

## REJOINDER

**Dave Burgess**

*Douglas College  
British Columbia*

The reviewer is correct in his assumption that our program focuses largely on employment preparation. Although many of our graduates continue their studies on a part-time basis and some eventually return to pursue their education as full-time students, the majority proceed to work directly with troubled children and youth. This, I believe, drives our desire to ensure, as best as possible, that our graduates are personally ready, more than the supply and demand of seats in the program.

On the differences cited by the reviewer, I agree that we need to focus on the strengths of our students and believe that we regularly do that in our program. I also agree that "the ability to form healthy relationships with clients is the key to change." Bowlby (1988) tells us that "...the therapist must always strive to be aware of the nature of his own contribution to the relationship which, amongst other influences, is likely to reflect, in one way or another, what he experienced himself during his own childhood."

I would argue that, while I can help students fine-tune this ability, if the capacity is missing or in some way markedly impaired, the person is more rightfully a candidate for therapy. This may be preparatory for training or ultimately in lieu of training, as I suspect that many troubled applicants pursue training in hope of receiving help and once having received it, may no longer feel a need to pursue the training. I may have, in my quest for conceptual clarity, portrayed the distinction between training and personal growth as being more easily discernable than they are in practice. I believe, however, that therapy or treatment needs to be kept distinct and separate from the training process. For me to pursue one under the guise of the other would be tantamount to breaking not one, but two trusts which I hold very dear.

On the point of whether social work should be used as a model in this matter, I believe the reviewer is advocating initially that we emulate them by restricting ourselves to the question of "what do we do with these students once we have them," I do not necessarily agree. I believe, in respect to personal readiness, the needs of the two professions may be significantly different and that this in turn may relate to their different roles. In the systems in which I have worked and those with which I continue to be familiar, social workers, in general, tend to function as case managers while the expectation of child and youth care counselors is that they enter into meaningful and frequently intense personal relationships with the children in their care. In this respect it may be more possible for a social worker to function effectively in his role despite significant unresolved personal

issues, where it would not be possible for a child and youth care counselor to do the same. Clearly, I believe that we need to ask: should we have this applicant at this time? I would see the placing of an applicant unable to enter into a personal and meaningful relationship, due to no fault of his own, with children who have precisely that need may constitute cruel punishment and may serve to reinforce the hopelessness felt by each.

This does not mean that there is no place in human services for the applicant and I find it hard to understand how the reviewer could have drawn this inference from my paper if such is the case. Unlike the reviewer's program we only help students prepare for child and youth care work; but regularly advise students to investigate other program options, including those referred to by the reviewer.

As the quote from Professor Baizerman is out of context, I have some difficulty knowing how to read it. However, I sense and hope that the reviewer would agree with me when I say that I believe that sometimes kids need to be taken home, that sometimes kids need someone to fight with agencies on their behalf, and that sometimes a child and youth care counselor shouldn't go home right after her shift because a sense of personal responsibility should not be seen as subservient to a schedule.

I do not believe that the challenge is to be personal or professional but to be both and that it is indeed a synthesis of the "art" to which the reviewer refers with relevant training that should help child and youth care counselors achieve this.

## REFERENCE

Bowlby, John. (1988) *A Secure Base, Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*. New York, Basic Books.