower their expectations. For others, it can reawaken old school phobias.

The student at Learning Level I is dependent and hungry, but ready to “learn how to fish.” He takes information directly from the teacher and may adapt it somewhat through trial and error, but he has not yet learned to draw on a large, diverse body of information, experience, and intuition to come up with his own new, creative solutions.

## Level II: Self-Reflective Learning

The Second Order Change process focuses on changing how we think (how we construct a world view). Through self-reflective descriptions, self-reflection involves learning about systems of which we are an integral part; by including ourselves in our descriptions, we gain awareness in how we “frame,” punctuate, or make meaning of our experience. At this stage, the learning process must challenge unconscious learning habits formed since infancy (nonverbal message interpretation, context setting cues, making meaning, values selection, etc.) The belief-systems and learning-systems, out-of-conscious “rules” to which we have become habituated, need to become conscious, and a language to describe them must emerge. With Second Order Change, knowledge grows from dialogue, feedback from others, interaction in varied contexts, and experiencing multiple descriptions of multiple events.

The outcome of Second Order Change is Self Reflective (Level II) Learning. Here, awareness is interactional and systemic, capable of harnessing intuitive capacities intelligently and comprehending non-linear processes. Empathy grows to an interpersonal compassion, a developmentally based consciousness which includes the experiences of another into an “I-Thou” dialogue. Ethics emerge as tolerant (even desirous!) of multiplicity, and become pluralistic in focus.

At this point, the student-practitioner has “learned how to fish” and now begins to “learn how he learned how to fish.” The process of learning how to learn becomes as interesting as what is learned and students begin to inter-relate information from many different sources — the classroom, the field, their personal lives — in order to come up with and test highly creative, personal solutions, theories, and methods. To return to the fishing analogy, the student-practitioner becomes an “independent man who fishes” because he has the resources to solve a variety of fishing problems that arise. He no longer needs to wait for a solution to be presented to him; he can actively pursue it. If he has a problem, he knows where to get books or how to locate a master-fisherman for consultation. Further, he begins to invent his own so-

lutions by inter-relating information from various fields. Pouring tea through a strainer might spark the idea of using nets in fishing. Once he has the idea of using a net, he would have a new problem: how to cast the net. As he realized he needed to move away from the dock, he would have yet another problem: how to acquire or build a boat. In turn, he would have to learn how to navigate the boat and so forth. Each solution poses an increasingly more challenging problem. The key to growth in this scenario is that the student-practitioner owns both the problem and the solution.

As classroom learning, clinical practice, and personal experience begin to inter-relate, students often experience a flood of insight and subjective responses. The teacher can help students cast these experiences in an "information frame" in order to use them as recyclable feedback. The teacher can deliberately channel self-reflection through a variety of self-teaching devices such as journal writing and the Jungian practice of Active Imagination (Dallett, 1982). In this stage, personal beliefs and feelings, world views, or the "ill-drawn abstractions" of which Bateson warned, are dissembled temporarily and examined anew, under the tutelage of the instructor, for validity.

Students can test their learning as "participant observers" by applying that learning to another person. At this stage they begin to understand that "the map is not the territory" or, as Lankton (1983) has put it, "the explanation, theory, or metaphor used to relate facts about a person is not the person" (p. 12). Ecosystemic assessment tools such as WAY (Who Are You?) (Ebner, 1974) help explore ways in which multiple facets of a person's whole self (group, social, cognitive, affective, cultural, hereditary, etc.) interact to shape perception, behaviors, beliefs, roles, and values.

### Level III: Integrative Learning

As we begin to use Level-II Learning, our confidence grows. As we begin to master it, the "shock" of its power, of the accessibility of creative solutions, impels us into what the model refers to as Third Order Change. We experience a difference in how we think about what we think (how we construct what we construct as a world view). We undergo a dramatic revision in how we view ourselves. We are no longer "just" a "man who fishes" well or "just" a teacher or a student. As our identity, we are all these things and much more. According to Gregory Bateson (1972), at this third level of learning, fundamental premises in abstract, philosophical, aesthetic, and ethical domains become open to question and change; we become capable of self-selecting and constructing our own rules for determination (setting the contexts of contexts). In such a "profound redefinition of the self," the identified self

recognizes it is in charge of reorganizing the contexts of meaning from which first and second order behavior stems. The realization dawns that real, fundamental choice exists, and is not arbitrary; the questions one wishes to answer determine the choice of paradigm one constructs (Fisher, 1978).

The outcome of Third Order Change is Integrative Learning (Level III Learning). Here, awareness reflects an interconnectedness between thought and action, what Bateson (1979) termed a “necessary unity of mind and nature.” Such awareness exhibits a change in epistemology, or values and world view, which acknowledges the self-organization of awareness itself. Empathy increases to become “ecosystemically compassionate,” that is, concerned with all living events from a planetary perspective. Ethics are structured interdependently (McCulloch, 1969) and have a self-inclusive activism at their core: a solution-generating, ecologically responsible selection of governing (“cybernos”) epistemology and corresponding practicing ontology.

At Learning Level II, we are independent; at Learning level III, we are interdependent. All things relate. A practitioner operating from Level II awareness can be responsive to a client’s problem, bringing to bear a broad spectrum of methodologies and creative insights, able to switch from one method to another if need be. But a practitioner operating from Level III has an even more encompassing view. At Level II, the practitioner views the clients from the doorstep: she can see who they are and where they came from. At Level III, the practitioner operates from the “cultural” rooftop: she can see not only who the clients are and where they came from, but also the world that shaped them (and that will hold answers to their problems).

As students mature into integrative learning, they will have a more complete understanding of holistic evaluation and will be wary of the limiting effect of reductionistic, simplistic, or negativistic assessment practice. They will adopt the generation of “multiple descriptions” as an ethical imperative. They will take as a personal responsibility the construction of their own meaning (the construing of intention in a relationship). Varela (1984) puts constructivist ethics in perspective:

. . . Ethics — tolerance and pluralism, detachment from our own perceptions and values to allow for those of others — is the very foundation of knowledge, and also its final point. At this point, actions are clearer than words. (p. 323)

At Level III Learning, after the student has some direct experience with choosing meaning in interactions and has answered some of the attendant questions (such as “How do I know how to define a situation?



How do I select the patterns and categories for deciding how to interpret events?), the SAT system hopes to help build identification with the children and youth we serve, and to develop empathy with their situations. Understanding the contexts of another's life is only a partial learning; the SAT goal of providing learning at an interpersonal level requires that the practitioner experience emotional content in order to reach new levels of compassion and empathy. The "Aha! So that's what the kid felt like! . . ." experience can be induced through role plays and reversals, projection exercises, and age-regression to childhood memories. The unconscious learning of the practitioner's "counter-transference" issues is affected; such procedures can reveal poignantly that "actions are clearer than words," bringing home the SAT experience in a very persuasive and personal manner.

Gergen (1982) has posted two fundamental characteristics of human conceptual ability: reflexivity and reconceptualization; taken interactively, they "endow the human with capacities for the . . . envisioning of alternatives." As student-practitioners are encouraged to generate multiple descriptions of their experience, unconscious information and patterns begin to surface. These are resolved consciously as new awareness of pattern emerges. Hitherto unchallenged premises can be reconstructed according to choice and personally chosen ethics. Biography no longer need imply destiny; through redefinition a person can be freed from the accidental learnings of a confining history. As a result, one's flexibility and behavioral repertoire increases, leading to greater spontaneity and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

### **Integrative Teaching: Changing How We Think about Thinking and Learning**

Converging different "types" of learning process into an integrated experience is more than an eclectic borrowing from a variety of fields; it is a synthesis, in a Batesonian fashion, of a "multiple description" from which a "formal truth" can emerge. The goal of integrative teaching is to create "emotionally instructive opportunities" for the learner to facilitate both self-reflective and integrative learning about the recursive process of change. According to the model of integrative learning presented here, one would expect that both the child and the practitioner's perceptions, behavior patterns, premises, role dynamics, relationship themes, and cultural/ethical "roots" are interdependently interwoven. A change brought about through re-enactment of a past learning context can lead to a re-decision; correspondingly, a change resolution in any one of these areas reciprocally alters the experience and process of multiple levels, eliciting new learning contexts. Out of

the crucible of multiple description emerges the phoenix of “the pattern which connects” (Gordon & Meyers-Anderson, 1981; King, Novik, & Citrenbaum, 1983). The “whole” self of the student is offered an opportunity to undergo a paradigm shift.

As a result of this process, the student discovers (and, we hope, adopts) a “systems interventionist” approach. Into such an ecological context, he can then place the assessments, treatment plans, and interventions of his practice of professional child and youth work (Peterson and Brown, 1981).

We can achieve the experience of multiple approaches and the definitions generated through them in three basically different ways: first, through establishing a dialogue within an individual by other-than-conscious levels of the self; second, through generating multiple descriptions via conscious feedback loops, and third, through groups of individuals which cooperate together to provide multiple descriptions, each from a separate point of view. Each of these methods sets up a “conversational domain,” a dialogue between alternate methods of description. Although still subject to the potential error of self-verification at a second order of description systemic self-fulfilling prophecy, it is a vast improvement over the limitations of any single “uni-dimensional” description. Let us take a closer look at these three methods:

### 1. A Dialogue Within The Self

Bandler and Grinder (1981) describe how trance states induced in the self via self-hypnotic techniques can be used to create a relationship with one’s “unconscious,” or analogic, information processing. Ideomotor signals can be set up to communicate with orders of description within the self which are nonverbal but nonetheless context-setting (e.g., paralinguistic cues). Such a strategy resembles the practice of “active imagination” which Jung described. Janet Dallett (1982), a Jungian analyst, elaborates on the practical advantages of undertaking such an internal dialogue: “Through active imagination we become aware of our own images and begin to take responsibility for what belongs to us, rather than forcing [others] to carry fragments of the psyche that we fail to recognize as our own” (p. 190). She differentiates the process of active imagination from other forms of reverie (prayer, meditation, guided fantasy, dream analysis) which are not interactional in nature. This all-important distinction allows the essential multiple descriptions to be generated from within the self. A training program can use these methods from hypnotherapy and Jungian analysis to provide one type of multiple description.

## 2. Conscious Feedback Loops

We can use the conscious mind to create multiple feedback loops, both “forward-feeding” and “feed-backing.” Methods include journal writing with goal-setting and subsequent analysis, or using video and audio recording. For example, consider the simple process of recording your thoughts in a stream of consciousness, then playing them back to yourself while recording “meta-comments” upon the content and process of the stream. That recording can be analyzed in the third round. Such a technique generates a third level of feedback from the conscious mind toward your own descriptive process and your (usually unconscious) first level of “self-editing.” Such a process can identify common patterns, distill contexts and operating presuppositions, or simply clarify questions.

## 3. Cooperative Multiple Descriptions

A third strategy to avoid the pitfalls of single description is to employ a definition generated by a group of individuals. Such “team” generated descriptions have been clinically pioneered by the Milan group of family therapists (Selvini-Palazzoli, 1978), and applied in methods like the “Greek chorus” technique which Papp (1983) describes. In this type of group process each individual plays the role of representing a self-correcting (homeostatic) or self-generating (morphogenetic) feedback loop; together they symbolically represent a system’s description-making and decision-making process.

Strategies such as these fit easily within a SAT program for therapists. The next step would be to talk about these self-reflective experiences, thus generating both a new descriptive language and a “third order” of process, that is, discussing in a “metalogue” what has occurred in the “dialogue.” At this level, recursive and paradoxical phenomena become more evident.

## **From Problem Identification to Problem Resolution**

So far we have focused only on the “assessment” phase of intervention during which “problem” formation (description) occurs. Problem resolution requires not only the ability to select perceptual frames of reference but also training in personal behavioral flexibility. Every problem is unique; the flexible practitioner, operating at Learning Level III, will be able to work with unique solutions designed from a deep well of methodology adapted by the nearly limitless responsiveness and creativity that SAT helps to develop. The multi-level teaching/learning strategies of SAT incorporate not only a broadening of “par-

ticipant-observer” skills but also include interdependently connected patterns for treatment planning, accessing of resources, goal-setting, and systemic intervention. Drills for students should emphasize changing frames of reference, recognizing multiple descriptions, and then altering one’s behavior accordingly. This is the basis of an ecological, empathy-based practice.

SAT encourages us to examine our epistemological base (not only what we believe, think, feel, and know, but how we know it) at the same time we study our ontological expression (how we act). Our “self apprenticeship” to our very lifestyle will allow us to discover the recursive influence of our actions upon our perceptions and our perceptions upon our actions. As we grow within this process, we will conclude, as did Roszak (1969, p. 233), that transformation comes from “subordinating the question ‘how shall we know’ to the more existentially vital question ‘how shall we live?’ “

### **Modelling: Teaching by Doing**

Every parent is aware of the powerful effect that modelling, the way they “do things,” has on the way their children will do things. Modelling is as powerful a tool in the classroom as it is in the home or treatment center. To quote Varela again, “actions speak louder than words.” As students observe the material being taught, an opportunity emerges for the instructor to model the methods, techniques, and strategies involved as they are being presented. Watching how it is being taught reveals the process dimension to the students; in such a manner, the instructor reveals both content and context; watching how others learn can reveal the importance of rapport and the relationship dimension in the learning process. In this way, question and answer periods become more than times for simple clarification or discussion; they can be elegantly used as periods for modelling. While a question presents a problem, the situation indicated in the question is usually not the whole problem. We can strive to understand the larger questions behind what is asked.

Because modelling can be so important in the process of Level III Learning, I would like to present a rather lengthy example from the classroom. Although this example is necessarily simplified here, it can provide one illustration of Level III teaching promoting Level III learning.

A student — I’ll call her Anne — brought a problem to class. She was working with a 15-year-old abused girl — I’ll call her Martha — who generally ignored her. However, once or twice a week, Martha would get in a fight with another girl just before Anne was to go off

shift. Anne would have to intervene and send Martha to the quiet room. It would take Martha two or three hours to calm down. Anne was supposed to be “off shift,” and she received no overtime pay for extra hours. Besides, she wanted the time for herself. But she didn’t feel she could leave Martha to the next practitioner. Martha was just beginning to trust her; staying with Martha through her crisis was important for their relationship. Something was obviously going on, but Anne didn’t know exactly what, and she didn’t know how to change the situation.

One response (a Level I response) would have been to suggest that Anne let Martha know that throwing a tantrum just before Anne went off shift was unacceptable behavior. Anne could choose not to be present to reinforce the behavior; she could have a practitioner on the next shift work with Martha until she calmed down.

I tried, however, to respond to the problem from a deeper level. We were not dealing only with Martha’s problem. We were dealing with Anne’s as well. First, I searched my own experience for an example that would suggest a way to handle the problem on a surface level, and I talked about the use of the paradox frame. I suggested that Anne congratulate Martha on her innovative approach to getting close, to testing commitment. Closeness scared Martha; it was commendable that she was finding a way to risk it. I also suggested that perhaps Anne and Martha might arm wrestle, have a physical contest with each other. And I suggested they do this during lunchtime.

But I also tried to understand the deeper context of the problem. At one level, Anne was fully adept enough to both cope with the clinical issue and present her assessment and intervention. She was very strong, intelligent, and self sufficient. At a deeper level, she was a bit of a loner, often not comfortable with the team interdependence we tried to use in class, in which she would depend on others and they would depend on her. At the point of her question, she was integrating Second and Third Order approaches in her practice; more importantly, she was experimenting with new ways of working with those around her, challenging her own tendency toward being unattached or competitive.

In an attempt to begin to reach, on a subconscious level, the subtext to the problem, I told stories from my experience and searched for metaphors that contained both part of the problem and part of the solution. For example, when two mongooses fight, they move so fast you can’t see them except for an instant when they meet eye to eye. They come together face to face, but they have to grasp each other in order to stand up. They are closer then, in the battle, than they are at any other time of their lives. Through the use of this story as a part of a network of metaphors that developed within the class, I tried to

speak to the unconscious part of the question, most particularly to the emerging trust in others in the class and in Anne's acknowledgement of her own considerable expertise.

The attempt here was to develop a teaching opportunity on three levels. The first level was to model the answering of a clinical question. The second was to reach, through metaphor, the subtext of the question. And the third was to work with a process I call co-teaching. The importance of co-teaching is that it demonstrates the collaboration between instructor, student, and class that mirrors the process between practitioner, young person, and therapy. For co-teaching, Anne agreed to continue working with some of the issues in the class setting. As we discussed this problem, the class realized that Anne's problems were common to us all and that working through the issues was useful to us all. Something more significant than a simple answer to a clinical question was evolving. We again learned that our practice affects us as much as it affects our clients, that disclosing personal change is not dangerous, and that there are common growth issues and common support on the team. We learned deeper ways of teaching, deeper ways of learning.

## Conclusion

Integrative learning is holistic learning — impacted at all levels — that creates not just a cognitive breakthrough but often an emotional aspect, an Aha! experience. This insight then reorganizes our epistemology, our sense of the world and our place in it, causing a shift if ever so slight in our awareness, ethics, and empathy.

The SAT process raises the inevitable issue of similarity between the process of changing oneself and the process of facilitating change within another; as Whitaker has noted, self-awareness in the therapist becomes critical in a therapeutic relationship. For this reason, great emphasis is placed on the examination of "applied ethics" (Peterson, Young, and Tillman, 1988) during the SAT course.

Bateson's concept of multiple approach suggests that by looking from two parties' perspectives in an interaction one can perceive another order of information, that of the relationship or "system." At this order of description, the relationship is more than the behaviors of any one individual; the fallacy of punctuating meaning without including both parties reveals itself readily. Without a multiple approach, what is in fact a dialogue is effectively reduced to a monologue, and the context set by the qualitative relationship between the parties is lost. Each person is more fully represented when described in an interactive context with the other.

Perception of such a “relationship” dimension is analogous to the qualitative shift in experience when we look through two eyes rather than one; “depth perception” provides additional information due to the integration of two separate, “single source” flat descriptions. Stereoscopic vision, however, does not confirm a description of reality; it merely correlates alternate descriptions. Segal (1986) warns of the dangers in taking metaphysical comfort through consensual descriptions:

. . . we cannot see what we hear or hear what we see. These are only inferences arising from correlating two sensory modalities. Stereoscopic vision provides another example of how we mistake confirmation for correlation. We do not confirm what we see with the left eye with what we see with the right eye, nor is the converse true. Each eye represents us with a different picture. Correlating these two pictures, we construct something new, the perception of depth. (p. 20)

Analyzing, abstracting, and model-building from the holistic contexts which have been set by the SAT instructor are other learning tasks. A “recognizing,” or “reforming” (reframing of what one has accepted as a formal truth), is precondition to the “paradigm shift” which is being nurtured throughout the SAT process. How do the multiple descriptions the students have experienced overlap? Where are the abstractions limiting, or “ill-drawn”? Students are encouraged to think critically and engage in self-examination. However, the goal is to achieve a “repersonalization,” or reenvisioning of human potential. The PERSUNS model (Physical, Emotional, Relationship, Skill, Understanding-cognitive, Norms-values, Spiritual-intuitive) (Peterson, 1976), a “holistic” description of human beings, seeks to establish an abstract representation which is not dehumanizing or mechanistic. By including oneself in one’s construction of a world view, one hopefully reaches the conclusion which Carl Rogers (1964) drew in *On Becoming a Person*:

The degree to which I can create relationships which facilitate growth of others as separate persons is a measure of the growth I have achieved in myself. In some respects this is a disturbing thought, but it is almost a promising or challenging one. It would indicate that if I am interested in creating helping relationships, I have a fascinating life-time job ahead of me, stretching and developing my potentialities in the direction of growth. (p. 56)

The experience and use of multiple approaches is a primary goal

of SAT. In theory (Maruyama, 1977, p. 75), a multiple approach predicts autonomy and the potential for creation of many alternatives among which one can responsibly choose; in practice, this implies not only that personal change is possible, but also that such change of personal history is a natural potential of every individual.

As Henry Maier appealed to educators, "we need to develop programs that go beyond conventional teaching to model in [our] own operation the interconnectedness of life and the sensitivity to milieu considerations that are organic to the work. Thus, educational programs for child and youth care work need to model milieu teaching, planful intervention within the flow of life to facilitate growth-enhancing experiences" (1987, p. 205).

I have attempted here to describe a model for college training of child, family, and youth care workers. The Self Apprenticeship Training approach based on the epistemology of Gregory Bateson provides a model which currently functions to provide many of the "ingredients" recommended by Bateson, Whitaker, and Maier. SAT and similar approaches offer great promise, as additions to traditional educational methods, to provide versatile and broadly integrative, process-oriented experiential learning. The model developed here presents a discussion of the aesthetics of teaching, but that is just a starting point.

If we are to fully meet the challenges of our profession, we need to further develop methodologies and evaluate their effectiveness in the field.

### Note

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Trainers' and Educators' Day, Albert E. Trieschman Memorial Conference, Boston, MA, USA, "Communication Systems: Training and Educating for Excellence in Child and Youth Care Work," March 18, 1987.

### REFERENCES

- Bandler, R., & Grinder, J. (1981). *Trance-Formations*. Moab, Utah: Real People Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of the Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: Bantam Books.



- Bateson, G., Mead, M., and Brand, S. (1976). "For God's Sake, Margaret: Conversation with Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead." *CoEvolution Quarterly*, 10, 32-44.
- Beker, J. (1972). *Critical Incidents in Child Care*. New York: Behavioral Publications.
- Brown, G. (1971). *Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education*. New York: Viking Press.
- Brown, G., Phillips, M., and Shapiro, S. (1976). *Getting It All Together: Confluent Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.
- Dallett, J. (1982). "Active Imagination in Practice." In M. Stein (Ed.), (1982). *Jungian Analysis* (pp. 173-191). Boulder Shambhala.
- Ebner, M. (1974). "Who Are You (Way): An Ecosystemic-Existential Assessment Approach." The assessment training manual for the Child Care Treatment and Assessment Advanced Certificate Program, Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oregon.
- Fisher, B. (1978). *Perspectives on Human Communication*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Gergen, K. (1982). *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge*. New York: Springer-Verlag New York Inc.
- Gordon, D. (1978). *Therapeutic Metaphors*. Cupertino, California: Meta Publications.
- Gordon, D., and Meyers-Anderson, M. (1981). *Phoenix: Therapeutic Patterns of Milton H. Erickson*. Cupertino, California: Meta Publications.
- Havre, R., Clarke, D., & DeCarlo, N. (1985). *Motives and Mechanisms*. New York: Methuen & Co.
- Keeney, B. (1983). *The Aesthetics of Change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- King, M., Novik, L., & Citrenbaum, C. (1983). *Irresistible Communication: Creative Skills for the Health Professional*. Philadelphia, PA: W.P. Saunders & Co.

- Lankton, S., & Lankton, C. (1983). *The Answer Within: A Clinical Framework of Ericksonian Hypnosis*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.
- Maciejewski, G. (1986). *Toward an Application of Gregory Bateson's Epistemological Analysis to the Clinical Child and Youth Work Field: A Model for Professionalization, Training, and Practice*. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth.
- Maier, H. (1988). *Developmental Group Care of Child and Youth: Concepts and Practice*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Maruyama, M. (1977). "Heterogenistics: An Epistemological Restructuring of Biological and Social Sciences." *Cybernetica*, 20, 69-86.
- Papp, P. (1983). *The Process of Change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Peterson, R. (1978). "The Child Care Worker as a Child Life Specialist and Systems Interventionist: A Model of Multi-Method Child Care Training." *Child Care in Focus*, 2(2 & 3), 10-16.
- Peterson, R. (1976). "Occupational Stress in Child Care: The Burnout to Burnthrough Model of Change." Paper presented at the NOCCWA forum at the annual meeting of American Orthopsychiatry, Atlanta, GA.
- Peterson, R. (1974). *Toward an Integration of Behaviorism and Humanism in Psychotherapy: An Introduction to the "Action-focused Choice-building Technique System"*. Unpublished manuscript. Western Washington State University.
- Peterson, R., & Brown, R. (1982). "The Child Care Worker as Treatment Coordinator and Parent Trainer." *Child Care Quarterly*, 11, 188-203.
- Peterson, R.; Young, S; and Tillman, J. (1988). "Applied Ethics: Educating Child and Youth Workers in Competent Caring Through Self Apprenticeship Training." In Angelin, A, Denholm, C.; Ferguson, R. and Pence, A. (Eds.) (in press), *Perspectives in Professional Child and Youth Care*.
- Rogers, C. (1961) *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Roszak, T. (1969). *The Making of a Counter-Culture*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc.

- Savicki, V., & Maciejewski, G. (1986, June). *A Paradigm Shift to Redefine Anomalies in the Delivery of Care*. Paper presented at the joint Meeting of Arctic & Pacific Divisions of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Vancouver, B.C.
- Segal, L. (1986). *The Dream of Reality*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Selvini-Palazzoli, M., Bosolo, L., Cecchin, G., & Prata, G. (1978). *Paradox and Counter-Paradox*. New York: Jason Aranson.
- Shiflett, J., and Brown, G. (1972). *Confluent Education: Attitudinal and Behavioral Consequences of Confluent Teacher Training*. La Jolla, CA: Development and Research in Confluent Education.
- Varela, F. (1984). The Creative Circle: Sketches on the Natural History of Circularity: In P. Watzlawick, (Ed.) (1984). *The Invented Reality* (pp. 309-323). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Watzlawick P., Bevens, J., and Jackson, D. (1967). *The Pragmatics of Human Communication: A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies, and Paradoxes*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Whitaker, C. (1982). Comments on Keeney's and Sprinkle's paper. *Family Process* 21, pp. 405-406.

