Chapter 9: Understanding Ourselves and Our Relationships

Introduction 788

Theories of personality 789

- Ancient theories about types--Enneagram 789
- Modern theories--Myers-Briggs and Jungian Types 792
- Other personality types 795

Understanding the parts of our personality 797

- Parts: Child (id), Parent (superego), Adult (ego) 797
- Keeping the parts in balance 801
- Other parts and motives--Jung, Adler, Allport 803

Theories of development: becoming a person 805

- Table 9.1: Stages of life 807

Personality involves relationships with self and with others 809

- Transactional Analysis and Life Positions 810
- Life Scripts 810
- The notion of human needs 814

Psychiatric Diagnoses

- Psychoses
- Adjustment Disorders
- Personality Problems

Traits of a mature, self-actualizing person 814

Self-understanding can come in many ways 816

- Getting to know your inner child 817
- Let the parts of your personality speak for themselves 817
- Reading for self-understanding: Bibliotherapy 818

Relationships with others 821

- Why are relationships with others important? 821
- Why are so many relationships unhappy?
- The "games" we play with others 822
  - Put downs of others 822
  - Put downs of one's self 825
  - Ego-boosting 826
  - Summary and how to stop game-playing 828
- Other self-deceptions: excuses and self-handicapping 830
- People cause our problems and provide relief 833
  - Sources of help: Friends, family, self-help groups, therapists

Relationships within the Family 834

- The family 834
- Child-care--useful references (and a little history) 835
- Problems within the family (Satir) 839
- Increased child-care role for fathers 841
- How psychological problems begin (parent blaming?) 843
- The causes and results of alcoholism and abuse 845
  - Alcoholism, neglect, and abuse 845
  - Do abused kids become abusing parents? 846
  - Child sexual abuse, incest 846
  - Websites about sexual abuse 847
- Effects of traumatic early experiences and poor parenting 852
  - Table 9.2: Possible outcomes of harmful experiences 846

Common interpersonal problems and needed skills 860

- Fear of approaching someone 860
- Handling the first few minutes 861
- Becoming a good conversationalist 861
- People addicts and people haters 864
- Self-disclosure and self-acceptance 865
- Misunderstandings--checking out your hunches 866
- Empathy responding 867

Sustaining long-term relationships 868

- Why can't we communicate? 869
- Being “taken for granted” 869
- Resolving conflicts 870
- Control of and by others 871

- Unconscious controlling of others 872
- How to handle difficult people 873
- Driving each other crazy 875

Competition and feeling superior to others 876

- Gender differences in values, purposes, and orientation 876
  - Competition vs. cooperation (values) 878
  - Early developmental differences between boys and girls 879
  - Male aggression and female loss of self-esteem 879
  - Gender differences in conversation 881
  - Women's ways of knowing 882
- Society establishes gender roles for men and women 883
  - Gender roles for women 884
  - Gender roles for men 887
  - More male-female differences 889
  - Learning our gender roles 890
  - Misunderstandings between men and women about roles 891
- Chauvinism 894
  - Chauvinism as a nation 894
  - Chauvinism as parents and in child care 895
  - Chauvinism in schools 897
  - Chauvinism at work 897

Selected references for understanding relationships 899

Introduction

The chapter starts with several general descriptions of human personality and its development. Then relationships are discussed, including "games" we play, family relationships, and the long-term effects of childhood experiences. The chapter ends with a review of common interpersonal problems, the difficulties we have keeping relationships together, and the continuing conflicts between men and women (love and sex are in the next chapter).

Understanding ourselves probably aids self-acceptance, self-control, and good relationships. But self-understanding only comes from interacting with others; we know ourselves in comparison to others. So, the two--self-awareness and insight into relationships--develop together. Indeed, we have a relationship with ourselves as well as with others. Jo Courdet in *Advice from a Failure* observes: "Of all the people you will know in a life time, you are the only one you will never lose." This relationship with the "me" inside is crucial; the better we know ourselves, the better we know others, since our perception of

our own self provides us with our primary means of understanding all other humans.

Thus, this chapter, of necessity, explores both our "personality" and our social interactions. For most people, this is the "crux" of psychology. Of course, we need to know ourselves. But interpersonal relationships are the most important part of living for most of us, i.e. our family relations while growing up, our teenage friends and early loves, our serious romances and marriage(s), our children and grandchildren, our close friends and colleagues, and so on. This is the heart of life--for better or for worse. This chapter reviews information useful in each of those parts of life, and the next chapter deals in greater depth with the most intimate relationships--dating, sex, marriage, and divorce.

Earlier chapters have already dealt with some of the major features of our personalities and our interpersonal relations: values, habits, anxiety, sadness, anger, and dependency. So if you need help deciding what to do with your life or what will raise your self-esteem or what can reduce your prejudice or how to control your stress or anger, see those previous chapters. This chapter focuses more on common, normal development and relationships. To some extent it is a catch-all but all-important chapter covering various topics about understanding ourselves and our relationships.

The chapter starts with several general descriptions of human personality and its development. Then relationships are discussed, including "games" we play, family relationships, and the long-term effects of childhood experiences. The chapter ends with a review of common interpersonal problems, the difficulties we have keeping relationships together, and the continuing conflicts between men and women. Select the topics that interest you at this time.

Theories of Personality

Ancient theories about personality types--Enneagram

Scientific psychology, like many modern disciplines, tends to discredit anything discovered or written more than a few years ago. Actually, it is enlightening and humbling to know about the personality theories of many years ago. An old theory has recently surfaced. It is the Enneagram, which may be 5000 years old, i.e. 2500 years older than Buddha, Confucius, and Aristotle and 3000 years before Christ. This psychological folk wisdom was developed in the Middle East and passed along orally, probably by minstrels as well as Jewish and eventually Christian and Moslem teachers, and certainly taught by the Sufi masters. The theory describes nine different personality types, hence the name Enneagram (ennea means nine in Greek). These

character types make sense today; they are as complex and sophisticated, including unconscious needs and drives, as the currently popular lists of personality types described later.

The purpose of the Enneagram was and is self-enlightenment, partly by discovering the hidden driving force--an unwanted compulsion--which underlies your surface personality. Indeed, it is assumed that your visible personality traits were developed to conceal your "sinful" compulsion from yourself and others. The nine personality descriptions are far more richly detailed and prescriptive than I will be able to provide here, but this will give you the idea and whet your appetite (see Beesing, Nogosek & O'Leary, 1984; Palmer, 1990; Riso, 1990):

Type #1--The *we-can-do-better inspirer*: wise, conscientious, idealistic, hard-working, and perfectionistic. It bothers them when things are not done "the right way," so when frustrated they may become critics of others and of themselves. Their underlying drive or compulsion is *to avoid anger and avoid being wrong or criticized*. It is important for them to be right, to maintain control over their emotions, and to not receive anger or express it. However, few things or people are perfect, so life is never easy for them.

Type #2--The *good Samaritan*: compassionate, attentive, empathic, warm, caring, and constantly giving. May become so concerned about "preaching" love that they overlook actually helping, but always have lots of good intentions. Their hidden compulsion? Neediness. They have strong *needs to be needed*, appreciated, and loved, but they want to avoid recognizing those needs. Nothing is done without a reason, not even by the "selfless" giver.

Type #3--The *go getter*: confident, high self-esteem, ambitious, inspiring achiever. May become overly competitive, wanting to always come out on top, continually trying to impress people. Their compulsion is *to avoid failure* and rejection, which forces them to work hard for success. They believe their personal worth is determined by their achievements.

Type #4--The *creative person*: artistic, sensitive, in touch with feelings, true to self. May become moody, easily hurt, and socially or emotionally withdrawn, feeling emotionally overloaded and different from others. They are striving *to avoid being ordinary or defective*; they want to be special and unique; they sometimes feel deeply but more often "on stage" or like an impostor.

Type #5--The *learned one*: intelligent, logical, loves being alone and learning, original thinker. May become absorbed in abstract trivia, proving their own theory, or counter-attacking criticism. They are attempting *to avoid being empty*--empty of knowledge and understanding of the world, empty of answers when asked a difficult question, and empty of opportunities to learn more. Absorbing knowledge is their addiction, not using knowledge.

Type #6--The *dependable, admiring follower*: likable, engaging, friendly, loyal, trustworthy, concerned with making friends. May become indecisive and insecure but remains devoted and a "team player." Their compulsive fears are of rejection, being alone, and especially condemnation by an authority figure. Their drive is to follow all the rules, to be approved, and *to be secure (without becoming self-reliant)*.

Type #7--The *happy hedonist*: enthusiastic, practical, playful, accomplished, enjoying life, knows and wants the best of everything. May become materialistic, hyperactive, easily frustrated, and compelled to buy new "toys" and find new ways to have fun, including alcohol and drugs. Their fear is of deprivation and boredom. Their compulsions are *to avoid personal pain*, not even see it in others' lives, to put off anything unpleasant, and to have more of everything. Life should be fun.

Type #8--The *conquering hero*: strong, assertive, "can-do" attitude, loves challenges, natural leader, champion of causes. May become a risk-taking entrepreneur or a righter of wrongs, intimidating or "having it out" with others and feeling he/she must get his/her way. The driving force underlying this personality is *a fear of being dominated or the avoidance of weakness*. They favor radical change (by them).

Type #9--The *complacent pacifist*: accepting, patient, unpretentious, open, relaxed, just a nice reassuring person. May become too submissive or accommodating, too self-effacing, too indifferent, and falsely reassure others in order to gain peace at any price. They *fear conflict and separation from others* due to conflicts. They will do anything for harmony, even deny reality. Their approach is: "What's the big deal anyway?"

The best way to use these nine brief descriptions is to go back through the list and identify your basic personality type by noting primarily *the positive characteristics* because that is what we know best about ourselves. Then, your insight should come from noting the underlying (unconscious?) fears and compulsions of your personality type. Next, you need to spend a lot of time considering possible ways your hidden fears or desires have influenced your life. By becoming more aware of these hidden needs or forces within you, perhaps you can see yourself in a different light and find better ways to cope with your problems. I'd encourage you to read more about the Enneagram personality types.

Judith Sills (1993) takes a similar approach; she argues that good qualities often have unwanted side effects or "excess baggage." Examples: a well organized person may insist that things be done his/her way; a bright, informed person may so need to be right that he/she can't admit being wrong; a person with noticeably high self-esteem may feel superior; an interesting, warm, engaging person may be driven by strong needs to be the center of attention; a person who

constantly fights injustice may need to criticize and express anger. It is common to speculate about these kinds of internal dynamics.

Modern theories—Myers-Briggs and Jungian types

The idea of personality types is still very much in use today; for instance, types of personality disorders are used as part of modern psychiatric diagnoses. The current types used for diagnosis emphasize the negative or "problem" end of a dimension and include (the # indicates the Enneagram type which are likely to have this kind of problem): Antisocial personality (#3 & #8), Avoidant personality (#4 & #5), Borderline personality (#6 & #9), Dependent personality (#6 & #2), Histrionic personality (#4 & #7), Narcissistic personality (#3 & #8), Obsessive-compulsive personality (#1), Paranoid personality (#5), Passive-aggressive personality (#9), Schizoid personality (#4 & #5), Schizotypal personality (#5 & #7), Self-defeating personality (#6), and Sadistic personality (#3 & #8). As you can see, 5000 years later we haven't changed our thinking about personality very much. If you are interested in learning more about these personality disorders, see a personality or abnormal psychology textbook or American Psychiatric Association (1994).

The term "type" refers to a person's general disposition; most theories describe only a few types. The term "trait" also describes a characteristic or tendency, but a person may have many, many traits--or needs or motives or talents or handicaps. Indeed, Cattell (1965) factor analyzed over 50 human traits and found they could be summarized by just 16 major personality factors. Some say only five factors will describe our personality: (1) nervousness vs. feeling secure, (2) sociable vs. reserved, (3) independent (flexible) vs. conforming, (4) helpful (trusting) vs. hard-hearted, and (5) conscientious vs. disorganized. Whether it is 50 or 5 is pretty arbitrary.

The notions of types or traits or motives are useful because they help explain and predict behavior that isn't easily explained by external forces. A motive explains behavior in more general terms than a habit (like a habit to eat a candy bar in the afternoon). For instance, if we know a person has a "sweet tooth," we may not know exactly what behavior will occur (eating candy, ice cream, cake, pie, etc.), but we can predict that such a person will be motivated get something sweet. Henry A. Murray named 39 specific needs, such as to socialize, nurture, be taken care of, have sex, etc. We have already discussed achievement needs in chapter 4.

Keep in mind that labeling a trait or attempting to explain a behavior by merely naming a need supposedly underlying the behavior is hardly a full, adequate explanation. To understand a person's actions or feelings you must know the *origin* of that behavior; you must explain how the trait or need developed. Don't let your psychological explanations get too glib, sloppy, and lazy. Example: to say that someone is a high achiever because he/she is "driven" does not say anything; you must explain in detail how the person became

driven. Now, let's look at a more recent example of types. Then we will discuss "parts" of our personality and more about motives.

In the last ten years, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® has become very popular within industry and schools. These personality types deal with normal people, not psychopathology, so you don't need to be a clinical psychologist to use the instrument (but you need training in the use of psychological tests). But the four dimensions on the Myers-Briggs, all originally described by Carl Jung in the early 1900's, seem (intuitively) to reflect personality characteristics of a fundamental nature:

1. Where do you live mentally? Do you attend mostly to the external world of events and people (you need people) *or* to the internal world of your thoughts and reactions (you need privacy)?

   Extroversion or Introversion

2. How do you take in information? Do you attend to your senses telling you what is happening and useful right now (likes detail and routines) *or* do you tune into the pattern of what is happening so you can anticipate possibilities for the future (likes imagination and change)?

   Sensing or iNtuition

3. How do you make decisions? Do you use your head--objective data, logic, justice, and reason to analyze causes and effects *or* do you rely more on your heart--feelings, values, relationships, and vague, subjective reactions?

   Thinking or Feeling

4. What is your lifestyle? Your way of dealing with the world? Do you have clear ideas about what "should be done" and carefully plan and organize for each anticipated event (seem rigid and stuffy to P's) *or* do you prefer to wait and see what develops, remaining open to new or different options that you can select spontaneously (seems loose and messy to J's)?

   Judging or Perceiving

Thus, depending on your score on these four scales, you fall into one of sixteen personality types, e.g. INTJ, ESFJ, ENFP, etc. Even though there are only four scales, a great deal can be told about each of the 16 personality types. The Myers-Briggs types are reported to be quite useful in understanding managers and subordinates, teachers and students, marriage partners, and many others. I'll give you two brief sample descriptions of these types. This is the INTJ type, which is my type:

This type, being an original thinker, has a vision of how to do something better and he/she perseveres in trying to persuade others that he/she is right. They do have good organizational ability, but they think they can improve everything. Indeed, unless the thinking or judging dimension is strong, there is a risk that the introverted intuitive (IN) person will be absolutely convinced he/she is right, even when wrong. Difficult problems fascinate him/her; routine jobs are considered a waste of time. They make good scientists. They are not easily directed but will consider new facts and other opinions when carefully presented. They tend to be skeptical and critical, frequently not considering other peoples' feelings as much as they should.

For comparison let's look at the ESFP personality type. This type makes decisions by how they "feel," rather than by thinking or logical foresight. Their world centers around people; they are friendly, tactful, accepting, fun-loving and fun to be with. They are also sensitive and aware of others' feelings, good judges of people, and good compromisers. They may be good with practical matters and concrete facts but are not abstract thinkers or grandiose planners. This type is realistic, relying on their own senses--perception of the situation--and not on expert opinion, theory, or book-learning. They may not develop a plan for coping with a troublesome situation; they simply handle problems as they arise, often with confidence. They like using their senses--looking, hearing, tasting, feeling--and may be good with machinery because they can "see" how it works. They like material possessions.

Obviously, these are two very different types of people. Jung's theories and the Myers-Briggs scales make it clear to us that two people in the same circumstances may be experiencing two entirely different "worlds." I recommend you take the Myers-Briggs test and read a book about the types (Myers, 1980; Kroeger & Thuesen, 1988). It will help you understand and work with others and yourself. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (http://keirsey.com/index.html) is an online test based, in part, on Jung's personality characteristics. This test yields scores similar to the Myers-Briggs. Extensive descriptions of different personality types and how to understand one's own scores are also given on this site and in Keirsey's books.

The Myers-Briggs Types are based on Jung's 70-year-old description of personality types. Let's discuss that briefly. Jung's basic focus was on the introvert-extrovert dimension. As described above, note that his "introvert" had little to do with being socially shy; an introvert directs his/her mind inward towards his/her thoughts, feelings, and awareness. The introvert wants to understand life before living it. An extrovert directs his/her attention outward towards external objects, people, and actions. The extrovert plunges in and lives life, then he/she understands it, maybe. Secondarily, Jung ranked people according to mental processes: thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuiting. He believed one of these four functions tends to dominate but an optimally adjusted person would be facile with all these functions. Jung spoke primarily of 8 major personality types:

The extroverted thinking type depends on rational reasoning and observing the external world, he/she represses his/her feelings. He/she wants to run the world rationally. The introverted thinking type is also the thinking type but the focus is on his/her ideas, not external observations or the words of some authority. He/she wants to analyze the world, not run it. He/she appears cold, aloof, and inconsiderate. The extroverted feeling type is controlled by the wishes and expectations of others. He/she is friendly and avoids conflicts. Thinking is repressed. The introverted feeling type is quiet, unexpressive, hard to understand, and perhaps depressed but capable of intense feelings inside. He/she is like a fur-lined coat--warm inside. He/she is loyal to close friends and committed to his/her values.

The extroverted sensing types seek thrills and pleasures; they have little interest in thinking or reasoning but they are very perceptive of what is going on around them. They accept reality and are tolerant of others as well as of themselves. Often they are primarily concerned with eating, partying, enjoying art, and having a good time. The introverted sensing type absorbs many facts but may overreact to outside stimuli. The reactions are often unempathic, even irrational. Example: an casual remark may be interpreted in an odd way or as having great significance; yet, little interest is shown in the person making the remark. He/she may be hard-working, patient with details, and systematic. The extroverted intuitive type is confident and innovative--constantly looking for an opportunity to take advantage of the situation--perhaps a merchant, a politician, a champion of causes or a person intent on making all the "right social connections." He/she hates routine; even his/her own projects may become boring. The introverted intuitive type is caught up in his/her own unreasoning understanding of the world or of their selves. Since they may underutilize thinking (judging truth or falsity) and feelings (judging good or bad), this type may have difficulty realizing when they are wrong. They may not communicate with others very well.

Note: on first reading, these personality types are much too complex to readily understand. Full effective use of any classification system only occurs after working extensively with the types. You need to take the test yourself, read extensively about the meaning and implications of each type, and practice using the classification system to describe and understand friends, relatives, co-workers, teachers, etc. After a week or so, you start to think in terms of the types you are studying. Eventually, you will find the personality types an aid to understanding people and predicting their reactions in different situations. An employer or manager can use personality type to assign each employee the kind of work he/she does best or to decide who will work best together on a team.

Other personality types

Recently, Harary and Donahue (1994) recently published a self-administered, self-interpreted personality test. It includes self-tests and exercises designed to help you explore and understand five

aspects of your personality: your expressive style (quiet to dramatic), interpersonal style (introverted to extroverted), work style (unmotivated to driven), emotional style (positive to negative), and intellectual style (analytic and linear to creative and global). If you are looking for a research based, practical way to objectively assess your personality traits, I'd recommend this workbook (or go see a counselor for a professional interpretation of a personality test--see chapter 15).

Hundreds of other theories of personality have attempted to explain certain types of people. Freud, for instance, described "oral," "anal," "phallic," and "genital" characters. Each type originates during a particular psychosexual stage of development, i.e. you can get stuck at any stage. Oral characters may have been overindulged or neglected as infants when eating was our most important function; the outcomes are described in Table 9.2.

Anal retentive characters have traits that supposedly originate during toilet-training; they include being orderly, persevering, compulsively clean, and reluctant to give things away. Anal expulsive characters are messy, unconcerned with cleanliness, careless with money and everything, disorganized, and, when pushed, stubbornly rebellious and defiant. Phallic characters have never resolved the Oedipus or the Electra complex and tend to be strident, proud, dominant, and arrogant. Such men are often self-centered, macho Don Juans obsessed with proving their sexual attractiveness; such women are resentful of men and try to dominate them. Genital characters are healthy; they have gone through puberty; they are physically and psychologically mature. They have learned to handle external stresses and internal conflicts by coping with the previous stages of "psychosexual" development. During puberty when there is a demanding upsurge of sexual interests, the genital characters are able to draw on the skills and rationality they have acquired. As adults, they have the maturity to cope well with others, with love, with work, and with the conflicts within.

Adler typed people according to birth order and research still supports some of these differences. Adler described the first born as anxious, conscientious, and dependent on authorities, the second child as socially oriented but competitive, and the youngest child as pampered but always having to "catch up."

The ancient Greeks classified people as cheerful-sad and emotional-unemotional, not very different from our current Type A and Type B personalities. Much research has assessed the relationship between physique (heavy, muscular, and thin) and character; there is some connection. You will find many lists of "types" throughout this book; such lists will help you understand the enormous variations among us human beings.

A final note about personality traits: a trait may be far more complex than commonly thought or implied by a simple name and the basic driving force or motivation underlying the trait may be different

than you imagine. For example, extroversion has many facets: a. enjoying being with people in a warm, friendly way, b. being a leader and assertive, c. being venturesome and seeking excitement or change, d. seeking positive feelings and enthusiasm, e. feeling ambitious and in control, f. being lively and active, g. being exhibitionistic and the center of attention, and other characteristics. See, extroversion is complex. Of course, not every extrovert has all these facets but, in general, all these characteristics tend to cluster together in one concept.

Now, what is the glue that holds all these characteristics together in the trait of extroversion? Most of us would simply say "being socially outgoing" and wanting to be with people. However, recent researchers (Lucas, Diener, Grob, Suh, & Shao http://www.apa.org/journals/psp/psp793452.html), 2000), studying the relationships among the many sub-traits of extroversion, conclude that extroverts have more "reward sensitivity," i.e. extroverts are more likely than introverts to approach rewarding or satisfying situations. Social situations and relationships are often rewarding so extroverts have more needs to go there and enjoy themselves more than introverts. The motivation to seek rewards and feel good seems to explain the complex trait of extroversion better than just the desire to socialize. Maybe this is a difference that is only important to a researcher but, at least, it illustrates that personality traits are often quite complex. Now, the question becomes why some of us have more "reward sensitivity" than others. Self-understanding and psychology are seldom simple.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® and MBTI® trademarks are registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and are owned by CPP.

Understanding the Parts of Our Personality

Parts: Child (id), Parent (superego), Adult (ego)

If we realized the many different parts of our personality, we should be better able to discover what we are really like inside--what "makes us tick." Personality theories provide a kind of road map of the parts of our personality which generate the complex and conflicting feelings, thoughts, and behaviors we experience. Such theories fill entire books (e.g. Monte, 1980; Byrne & Kelley, 1981; Mischel, 1981). I will summarize here only Freud's parts of the personality--id, ego and superego--and Eric Berne's (1964, 1973) parts--the "child," "adult," and "parent." Freud's and Berne's ideas are similar and together they probably are still the most commonly used theories (Psychoanalysis

and Transactional Analysis or TA) for understanding ourselves and others. An impressive and delightful bibliography of Transactional Analysis is available at TA in Ireland. The purpose of these personality theories is to help you find your way around inside--to explore your psyche and gain awareness of the many forces and views fighting for expression inside us. I can only whet your appetite.

The id or the "child"

The id contains the primitive biological urges assumed (by Freud) to strive for expression in all of us. These drives include the needs to be loved and cuddled, the desires to have all kinds of sexual stimulation, and the tendencies to be aggressive and destructive in general and hostile in particular towards anything that interferes with our gaining the pleasures we seek. The id is not rational or realistic; it has no morals. It seeks immediate gratification. Some of its urges may be conscious, like wanting to look at your mother's breasts; some are unconscious, perhaps homosexual urges or murderous impulses. The id's motto is "If it feels good, do it."

Eric Berne's "child" ego state is similar to Freud's id (or "it" in German) except he divided this part of our personality into three sub-parts:

1. The natural child is the fun-loving, carefree, impulsive, creative, pleasure-seeking, impatient part of us that provides much of our motivation, excitement, and energy. The natural child part also provides some of our important emotions, such as joy and curiosity when we are happy and anger and vengeance when we are frustrated. Without this part, life would not be nearly so much fun or as mean.
2. The adaptive child is the compliant, orderly, neat part of us that encourages us to act "grown up," attempts to please others, hides our anger and greed, and generally seeks the rewards of doing what we are supposed to do. It is the need to be a "good boy" or "good girl." As we learned in chapter 8, however, the needs to be "good" and conform are often opposed by the needs to rebel; dependency is followed by resentment. Thus, the adaptive child also contains urges to subtly resist orders and tradition. It may procrastinate rather than openly rebel; it may get sick to get attention; it may devise a "script" (a life plan) to please a parent's "child" which wants the son or daughter to fail or to be "bad;" it may play "games" to hurt itself or others; it may become neurotic or psychotic or just unhappy and grouchy if such an adaptation has a payoff (see Sooty Sarah in chapter 6).
3. The Little Professor is the intuitive, clever, observant, conniving, manipulative part of us which figures out how to relate to others to get what we want. Examples: it may say, "if I'm nice to my brother and sister" or "if I'm cute and smile a lot" or "if I say 'I love you' frequently" or "if I throw a temper

tantrum" then I'll get what I want. The Little Professor may help us be good or it may be a trouble-maker.

Your "child" is probably in control when you:

- act on feelings and/or act impulsively and/or make an emotional decision.
- use words such as won't, can't, hate, love, give me, now, damn, and so on.
- get upset with other people or when something gets in your way.
- look for and do whatever seems to be the most fun (rather than what you should do in terms of common sense or morals).
- notice that people are playful and comfortable with you and enjoy being around you (at least at a party).

These three sub-parts of the "child" are responsible for much of our personality and interaction with others. The key questions to ask are: Is my "child" happy or unhappy? Is it free and having fun (part of the time)? Is it suppressed and angry? Has it felt forced to adapt by being sickly (and complaining) or weak or disruptive or rebellious or deceptive? Later in this chapter we will study the "games people play;" these "games" are devised primarily by the unhappy adaptive "child" to get some pay off to replace the love and attention it can't get by straight-forward interactions .

The superego or the "parent"

Early in life we start to realize that all of our pleasure, love, and sexual needs can not be satisfied. Some desires may be impossible to fulfill; other urges are taboo; still other urges anger people who are important to our survival. Thus, a part of us starts to say, "You can't do that" or "You shouldn't think about those kinds of things; they are bad." This internal voice becomes the superego or "parent" part of our personality. Freud gave detailed explanations of how the superego developed. For instance, in chapter 5 we have already learned how the scary Oedipus and Electra Complexes are resolved by identifying with the same sexed parent. For example, for girls: "If I ally myself with Mommy--become like her--then she will like me and not hate me." Thus, the parent's values, morals, and attitudes are absorbed as part of this identification process. Furthermore, parents, baby sitters, relatives, and older siblings have morally guided the young child by repeatedly encouraging good behavior and reprimanding bad behavior, so that the superego of the child takes over that controlling role.

Freud recognized two aspects of the superego: the conscience and the ego-ideal. The conscience is learned through criticism and punishment by parents and others. The ego-ideal, a perfectionistic ideal (often a glorified image of the same sexed parent) held up for the ego to strive for, is acquired by being rewarded for being good. Likewise, Berne divided Freud's superego functions into two "parents:"

1. The nurturing "parent" is the part of all of us that is caring, loving, helping, supportive, giving, and protective towards others and towards one's self. This part of our personality may include giving ourselves and others practical hints about coping, bits of wisdom, values, wise sayings, and other suggestions about how to live. This part talks to us and says things like, "You are a good person when you help your parents" or "You don't have to do what others want you to do, you have good judgment, make up your own mind."
2. The critical "parent" is the part of us which criticizes our own or others' behavior (or feelings or thoughts) when we do something we shouldn't. It is our conscience; it is filled with "shoulds" and "thou shall nots" and "oughts." When we do something wrong, the critical parent can be very severe and harsh with us, causing shame, guilt, and depression. Freud believed that the stronger the id's unacceptable love-sex needs and aggressive tendencies, the more critical the superego must become. Thus, there is a constant struggle between the id and the superego--between the "child" and the "parent."

Your "parent" is probably in control when you:

- obey rules or follow customs unquestioningly.
- use words such as awful, good, silly, cute, disgraceful, disgusting, dirty and so on.
- do what others think you should rather than what you prefer to do.
- are bossy, give advice or instructions, and explain a lot of things to others.
- talk and act the way your mother or father did.
- stand over others, point your finger at them, and lecture.

Ask yourself: Is my nurturing parent or my critical parent strongest and most predominant?

The ego or the "adult"

Obviously, both the pleasure-seeking, destructive id and the cruel, demanding superego must be controlled, which is one of the assignments given the ego (Freud's word was "I" in German) or the "adult." The ego tries to find realistic ways to placate the passions of the id and still stay within the moral boundaries set by the superego. Moreover, the ego must learn to deal with the outside world--what others will tolerate and what demands are made on us for survival and for approval by others. The ego is the perceiving, thinking, reasoning,

logically deciding part of us--our Mr. Spock or our computer which helps us decide what is rational to do. (Actually, it was later psychoanalysts who in the 1950-70's developed theories, called Ego Psychology, which emphasize the normal, conscious, coping functions of the ego.)

Neither the id nor superego is realistic. The id demands constant gratification; the superego is impossibly idealistic. The ego or "adult" has to deal with reality--and reality includes (1) the id's emotional impulses, (2) the superego's moralistic demands and censure, and (3) complex external reality, including understanding how things really work in the outside world and how to get along with others. As Freud said, "Life (for the ego) is not easy!" It has an enormous task and, as we saw in chapter 5, when our ego becomes overwhelmed, we feel anxious. The anxiety may come from the id (the urges are about to break loose), the superego (the criticism is devastating), or reality (things are falling apart in the external world).

Not all of the work of the ego is conscious, i.e. it does many things without telling us. For instance, the ego represses some of the id's desires because consciously thinking about these selfish or sexually perverse or brutally hostile urges makes us anxious (the urges are still there). The ego's defense mechanisms, as discussed in chapter 5, operate unconsciously. In a similar way, our ego unconsciously devises a variety of excuses which enable us to escape the critical wrath of our superego (see chapters 3 & 7). The best solution is to acknowledge (as we become able to do so) all parts of us, the good and the bad. That's why this road map to your psyche should be helpful for self-exploration.

Your "adult" is probably in charge when you:

- gather information for making a rational decision.
- check out reality to see if certain beliefs are actually true.
- weigh the pros and cons for several courses of action, considering the long-term practical consequences, the moral values, and the pleasure involved.
- make decisions in a reasonable way and then assess the effectiveness of those decisions.

Keeping the parts in balance

Ask yourself, "Is my adult free to make rational decisions or is it so 'contaminated' with emotions from the child or false beliefs from the parent that it can't think logically?" Examples: Feeling others are against us may come from a scared or frustrated "child." The angry "child" may convince the "adult" that "no one likes me" or "they hate me" (a projection). Our "adult" must learn to recognize the "child's" unconscious attempts to influence our thinking. Prejudices are false beliefs held by the "parent" part of the personality. If the "adult" doesn't rationally check out these false beliefs, we may genuinely believe that all Jews are shrewd, untrustworthy businessmen, all

blacks are lazy (except in sports), and all whites are materialistic chauvinists and prejudice. The "adult" must check reality to keep the "child" and the "parent" under control. Sometimes they overwhelm the "adult."

Also, ask yourself, "Are the three parts of my personality reasonably well balanced with the 'adult' in charge?" If not, there are problems:

Underdeveloped	Results	Overdeveloped	Results
The parent:	Poorly developed conscience	The parent:	Overly critical of child and adult
The child:	All work and no play	The child:	All play, impulsive, angry or sick
The adult:	Loss of contact with reality, impulsiveness, or even insanity	The adult:	Overly serious, intellectualizing

For each of these deficiencies, the solution is for the "adult" to recognize the situation and strengthen the weak part, so there is a healthy balance. If the "parent," for instance, is too strong, we feel beaten down and guilty. In this case, Harris and Harris (1985) suggest relaxation, enjoy the moment, tell yourself "it ain't so bad," go to a calming place, exercise, and do something fun. We need all three: a strong conscience, a playful, creative "child," and an even stronger "adult" in charge.

How to use this personality theory

It is vital to "know thy self," i.e. *all* parts of you. You can practice doing this by frequently asking yourself how each of your parts feel, realizing that *each part has a different answer to almost any question*. For example, suppose you were asked how you like going to school. You might ordinarily say, "It's all right." Actually, there are six (using TA theory) answers:

- The natural child--"It's boring, I hate it, I want to travel" or "Classes are dull but the parties and the men/women are great."
- The adaptive child--"It's going fine, thank you" or "I have to work so hard. I never get to bed before midnight (feel sorry for me)."
- The little professor--"I'm doing really well. One teacher told me I was the best student he had ever had. But I may have to drop out because my money is running out (so how about a donation or a loan?)."
- The nurturing parent--"I realize that a good education is priceless and can never be taken away from you. I feel real good about doing well in school."

- The critical parent--"Well, I goof-off a lot and I'm not a good student anyway. I just can't make myself work."
- The adult--"Some parts are enjoyable and some are not, but I need good grades to get an assistantship in a good graduate school, so I'm trying to do as well as I can."

Hopefully, this conception of our personality will open us up to considering all kinds of needs, wishes, motives, urges, beliefs, etc. as being inside of us. Perhaps it will be less scary if we know everyone probably has fears, childish dependency, murderous hostility, and perverse sexual urges, although many people would deny these traits. Your ego can rationally arrange compromises between the id and the superego if you know what unconscious needs are pushing for expression. Besides, self-discovery can be an exciting, enjoyable adventure. See the everything-is-true-of-me method #1 in chapter 15.

There are several other ways the parts of our personality can be used: The Gestaltists encourage you to engage in long conversations between parts, like the "top dog" and the "under dog" (see the empty chair technique in chapter 15). Neurolinguistic Programming has the problem solving part of us (the ego?) find another way to satisfy the part that is making us do something that is getting us in trouble (see reframing in chapter 15). When we develop new self-instructions (chapter 11), we are strengthening the rational control part of us. There are many self-help possibilities once we realize we are made up of lots of competing parts.

Other parts and motives—Jung, Adler, Allport

As you read more about personality theories, you will find other notions that give you insight into your self. For instance, Jung had a creative mind and besides describing the personality types above, suggested there are several parts of our personality beyond the id, ego, and superego. He believed that humans are innately prone to act certain ways and have certain beliefs, e.g. young children and animals are seen as "cute," almost every culture has created the notion of God and an after life, all societies have heroes and heroines, spiritual-mystical powers are thought to influence the weather, crops, health, etc., and the same children's stories are heard in all parts of the world (see Joseph Campbell's *The Power of Myth)*. These universal beliefs or themes were called *archetypes* by Jung. Instincts and archetypes make up our "*collective unconscious*," which is this tendency for all of us to view the world in common (not necessarily accurate) ways.

In Jungian theory, there is a part of our personality called the *persona* which includes the masks we wear when relating to others--it isn't our real self. In contrast to the publicly acceptable masks (Jung looked for opposites), there is the *shadow* which, much like the Enneagram, is our dark and evil side--our sexual, greedy, aggressive, and power-hungry needs which are difficult to control. If a normally well controlled person suddenly had an angry outburst, the Jungian might assume it is the work of the devilish shadow. Yet, the shadow is

always there; it compliments the conscious ego; a wise person will understand, accept, and consider (but not give in to) the shadow's needs.

Jung also believed we all inherited both an archetype for being masculine, called *animus*, and an opposing one for being feminine, called *anima*. These masculine and feminine tendencies not only influence how we behave but also what we expect from and how we see others. The anima part within a young woman may cause her to "think like a woman" and see her new boyfriend, who might only be interested in sex, as being sensitive and caring. At another time, her animus part (thinking more like a male) may arouse her suspicions that a guy is "on the make" when he really wants love.

For Jung, the *self* is that part of us that defines our highest potential. It is our unique, genuine, and best qualities. Self-realization is difficult to achieve, however, because there are so many conflicts to resolve inside us that we are, at best, middle-aged before we reach selfhood. As the self learns about the archetypes, the persona, the shadow, the anima and other parts of our unconscious, it provides more and more stability and balance among the opposing forces within our personality. If and when we do become more self-actualized, according to Jung, the self takes over control from the ego (Ryckman, 1978).

Another use of personality "parts" or "traits" is made by Jean Bolen (1985), a Jungian analyst, in *The Goddesses in Everywoman*. Her idea is that the characteristics of Greek gods and goddesses are in all of us. Examples: women especially have the potential of drawing upon the strengths possessed by these goddesses:

Name	Goddess of	Strengths
Artemis	the hunt and moon	Strong, able to reach goals, independent
Athena	wisdom and crafts	Smart, practical problem-solving, logical
Hestia	hearth and temple	Spiritual strength, comfortable alone
Hera	marriage	Devoted, committed for a lifetime
Demeter	grain	Maternal, nurturing, generous, giving
Persephone	the underworld	Can accept new ideas and ways
Aphrodite	love and beauty	Sensual, enjoys beauty & pleasure, creative

Women (and men) can learn to recognize, enhance, and utilize these strengths. These parts need to be developed *before an crisis*

occurs, however. One must practice being independent and assertive long *before* the crisis of divorce. One must learn to think and reason long *before* deciding serious matters. One must practice caring for others long *before* having children. One must be sensual long *before* having sex with a lover. It takes work to be god-like or goddess-like; we don't become strong and smart automatically or mystically or by magic. You can't wait until trouble strikes.

Alfred Adler (1951) had a very different view of where our basic motives come from: rather than being pushed by animalistic sexual-aggressive instincts, as Freud suggested, or by ancient archetypes, as Jung suggested, Adler believed we are *pulled towards certain goals*. This is a little like Jung's self. Example: as children we often feel inferior but we come to strive to overcome these feelings--to be superior. The healthy person tries to be optimally effective--maybe even perfect--in such a way that he/she contributes to the welfare of others. Each person sets his/her own goals and develops (by age 5 or 6) his/her own life-style for reaching those goals; in this way, we are responsible for our own destinies (see the discussion of life script later). Likewise, the existentialists (Fromm, 1941; May, 1953) suggested that humans are motivated to find meaning in their lives and are guided by the meaning they seek. The Humanists also believe we are motivated to achieve our highest potential. Adler was a strong advocate of respect, equality, cooperation, and love between people, including spouses or parents and children (see later section). He was also a pioneer in psychosocial education and in the development of Child Guidance Clinics.

There are obviously many other ways to conceptualize the parts of our personality. Allport, for example, thought the uniqueness of each personality was one of the most important things to understand. Part of this uniqueness is due to the many, many parts of our personality. He and many other psychologists considered reflexes, habits, skills and special abilities or weaknesses, drives or needs, beliefs, our particular view of our environment, goals or intentions, values, attitudes, and traits as being the kind of factors that determine what we do. Thus, "personality" becomes *very* complex. Moreover, Allport did not see us as slavishly controlled by innate or external factors (like Freud and Skinner did) because humans have the ability to actively, creatively, and rationally make conscious choices about how to behave.

There is an enormously rich literature about personality. *It provides a map to the mental maze inside us*. It not only describes the parts or structure of our personality, it also speculates about the development of certain traits, motives, and character types. The best overviews of this provocative and fertile material are in the textbooks for courses in theories of personality. Such summaries provide a guide for selecting additional books to read for more self-awareness. See the recommended additional reading at the end of this section.

Theories of Development: Becoming a Person

Many personality theories describe the stages we go through as our character develops. Understanding our own personality development should greatly improve our insight into our current drives, values, and views. With greater awareness perhaps we can be more in control or, at least, more accepting of ourselves and others. Indeed, Carl Rogers's and Abraham Maslow's basic notion was that we are all struggling to become our "real," true, unique selves. What stands in our way? For Rogers it was the tendency to deny our own needs and feelings, to pretend to be someone we aren't, to avoid facing our true self. For Maslow it was the necessity of satisfying our basic needs first--food, health, safety, love, self-esteem--before we have the luxury of carrying out the enjoyable and noble achievements that reflect our highest values and talents. According to both Rogers and Maslow, our true selves just naturally emerge if we are lucky enough to meet our basic needs and openly experience our basic emotions and motives. That's the rub: it is very hard to meet all our basic needs and become aware of all the feelings inside of us. Meeting those challenges is, as Rogers said, *the process of becoming a person*. Sadly, many of us never get to the point of carrying out the desires of our true self. If we knew more truth about human nature and coping, perhaps we would have more time to "actualize" our true and best selves.

How long does it take for our basic personality to develop? How fixed or stable are personality traits over time? How changeable are personalities from one situation to another? Some parts of our personality are remarkably stable. Freud, Berne, and others believed our basic personality and "scripts" were established by age 6 or so. On the other hand, William James and many current researchers believe our personality changes substantially during childhood, adolescence, and perhaps early adulthood but becomes fixed after age 25 or so. The best current evidence is that certain personality *characteristics are fairly stable over time*: emotionality (neuroticism), introversion-extroversion, openness to new experiences, masculinity-femininity, agreeable-irritable, and conscientiousness (dependability, orderliness). Don't forget, the Minnesota twin study researchers have claimed that your genes have more influence on these traits than your parents' child rearing practices. These genetic characteristics may form some of your "basic personality."

Nevertheless, other characteristics seem more likely to *change from one stage of life to another*: mood or morale, assertiveness, dominance, independence, alienation, and satisfaction with life. These traits, emotions, or behaviors may be more influenced by the person's life events, situation, or viewpoint (Goleman, 1987). For example, your level of alienation, happiness, and self-satisfaction when you are 20 has little to do with your adjustment on the same traits when you are 60.

The researchers, who believe our personality is set in concrete at 25 or 30, discount the idea of life stages or crises producing changes in our character, as described in Table 9.1. Yet, some people's personal traits clearly change after marriage, having a baby, getting promoted or fired, a heart attack, a serious accident, a divorce, death of a loved one, etc., especially if the person previously had certain personality traits. The traits most likely to change are emotionality, impulsivity, and irritability. I suspect we humans are *capable of changing* at any time much more than we imagine or try to change.

Beware of over-simplified personality theories. Besides there being hundreds of personality parts, many of our specific traits *change from one situation to another*. We may lie and cheat only in certain circumstances, not all the time. The introverted student, who won't talk to his/her teachers, may be the most talkative person in his/her peer group. The big grouch at home may be "Mr. Cool" or "Miss Sunshine" at work. Indeed, some people put on many different "faces" and play different social roles in many different situations, while other personalities remain about the same wherever they are (see chapter 8 and Snyder, 1987). You probably know people who are chameleon-like, eagerly changing themselves to meet their needs at the moment. The degree to which we *change* our personality to please others is probably another *stable* characteristic. Human personalities are fascinatingly complex.

Stages of life

Personality theories also describe the development of our personal traits. This knowledge should help us understand the significance of our history and the possibilities of growth in the future.

I have summarized some developmental theories about life stages in Table 9.1 and several references about personality development are given at the end of this section. Obviously, a thorough understanding of the normal process of growing up will require much more information than I have provided. Moreover, to understand where we went wrong, i.e. how our own personal problems arose, we need general knowledge of normal development as well as serious probing of our specifically unique history. Remember too, regardless of the effort expended, that any attempt to understand ourselves has to be tentative--an educated guess, at best. We can't be absolutely certain of why we behaved or felt the way we did. In the later section on Relationships Within the Family, Table 9.2 is provided. It shows some current theoretical speculation about the possible origins of several personality problems. Use it only as a rough guide to possible causes and as a stepping stone to further exploration (see the autobiography method in chapter 15).

Table 9.1 provides an overview of personality development throughout life. Even though certain traits are fairly stable over the years, we all go through unavoidable stages of life. There is a time to go to school, to go through puberty, to fall in love and have sex, to

marry and have children, to have an "empty nest," to be grandparents, and to die. In each stage, we have things to learn, opportunities to grab, and problems to handle.

Table 9.1: Stages of development

Stage of Life	Relations	Stage name (needs)	Good vs. Bad Outcomes
Infancy (Age=0-1)	Mother (caretaker)	Oral stage (needs to be held, loved)	Trust *vs* Distrust; Decides others are OK or not OK.
Early Childhood (Age=1-3)	Family	Anal stage (needs physical contact, play)	Confidence *vs* self-doubt; Decides I'm OK or not OK.
Play age (Age=3-6)	Family, play group	Phallic stage (needs relationship with parents)	Takes initiative *vs* guilt & self-doubt. Develops life "script.". Sees a purpose in life--or doesn't
School age (Age=6-12)	Family, friends	Latency stage (needs to act like a boy/girl)	Develops industry *vs* shame; Enjoys work or resists work (scared)
Adolescence (Age=12-18)	Friends, opposite sex	Genital stage (needs boy/girlfriend)	Knows who he/she is *vs* feels confused; Relates well or poorly.
Leaving family (Age=18-22)	Friends, lovers	Identity *vs* lostness (needs career & lover)	Defines who he/she is. Tests one's abilities.
Entering adult world (Age=23-29)	Mate or Lover, friends.	Love *vs* aloneness (needs to master world)	Establishes "home" and own life-style or remains lost. Shifts dependency to partner. May find mentor at work.
Settling down (Age=30-37)	Mate, children, peers	Productivity *vs* self-centeredness.	New questions and crises arise: Why can't things be better? Grows, advances or stays at low level. Is this all I can expect from life? Why am I oppressed?

Becoming your own person (Age=38-45)	Family, co-workers, friends	Generativity *vs* stagnation. Caring for others & passing on wisdom *vs* self-absorbed.	By this age "the die is cast." "I've got one last chance." May become a mentor and help family members *or* feel a failure. May relax and seek fun.
Mellow years (Age=45-60)	Spouse, co-workers, friends. Children leaving home.	Love of all people *vs* disgust and despair.	Become closer to spouse or leave empty shell. Need friends. Fewer money worries, more health worries. More content with past and future *or* disappointed. Death of our parents reminds us of our destiny. Life's a routine.
Retirement (Age=60-70)	Spouse, peers, grandchildren	Finishing work with zest *vs* hating the work.	Planning retirement. Has time for self and spouse. Major changes stressful: no work, less money, excess time, missing productive work and co-workers.
Facing death	Spouse, children, care-takers, dying friends	Acceptance of death but interested in living *vs* obsessed with and dreading death and doing little living.	Living *vs* complaining. Coping with a failing body. Much leisure time, so finding constructive ways to use time and talents *or* unhappy. Has a sense of completion.

Table compiled from Erikson (1950), Levinson, et al (1978), Gould (1975), and April, 1975, Time.

Several books discuss the human passage from youth to old age (see the bibliography at the end of this personality section). We all go through stages in critical areas of our lives--love, child rearing, work, friends, health, etc. Knowledge of others' lives can help us.

The above discussion of character types and personality development helps us recognize how similar or how different we may be from one another. And, as we have just seen, it is important to

understand the origin of the many different personality types. Others are different from us because they simply have a different background, different genes, and are in a different environment, i.e. a different developmental history. Besides the types discussed above, however, there are descriptions in hundreds of books of many types of mothers, fathers, children, lovers, wives, husbands, teachers, students, bosses, employees, poker players, etc. With experience, you will develop your own lists as well. That's fine, but don't prejudge people and falsely label them just because your first impression is a certain type. Each human is unique. Now, we will explore several other varieties of personality types which may help us understand others as well as ourselves.

Personality Involves Relationships with Oneself and Others

Transactional Analysis and life positions

Beyond the parts and the personal traits, our personality is powerfully influenced by our relationships with ourselves and with others. In the simplest terms, you can either like or dislike yourself and like or dislike others. Thus, Transactional Analysis (Harris, 1973) suggests that we live our lives according to one of four "life positions." The four basic types are:

"I'm OK; You're OK"--this is the only healthy attitude. The "adult" must be realistic, aware, and tolerant but in control of the "child" and the "parent." A person with such an orientation feels positive; they are winners.

"I'm not OK; You're OK"--this is the position we all begin in, according to Harris. Our life is sustained by others, so they are OK. When young, we are weak and unable to do many things others can do, so we feel "not OK." If we are repeatedly put down, if we are taught we are sinful, or if we become severe self-critics (like Sooty Sarah in chapter 6), we may take the "I'm not OK" attitude with us throughout life. If so, we run a risk of being anxious, depressed, passive and, in general, a loser.

"I'm OK; You're not OK"--this is a self-centered, self-serving position. If parents are unduly harsh, negligent, inconsistent or irrational, one learns that others are uncaring, unfair or unsupportive, i.e. "not OK." Such a person may certainly feel he/she is better than others, maybe even superior. They are likely to be distrustful, aloof, and unconcerned with helping others (who are no good). They may take from others without feeling guilty; they may insult others; they may avoid or hurt others.

"I'm not OK; You're not OK"--this is the most futile and helpless position of all. There is no way to turn for help; others won't help and you can't. Nothing seems worthwhile. At the least, this is an unhappy state of affairs and in the extreme, such a person's only recourse may be to withdraw into the utter hopelessness of depression or insanity.

You can see the crucial role that interpersonal relations play in determining what we are like, personality-wise. In Transactional Analysis, your life position is related to the "Life Script" you follow throughout life and the "Games" you play constantly with others. Scripts will be discussed next, games when we discuss interpersonal relations.

Life Scripts

A "life script" is the unconscious plan or expectation one has for his/her life. It reflects the kind of relationships we have had and expect to have with other people. Our life script is developed or, at least, started by the time we are 5 or 6, before the "adult" and "parent" are fully developed, according to Transactional Analysis (Berne, 1973). Our "child," probably the "adaptive child," makes these judgments (the life position) and plans (script) based largely on messages sent by our parents' inner "child."

The messages from our parents (or whoever raised us) get inside our heads and become part of our life position and life script. Included in the myriad of messages are instructions, called *injunctions*, about what not to do. In response to these injunctions we give ourselves instructions, some of these self-messages are helpful in counteracting the injunctions, called *allowers*, and some are harmful, called *drivers*. Examples are given below. Consider the first example: the message from the threatened parent's "child" is, "Don't do so well that you feel adequate." To cope with feelings of inadequacy, the child's "child" may try to give a helpful self-instruction, such as "Be perfect!" This message "drives" us but, because it is unrealistic, assures that we will fail and feel inadequate (as commanded by the parent's "child"). We could, of course, learn to give ourselves a more realistically helpful message, an allower, such as "It's OK to be yourself and less than perfect." Kahler (1974) describes several common injunctions, drivers (not OK messages) and allowers (OK messages):

Injunctions	Driver Messages	Allower Messages
Don't succeed. Don't feel adequate.	Be perfect!	It's OK to be human & succeed.
Don't be fast and efficient.	Hurry up!	It's OK to take your time.

Don't make it.	Try and try again!	It's OK to just do the best you can.
Don't think and feel what you want; think and feel what I want you to.	Please others, not yourself!	It's OK to consider and respect yourself.
Don't feel.	Be strong!	It's OK to be emotional and need others.

It is these sorts of primitive messages, plus other aspects of how we are dealt with (respected, valued, spoiled, neglected, resented), that determine how we feel about ourselves and others, and which produce a script for our lives. It is scary to think that we may be compelled to live out our lives in accordance with a five-year-old's interpretation of confused and subtle messages from our parents' irrational inner child. Many people seeking self-understanding reject this notion and disagree with Berne's (1973) book on scripts. Many of us don't like the idea that unconscious forces, like a script, are directing our lives. Liking or disliking something has little to do with its truth, however.

Your "child's" view of life as being positive or negative is related to your script being for a "winner" or a "loser." Our life script not only unconsciously controls the role we play but it also manipulates others into playing the roles needed for our script. For example, if your script depicts others as disliking you, you may act in irritating ways that insure a negative reaction from others. Yet, all we see is that "people don't like me." It may seem to us as though we are planning and living our lives rationally as adults but perhaps we aren't. If you experience the same kind of things happening over and over again with different kinds of people, suppose they all show little interest in being friendly, you should start looking for an underlying script. In any case, being aware of possible unconscious scripts should be helpful.

The best way to understand life scripts is through case illustrations. Sooty Sarah in chapter 5 and Stella in chapter 15 illustrate a "I'm a lonely, sickly, no-good person" script. They acquired the script in different ways, however. Berne described six common kinds of scripts based on one's orientation to time: (see if you think in any of these ways)

1. A "before" orientation would involve *focusing on the near future*, e.g. "Before I get married, I'm going to do a lot of hell raisin" or "Before I get fired, I'm gonna take this company for all I can."
2. An "after" orientation *focuses on distant events*, e.g. "After I finish college, things will be a lot better" or "After we get married, I'll get serious about holding a job" or "After I get a raise, I'll relax with the family more and slow down."

3. An "over and over" orientation *expects history to repeat itself*, e.g. "Over and over again I fail, just when I think I am going to succeed" or "Over and over I think I have found the right person, then they screw me over."
4. An "always" orientation sees things as *remaining the same*, e.g. "My job...my marriage...my family...the world will always be the same, so why try to change it?"
5. A "never" orientation reflects a wish that *will never come true*, e.g. "I'll never be able to..." or "They will never change..."
6. An "open ended" orientation is where *the original script has been played out and now we have no script*; thus, we feel lost. Berne believed most of us have a notion of when we will die. If we live beyond that time, we may have no script to guide us. Also, Berne believed it is hard for our "child" to out do our parents and may have no script for doing so. This had personal significance for Berne because his father was a physician who died in mid-life and his mother was a writer and close to her son. Berne, a writing physician, felt he was living on "borrowed time" after middle-age and he died of unknown causes about the time he reached the age of his mother at her death. Other examples of having a vague script are (1) a student who has been in school for 20 years and facing graduation has little notion of what professional life will be like or (2) a person who gets a divorce after 20 years of marriage and has little idea of what being single will be like.

Hopefully, a few brief descriptive phrases can convey to you the general nature of several life scripts or attitudes towards life. Remember these are "life plans" of 5-year-olds, which influence their life-style and continue to dominate their lives even as adults. Try to see which ones "ring true" for you.

I'm-A-Winner Scripts

- I'm the greatest, a conquering hero, a big shot.
- I want to do something worthwhile and I will.
- Let's live it up today, let's party, and I'll show you how much fun I can be.
- I'm a stud or a sexy thing.
- I'm a little angel or a good boy.
- I'm a fantastic ____ (student, athlete, talker, mechanic, reader, etc.)
- I'm the class clown, I make people happy.
- I'm a good person, I help people in need.

I'm-A-Loser Scripts

- I'm down on myself, I hate myself (see Sooty Sarah in chapter 6).
- I'm always messing up other people's lives. I just do and say the wrong things.

- I try hard but I am always making mistakes. I'm a sad sack. I can't do anything right.
- I'm so unattractive; no one will ever want me. It is better to be alone than to be rejected.
- I am weak and sickly, I've got problems, please don't abandon me (see Stella in chapter 15).
- I have a heavy cross to bear. I'm preparing for the worst, because it's coming.
- I'm a little rebel, a real trouble-maker; I'm never going to get along.
- I don't want to upset anyone, ever. I don't ask for much because I don't deserve it. I apologize (for being alive).

The idea of scripts is useful in uncovering and identifying possible unconscious forces that direct our lives. Yet, scripts aren't the only forces at work. The TA theorists tend to neglect the "adult's" conscious, reasonable planning and decision-making. As discussed in chapter 3, we can consciously chose our own values and life goals. We can pit our constructive self-help efforts against our unconscious, childish scripts, and live more rationally. You can give yourself realistic and practical "I'm OK" messages which can override any unconscious putdown messages. Furthermore, besides a "script," there are perhaps hundreds of driving forces, habits, and traits trying to find expression within us.

The notion of human needs

Most theories try to simplify our personality so it is understandable, i.e. three parts or nine character types or "the environment determines the behavior." Henry Murray and other theorists argued for much greater complexity. Murray wrote, "a personality is a full Congress of orators and pressure-groups...and a psychologist who does not know this in himself, whose mind is locked against the flux of images and feelings, should...make friends...with the various members of his household." A need is a force that causes us to act, to try to satisfy our specific wants. Murray identified 20 or more needs, including dominance, deference, aggression, autonomy, nurturance, achievement, order, understanding, sex, self-abasement, and to avoid harm or blame from others. The strength of these needs are constantly changing but the strongest needs at any one time strongly influence our behavior. Therefore, it is important to be able to measure the relative strength of our needs, as done with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (see chapter 15). Also, if needs determine our behavior, then it is vital to self-understanding that we know how our needs developed. Just saying "I have a need" is hardly a complete explanation.

Fromm proposed these five needs: (1) the *need for human contact*, especially love but including destructive interaction (domination, sadism, or submissive dependency) if love isn't possible. (2) The *need for transcendence* --to rise above and change things--can be positive or negative. If we love ourselves and others, we can act

creatively. If we are powerless, we are likely to be destructive. (3) The *need for rootedness* stems from our almost universal dependency on our mothers. This need is related to the need later in life to worship and slavishly follow male authority figures; Fromm believes peace, justice, and equality will only come when we truly love and are well rooted in our identification with our fellow humans all over the world. (4) The *need for identity* involves knowing ourselves and accepting who we really are. (5) The *need to believe in something* and be devoted to those beliefs.

Abraham *Maslow's hierarchy of needs* was described in chapter 4 because unsatisfied basic needs take priority over higher needs. That may explain why certain changes in behavior are hard to make, i.e. pressing needs take priority over the desired new behavior. However, if basic needs are satisfied, we are supposedly free to self-actualize. What exactly does this mean? What would we be doing if we were well adjusted and free of worry about physical-safety and love-self-esteem needs? Maslow studied successful, creative people to find out.

Psychiatric Diagnoses

Psychoses

work in progress

Adjustment disorders

work in progress

Personality problems

work in progress

Traits of a Mature, Self-Actualizing Person

If you don't know what healthy adjustment is, how can you ever get there? Self-actualization generally includes being knowledgeable, emotionally aware, self-directed, and at peace with the world (O'Connell & O'Connell, 1974). Several specific traits were consistently found in Maslow's self-actualizing subjects (Jourard, 1974):

1. They see reality, and knowing "the facts are friendly," they accept reality more than most people. They see through

phoniness, deception, and "games"--and avoid them. They cope with problems, rather than avoid them.
2. They accept themselves and others; thus, they can honestly self-disclose and forgive others' shortcomings.
3. They are spontaneous with their ideas, feelings, and actions, being genuine and confident.
4. They focus on solving problems but their "problems" tend to be outside themselves. For instance, they often have a "mission" that may be difficult to accomplish but gives excitement, challenge, and purpose to their lives.
5. They enjoy privacy, withdrawing sometimes to be free to have their own thoughts. Occasionally, they may have mystical experiences in which they become part of all mankind or of nature.
6. They resist culturally prescribed roles, e.g. masculine or feminine. They resent unfairness caused by social roles and prejudice. They insist on thinking for themselves and completing their mission, even in the face of social criticism.
7. They enjoy and appreciate the commonplace, the little things in life--a rose, a baby, an idea, a considerate comment, a meal, a loving touch, etc.
8. They feel a kinship, a closeness, a warmth, a concern for every human being.
9. They are close to a few people, although not always popular. They can live intimately and love.
10. They do not judge others on the basis of stereotypes, like sex, age, race, or religion, but rather as individuals.
11. They have a strong self-generated code of ethics--a sense of right and wrong. Their values may not be conventional but they do guide their lives.
12. They are creative and do things differently, not in rebellion but for the joy of being original and talented. They are clever, even in their ability to be amused instead of angered by human foibles.

Unfortunately, Maslow assumed, without evidence, that these self-actualizing traits can not be pursued directly via self-help. He thought self-actualization automatically resulted when you met your basic needs and committed yourself to a worthy cause, such as beauty, truth, justice, love, etc. He believed that without a cause--a mission--we stagnate. I think it may be possible to accelerate our self-actualization via self-improvement. We can select our own mature values and goals (see chapter 3). We can gain self-control. We can avoid slavishly conforming to social roles and stereotypes (chapter 8). We can develop tolerant attitudes (chapter 7). We can gain self-understanding. We can do these things early in life.

Shostrom (1983), based on humanistic theories, suggests it would be healthy to learn to *express all of our genuine feelings (the full range)*, not just selected emotions and roles in which we get stuck.

A. Dominant	B. Response to be	C. Synthesis

response	strengthened	
anger	loving	assertiveness
strong	bending (adaptation)	courage
critical	supportive	appreciation of differences
controlling	dependent	interdependence

If a response in column A is habitual for you, then strengthen the response in B. If the B response is stronger and A is suppressed, strengthen A. To be fully alive, we must experience all our emotions. When the feelings in A are integrated in a wholesome way with B, we experience C. All of us have the potential to experience all kinds of feelings, the self-actualized person is free to express them without denial, faking, or manipulation. This is, I assume, a learnable skill. We don't scientifically know the limits of self-help yet.

Please note: No one knows for certain what a mature, healthy personality is. Maslow, as a humanist, had his opinion, but what you consider to be an insightful (self-knowing), optimal personality depends on your values and ideals. An authoritarian or a technocrat would pronounce a different kind of person to be "healthy," "mature," or "self-knowing" (Wicklund & Eckert, 1992).

Sow an act and you reap a habit.
Sow a habit and you reap a character.
Sow a character and you reap a destiny.

Self-Understanding Can Come in Many Ways

Getting to know your inner child

Within the last 10 years, the phrase "your inner child" has become popular, especially within treatment programs for shame-based compulsives, addicts, and depressives (see discussion in chapter 6). (It is similar but not the same as TA's child ego state.) In a dysfunctional family, the inner child is likely to believe the troubled parents are OK and "normal." Moreover, children often feel "to blame" for Dad getting mad, Mom being drunk, Mom and Dad getting divorced, etc. The child feels shame and thinks, "I must have done something bad" or "I'm a terrible person." Years later when the child

becomes an adult, he/she may be unhappy and have problems similar to his/her biological parents--or different problems, e.g. he/she may find it impossible to trust and express emotions, he/she may feel like he/she doesn't fit in, or he/she may constantly take care of others. The shame-based, insatiable child often seeks another addiction rather than the one that ruined his/her parent's life, e.g. eating rather than alcohol. This troubled, needy, inner child can seriously mess up our lives.

Many therapists and treatment groups attempt to reach this wounded inner child. This isn't easy because re-living the childhood experiences and seeing clearly what really happened to us as a child can be very painful. Also, returning to childhood may make us very mad or scare us because we doubt that the childhood distortions and pain can ever be eliminated. It is a hard choice: continue a miserable adult life or re-live a hurtful childhood. Therapy (and self-awareness as discussed in chapters 6 and 8) offer hope if we can accept our inner child and take care of some of its needs (Hancock, 1989; Bradshaw, 1989).

The doorstep to the temple of wisdom is a knowledge of our own ignorance.

Let the parts of your personality speak for themselves

Another insight approach is interesting. By knowing what parts to look for inside, we can discover more about ourselves. Example: Give several of your parts a name, such as "Baby" for your dependent child, "Toughie" for your aggressive bully, "Spock" for your reasonable adult, "Hunk"/"Beautiful" for your flirty part, etc. Talk to them. Let them talk to each other. Realize that you can control your life by controlling which part is in charge. By reading psychological cases and explanations of dynamics, we can learn about ourselves. By knowing the stages of development that others go through, we understand our growth better. By realizing how certain personality traits and characters develop, we have greater insight into our personality. By recognizing the drives, needs, and scripts that push us in different directions, we may gain better control over where we are going. Recommendations: read a lot of psychology, especially explanations of actual cases. Use several methods in chapter 14 for changing attitudes and in chapter 15 for gaining insight. Don't be afraid of your unconscious. These forces can do less harm if we realize unconscious factors may be at work. Indeed, exploring our unconscious can be fascinating and enlightening but seldom easy.

Self-understanding is a life-long project

It concerns me that a few people might believe that a few pages about personality types or parts and about basic human motives or

needs contain all they need to know. No! No! There is so much inside each of us to try to understand--our growth, our thoughts and feelings, our dreams (last night and in the future), our values and motives, etc. Understanding ourselves and others are endless tasks. All the chapters from 3 to 10 offer insight into what makes us tick in specific areas. Also, chapter 14 deals with building self-esteem, correcting our thinking, and altering our motives. Chapter 15 is filled with methods for finding out things about yourself you don't know yet--fascinating! Don't fail to get to know yourself. You are fascinating. If you find problems, there are many sources of help.

A book is the only place in which you can examine a fragile thought without breaking it, or explore an explosive idea without fear it will go off in your face... It is one of the few havens remaining where a person's mind can get both provocation and privacy.
-Edward P. Morgan

Reading for self-understanding: Bibliotherapy

Baumeister, R. F. (1993). *Escaping the self: Alcoholism, spiritualism, masochism and other flights from the burden of selfhood*. New York: Basic Books. Most of the other references are for personal growth, but some people get obsessed with self-growth, perfect bodies, and self-aggrandizement. This book might help.

Cirese, S. (1985). *Quest: A search for self*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and, Winston.

Cross, J. & Cross, P. B. (1983). *Knowing yourself inside out for self-direction*. Berkeley, CA: Crystal Publications.

Frisch, A. & Frisch, P. (1976). *Discovering your hidden self*. New York: Signet.

Gordon, S. & Conant, R. (1975). *You*. Quadrangle Books.

Hamachek, D. E. (1987). *Encounters with the self*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Harvey, J. C. & Katz, C. (1985). *If I'm successful, why do I feel like a fake*? New York: Pocket Books.

Horner, A. (1990). *Being & loving*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.

James, M. & Jongeward, D. (1971). *Born to win: Transactional Analysis with Gestalt experiments*. Readings, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Jourard, S. M. (1974). *Healthy personality*. New York: MacMillan Co.

Liebert, R. M. (1987). *Personality: Strategies and issues*. Chicago:Dorsey Press. (Or, any other recent personality text.)

Missildine, W. H. (1974). *Your inner conflicts--How to solve them*. New< York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

Newman, M. & Berkowitz, B. (1974). *How to be your own best friend*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Oldham, J. M. & Morris, L. B. (1990). *The personality self-portrait*. New York:

Perls, F. (1971). *Gestalt therapy verbatim*. New York: Bantam.

Powell, J. (1976). *Fully human, fully alive*. Niles, IL: Argus.

Prather, H. (1976). *Notes to myself*. New York: Bantam.

Rogers, C. & Stevens, B. (1971). *Person to person*. New York: Pocket Books.

Samples, B. & Wohlford, B. (1975). *Opening! A primer for self-actualization*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Shapiro, E. (1973). *Psychosources: A psychology resources catalog*. New York: Bantam Books.

Singer, J. (1975). *Positive self-analysis*. New York: Ace.

Steiner, C. (1975). *Scripts people live*. New York: Bantam.

Stricker, G. & Merbaum, M. (1973). *Growth of personal awareness: A reader in psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

References for Understanding Development and Aging

Davitz, J. & Davitz, L. (1976). *Making it from 40 to 50*. New York: Random House.

Eisdorfer, C. & Lawton, M. P. (1973). *The psychology of adult development and aging*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Erikson, E. (1964). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fries, J. (1989). *Aging well*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. A good overall guide to the aging process.

Gould, R. (Feb., 1975). Adult life stages: Growth toward self-tolerance. *Psychology Today*.

Le Shan, E. J. (1973). *The wonderful crisis of middle age: Some personal reflections*. New York: David McKay Co.

Le Shan, E. J. (1990). *It's better to be over the hill than under it: Thoughts on life over sixty*. New York: Newmarket Press. Good advice with wit.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books. A survey of mental health professionals (Santrock, Minnett & Campbell, 1994) rates this book as the best among those dealing with adult development.

Lowenthal, M. F., Thurnber, M., Chiriboga, D. and associates. (1975). *Four stages of life: A comparative study of women and men facing transitions*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Mace, N. & Rabins, P. (1981). *The 36-hour day: A family guide to caring for persons with Alzheimer's Disease, related dementing illness and memory loss in later life*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

McLeich, J. A. B. (1976). *The Ulyssean adult: Creativity in the middle and later years*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

New light on adult life cycles. (April 28, 1975). *Time*, 69.

Schuckman, T. (1975). *Aging is not for sissies*. Phil., PA: Westminster Press.

Sheehy, G. (1976). *Passages: The predictable crises of adult life*. New York: Patton. Like many books written by journalists, professionals think the mid-life crises are overdramatized.

Sheehy, G. (1992). *The silent passage*. New York: Random House. A book about menopause by a journalist who interviews people to get case studies. Researchers, however, have found much fewer problems and less dramatic cases than Sheehy describes.

Trotter, R. J. (1976). East side, west side: Growing up in Manhattan. *Science News*, 109, 325.

Veninga, R. (1991). *Your renaissance years*. Boston: Little, Brown. A good guide to retirement.

Relationships with Others

Why are relationships with others important?

Don Hamachek (1982) answers this question this way: (1) we understand ourselves by comparing us with others. Example: we know how attractive or how irritable we are by noting how good-looking or crabby several others are. Especially when we are feeling afraid or upset, there is a strong need to compare notes with others, preferably similar others in a similar situation: "misery loves miserable company" (Schachter, 1959). (2) We overcome loneliness, which can be excruciating, by being with others. Also, living entirely alone is hazardous to your health (see chapter 5).

Humans are social animals, much of our joy comes from interactions with others. Loves and friendships are very important, no one would deny that. We must, of course, relate to others effectively and intimately, but we must also know how to be alone, self-reliant, self-aware, and effective at work. The ideal human adjustment isn't just having a wild, gleeful, fun-time with friends all the time. Good, caring, loving relationships are important but they aren't everything.

Why are so many relationships unhappy?

There are many reasons. Sydney Jourard and Ted Landsman (1980) say a healthy relationship has (1) open, honest communication, (2) reasonable expectations or demands of each other, (3) concern about the other's well being and (4) freedom for both to be themselves. That sounds pretty easy but is it? What interferes with healthy relationships? Hamachek (1982) says (1) we underestimate the changes we need to make but push too hard for other people to change, (2) not liking ourselves is usually associated with not liking other people, (3) shyness inhibits closeness and intimacy with others and (4) playing deceptive, self-serving "games" will drive others away. Brown (1995) describes the decline of true intimacy in our culture and tries to explain why Americans are becoming more and more unable to sustain meaningful relationships.

What can be done about these barriers to good relationships? A lot! For example, we can understand ourselves better, as we just discussed in the first part of this chapter and in the other chapters. We can gain insight into our socialization processes so we can build,

person by person, a more caring, cooperative, egalitarian, and less competitive society. We can allow others the freedom to be themselves, as Carl Rogers (1972) repeatedly advocates. We can accept ourselves without lessening our self-help efforts. We can learn social-communication skills (see chapter 13) and overcome shyness (chapters 5 & 12). We can be honest and involved with others and not play "games."

The “games” we play with others

Surely, many of our needs could best be met by having loving, secure, intimate, satisfying relationships with others. However, Eric Berne (1964) contended that three undesirable (and unconscious) needs motivate "games" between people which actually interfere with finding friendships, love, and closeness. The three major destructive needs or motives are (1) *expressing hostility* or putdowns towards others, (2) *expressing self-hatred* or self-criticism (see Sooty Sarah in chapter 6), and (3) *ego-boosting* by exaggerating one's assets or someone else's faults. It becomes clear why these transactions or games would be unconscious; they are mean and/or selfish.

Berne's book, *Games People Play*, was a best seller for several years. It was and is meaningful to many people. *What is a game? It is a put on...a dishonest interaction* designed (by the "child") to deflate someone or to inflate the game player's ego. Every game has *three steps*: (1) the initial interaction which appears on the surface to be reasonable and straight-forward. This is the "hook" or *the "set up"* --a deceptive front or pretense which hides the true purpose of the game. (2) There is a *secret ulterior purpose* --the destructive need. This is a hidden agenda, and gradually a "switch" is made from the pretense to the real motive. (3) There is *an unhealthy, childish, "sick" outcome*, *a "pay off"* that usually degrades the player him/herself or the other person. An example will make it clear. Suppose you volunteer to help a friend with her math problems. If there is a part of you (the child) which unintentionally makes the math lesson more difficult or confusing to her than it needs to be, then you are probably playing a game. If you use her feeling stupid to make yourself feel smart and superior, than it's a game. If you get some pleasure out of seeing her feel inadequate and scared or feel satisfaction out of proving again to yourself that most women are dumb, then it's a game, since you aren't really helping, although you may consciously think that is your motive.

Put downs of others

Games, as defined by Berne, are always destructive to relationships. They aren't "fun and games;" they end up being very serious and cruel interactions. So why are they performed over and over? As mentioned before, we have needs to "one up" another person, to punish ourselves, to feel self-righteous, to get attention (even if negative), to deny our fears and self-doubts and responsibility, to cut down others and so on. In the service of these

needs, games yield a variety of immediate, primitive, pleasurable feelings, e.g.

- I'm smarter than you are!
- I'm always being dumped on so I have a right to get revenge--to be mean and nasty.
- I'm always messing things up, I don't deserve good things, I deserve to be punished.
- See you are an SOB! So, it's all right if I rip you off.
- Other people are to blame for my problems, not me.
- I'm a bad person; I guess you'll just have to spend a lot of time with me, correcting and punishing me.

Also, the outcomes of the games we play confirm our prior opinions; they prove we were right, e.g. I'm not lovable (not OK), other people are stuck up (not OK), men are only interested in sex (not OK), etc. In this way, the games each of us play reflect our particular life position, our life script, and our expectations of others. Games are a major means by which we unconsciously carry out our expectations about who we are and what we are going to become.

In the last 20 years several books have described hundreds of games (Barnes, 1977). Some are specialized, e.g. sexual games (Chapman, 1969), student games (Ernst, 1974), alcoholic games (Steiner, 1971), and games avoiding closeness (Oden, 1974). These books will help you understand your relationships. Also, see chapter 15 for methods of identifying your life position and script. A few more examples of games will aid you in recognizing when you are or someone else is playing a game.

Yes, but...

The set up: "Hey, help me solve this problem." When the other person tries to help and offers advice, the response is "Yes, but I could never do that" or "Yes, but I tried that once and it made things worse" and on and on. Every suggestion is shot down (then the helper and the helpee begin to realize they are in a game).

The ulterior motives: to prove that "no one can tell me what to do," to control the conversation, to picture oneself as being the innocent, suffering, pitiable victim of an insolvable situation, or to demonstrate that "I am superior--I thought of a tough question and found fault with all your answers."

The payoff: I'm OK (smart and powerful); you're not OK (wrong every time!).

Rapo

The set up: a couple meets and has a good time together. He tries to impress her; she flirts.

The ulterior motive: after a fun evening, he asks to take her home or to stay the night and she responds, "You creep! What do you think I am? I'm no slut! You are just like all men; all you think about is sex." Or... he tells her he is in love with her and she sleeps with him, then he dumps her thinking, "Wow, are women dumb! They will believe anything you tell them."

The pay offs: to put down the opposite sex, to have an ego trip proving one's attractiveness, to justify one's anger towards the opposite sex, to avoid sex and/or an intimate, long-term relationship, to project dirty, crude sex to males or desperate needs for love to females, to confirm that I'm OK but you're not OK.

Now I got you, you SOB (referred to as "NIGYSOB")

The set up: the game player uses a minor incident, perhaps an oversight or a simple error, to "try to help" the other person do better or to correct some alleged injustice done by the other person.

The ulterior motive: The game player, whose anger has been secretly building for a long time, has been waiting for (or manipulating) an ideal occasion which would justify venting his/her full rage and nailing the other person to the wall. Examples: a rival at work makes mental notes of all your mistakes and then "tries to help you" by publicly criticizing you in front of co-workers and the supervisor. Or... you play NIGYSOB with your boss by finding he/she has made some mistake and then you denounce him/her as being inexperienced or stupid to all your buddies. Or... a jilted ex-lover may confront the former partner about not returning some minor items (say some bed sheets). The tirade takes place in front of the ex-lover's new partner and many other vitriolic accusations are thrown in: "You screw over people and don't care... you are the most arrogant, self-centered b _ _ _ _ _ I've ever seen...."

The payoffs: As the aggressor, one manufactures an excuse for venting one's pent-up anger, one can hurt the other person's reputation, one can avoid recognizing his/her own mistakes and weaknesses by focusing on the other person's faults, one can build his/her own ego while demonstrating that other people are SOB's.

If it weren't for you

The set up: a person, usually in a long-term relationship, wants to explain why he/she has lived the way they have. Example: the teenager with a mediocre school record says, "My parents weren't interested in school and didn't make me study." A middle-aged man says, "I could have been much more successful if I hadn't had to take care of a wife and family." A housewife says, "I could have gone to school and had an exciting career if I hadn't done all these things for my family which no one appreciates."

The ulterior purpose: to deny responsibility for one's life, to blame others for the misfortune one experiences, to seek sympathy, to express anger and resentment towards others or the world or God.

The payoff: to prove I'm not responsible, I'm faultless (OK); you are to blame (not OK) and deserve my resentment. This is similar to the game of "See what *you* made me do."

Note that many games are repeated over and over again with new victims, i.e. a Rapo or a Yes, but player may go through the same routine hundreds of times, suggesting the game player needs to frequently gain a certain pay off. In TA terms, this is called a "racket," that is, a need to play certain games and feel a certain way repeatedly--angry, neglected, superior, inferior, cheated, etc. Sometimes game playing leads to "Stamp Collecting," a TA term for storing up points for feeling bad, e.g. being "dumped," or for doing good. Then, "Brown Stamps" for being hurt can be cashed in for a guilt-free temper outburst, a week end binge, or some other revenge. "Gold Stamps" for being good can be cashed in for a good time--a shopping spree or a night on the town--which you wouldn't let yourself do if you hadn't been so good.

Thus far, we have described games that put down others. There are self-put down games.

Put downs of one’s self

Kick me or drop me

The set up: when we are feeling insecure and unlovable, we might put ourselves down and, indirectly, ask others to reject or hurt us. We might be self-critical and bore others until they leave. We might cling so tightly to our boy/girlfriend that we suffocate them and drive them away. We might be so clumsy or incompetent or insecure that we invite others to poke fun of us. It is as if we put a sign on our backs that says "Kick me."

The ulterior motive: to feel bad, unloved, rejected, and/or hurt without realizing that we, as "kick me" players, intended for it to happen precisely the way it did. Indeed, most "kick me" players then proclaim their innocence by playing, "Why does this always happen to nice, little me?"

The pay offs: to avoid having others expect us to be responsible and capable, to avoid intimacy, to re-create a loss of parental love, to get sympathy and some enjoyment when we tell others our "ain't it awful" stories, to deny any responsibility for what happened, to get positive strokes when putting ourselves down (see Sooty Sarah in chapter 6) and negative strokes when we are kicked, to confirm that I'm not OK ("No one likes me") and/or that you're not OK ("You can't trust people"). Hurt feelings earn us "brown stamps" which can be

cashed in for many pay offs, like a good sulk, a run-away-from-home, a fight, an affair, a lost weekend on the town, etc.

The "kick me" game is self-defeating, similar to a "gallows transaction" in which a person manages to get his/her friends to laugh and give other forms of attention when he/she makes mistakes, drinks too much, shoplifts, drives dangerously, cheats on a boy/girlfriend or on an exam, etc. In this way, the misguided friends help lead the person to the gallows of self-defeat and misery.

Wooden leg

The set up: "the reason I'm not a fantastic track star is because I have a wooden leg." "I dropped out of school because my parents were poor and from the wrong part of town." "I wasn't promoted because I wasn't in the right social circles."

The ulterior motives: to have an excuse for one's actions, to deny responsibility for one's own life, to get sympathy.

The pay offs: "surely you wouldn't expect much from me, considering that I have this handicap--a wooden leg, the wrong parents, the wrong friends, the wrong size, the wrong sex, the wrong age, the wrong race, etc."

Alcoholism

There are many reasons why people drink or use drugs: to forget problems, to reduce inhibitions and get courage or power, to have an excuse for doing things one wouldn't ordinarily do, to have social interaction, to get some sexual satisfaction (overt or subtle; heterosexual or homosexual), to hurt the family, and to satisfy physiological needs.

The TA interpretation of alcoholism is that the drinker needs to suffer, to feel awful during the hangover, to be criticized, to degrade him/herself. I think it's more complicated than that.

Ego-boosting games

The exaggerated friendliness of a used car salesman, a politician, or a striving administrator probably does little harm because the self-serving purposes are obvious. The greatest harm occurs when the game player starts to believe he/she really is superior and deserving of privileges because of income, status, education, looks or whatever. Some brief examples:

Comment	Purpose

The friendly phony: "I really like you."	Notice how wonderful I am.
"I'm the boss."	Adore me if you want a raise.
"Yes, boss, you're right."	Now, how about that raise?
"You are really great."	Now, like me and say "you too."
"I have a Ph.D. (MD, JD, MBA...)	You should be in awe.
"I love you."	Now, come on to bed.
"Ain't it awful."	Let's get buddy-buddy and feel superior by bad-mouthing someone.
"Let's fool the cop or boss."	We'll show them who is the smartest.
"The secretaries make the coffee."	We managers are superior; we are waited on.
"Women are so emotional."	We males are superior.

Another ego-boosting game might be called the "education game." If you make up a paragraph which sounds good but is total nonsense, the high schooler will tell you, "I don't know what this paragraph means." The college student will be uncertain but will take a guess. The graduate student or Ph. D. will say he/she knows what this nonsense means and will tell you with an air of confidence. As we get more educated, we become more sure of ourselves (or pretend to be) than we have a right to be.

The purpose of education is to provide everyone with the opportunity to learn how best he/she may serve the world.

Finally, there are some games that simply create stress, but the stress has a purpose.

Uproar

The set up: a touchy or explosive topic is brought up prior to going out for a nice evening or doing something important.

The ulterior motive: to avoid having a good time and becoming more intimate with the partner (because you are mad at him/her and/or are afraid of being in love and then getting rejected and/or are too insecure to leave an unhappy relationship).

The pay off: a good fight that reduces the closeness and intimacy in a relationship where intimacy makes us uneasy.

Power struggle

The set up: two people, usually spouses, co-workers, or parent and child, are trying to impress each other or get the other person to do something. "My _____ (house, car, job, performance, brain, social ability, etc.) is very good."

The ulterior motives: to feel superior by putting the other person down, to have the other person serve or defer to you. "My _____ is bigger and better than yours; therefore, you should do what I want you to do."

The pay offs: an ongoing, competitive argument about who is best and who should be the boss. There is always some hope of winning the argument and so the relationship continues on but without emotional depth.

Summary of games and how to stop them

First, recognize that games involve deception. The way to stop gaming is to see what is really happening. That isn't easy, but ask yourself if any of the above games sound slightly familiar or similar to your own behavior. That is the only hint you will have; don't expect to always have instant insight and think "Oh, I do that!" Our unconscious doesn't just pop open as soon as someone peeps in.

Second, realize that we are all frustrated and angry at times (see chapter 7). Games involve lots of putdowns. It is not surprising that we try to express our negative feelings subtly. It's safer to be sneaky! And, besides that, secret attacks are harder to defend against. Furthermore, if we feel angry and mean, it is less stressful sometimes if we do not think about our hostility, i.e. if our destructive urges are shoved into our unconscious. Thus, the interaction in games is rather strange: no one knows what is really happening! *Neither the game player nor the victim is consciously aware* of the purpose of this social interaction, until the pay off of the game is being collected. Even then, neither person may recognize what happened, the game player just knows this happens to him/her a lot. In addition, an interaction with any one person may produce many pay offs, some desirable, some destructive, some mixed. This helps conceal games. Example: the teacher who enjoys belittling and putting down students who haven't done their homework, may be a good teacher in other ways, such as lecturing or kidding around. The detection and control of games, for all these reasons, requires insight and a conscious motivation to change the unconscious interaction.

The only solution, for the game player, seems to be for your "adult" to become aware of what your unconscious parts, usually the "adaptive child" or occasionally the "critical parent," are doing via games. How does the "adult" gain control over the gamy interactions? It does so by (1) learning the games and the pay offs, (2) learning the situations in which you play games, and (3) consciously deciding that it, the "adult," will stop the manipulation and refuse to permit the sick pay offs to occur.

When we recognize a game-playing situation (try to detect the beginning of the set up), we can avoid it or have a pleasant, constructive, caring, straight, genuine, and intimate interaction, instead of playing a game. When we recognize a tendency to put down others, we can practice empathic responding (chapter 13) or try to strengthen our understanding and tolerance (chapters 7 & 14). If we tend to put down ourselves, we can instead build our self-esteem (chapter 14). Take pride in your new-found insight and conscious control. Say to your "child," "I caught you playing games again, didn't I?" or "I (the adult) love you (the child) and I need you, but let's see if we can't find a better way to get the "strokes" we both need."

If someone is running a game on you, refuse to go along. Examples: if he/she is playing "Yes, but," refuse to solve his/her problems for him/her. If he/she is putting you down, as in "NIGYSOB" or "If it weren't for you," you can simply refuse to take the blame and get away from the game player. Remember, the game-player may get mad if you do not play his/her game, especially if you start "analyzing" his/her behavior. Be sure to reward his/her being genuine. Also, remember he/she isn't conscious of his/her game playing. But that doesn't mean you have to "put up with it."

Every (person) is a good (person) in a bad world--as he/she him/herself knows.
-William Saroyan

Other self-deceptions: Excuses and self-handicapping

As "games" illustrate, it is vitally important that we humans learn to face the truth and avoid fooling ourselves and others. Yet, there seems to be powerful basic human needs to "look good," to appear competent, to be right, and to be in control. This is referred to as impression management (Schlenker, 1982). We all (almost) put "our best foot forward" or "show our best side," although at times it seems to our advantage to appear weak and troubled. Lerner's (1993) new book, *The Dance of Deception*, describes many ways of avoiding the truth and their consequences.

Nonchalance is the ability to look like an owl when you have acted like a jackass.

Excuses (explanations or actions, used when we have goofed, to make us look as good as possible under the circumstances) are an excellent example of deception. Note that excuses are deceptive in three ways: (1) our attempt to hide our bad parts and "save face" with others, (2) our attempt to justify our own bad behavior to ourselves and (3) we are quite often not aware--and don't want to be--of what we are doing. Snyder, Higgins and Stucky (1983) claim that excuses come in three basic forms: (1) "*I didn't do it*." Sometimes we say, "Someone else did it" or our memory (our "story") distorts the facts so we feel better. (2) "*I did it but it's not so bad*." Sometimes we fail to be helpful (see chapter 3) and say "I didn't think it was serious" (when there is famine) or "It isn't my responsibility" (when Kitty Genovese was killed while many watched). When we harm others, we may blame the victim (when we discriminate) or discount the harm we have done. When we get negative feedback, we attack the source and say the critic is stupid or we say the test is unfair. Men are more likely to use this type of excuse than women. (3) "*I did it and it was bad, but I have an explanation*." Sometimes we say, "Everybody does it" or "Anyone would have done the same thing" because the task was hard, "I just had bad luck," the "situation was awful," "I had a bad cold," "I didn't know," "I was confused," etc. Sometimes we reduce our shame or guilt by implying we weren't ourselves: "I didn't mean to" or "I only did it once" or "I didn't really try" and so on. Women are more likely to use this type of excuse.

Excuses are a way of saying, "I'm really better or more able than you might think (based on what you just saw me do)." They are our "public relations" efforts. They also soothe rough relationships: "I'm busy" sounds better than "I don't want to be with you" and "I forgot the assignment" is more acceptable than "I thought it was a waste of time." Snyder says excuses also help us accept our limitations, help us feel better about ourselves and help us take chances, since we know we can always come up with an excuse if we fail. So, excuses may do some good. However, there are several major difficulties with using excuses: (1) we seldom work as hard to excuse other peoples' behavior as we do our own (see chapter 7). (2) Constant excuses become irritating and drive others away. (3) Denial of real weaknesses may undermine self-improvement; if the excuses work well, we feel little need to change. (4) Excuses can become self-applied labels and self-fulfilling prophecies, such as "I had a little to drink" used as an excuse becomes in time "I was drunk" becomes "I have a drinking problem" becomes "I am an alcoholic." Excuses can become permanent and serious disorders (of course, the etiology of alcoholism is more complex than this).

(5) People who are especially insecure and concerned about disapproval by others will go to great lengths to avoid putting themselves to a true test of their ability. Often they will exaggerate any handicap which provides another explanation (rather than low ability) for their poor performance, for instance a person may not try very hard so he/she can still believe "I could have done better if I had wanted to." Others may say, "I don't do well on those kinds of tests" or "test anxiety really messed me up" or "I was really tired." There is also "*self-handicapping*," i.e. actually arranging another handicap (not inability) which can be offered as an explanation for a poor performance. Examples: Partying all night before a test or agreeing to help a friend instead of doing an assignment. The handicapper's purpose is to forestall or avoid the painful conclusion that he/she just doesn't have much ability or not as much ability as one would like to have others believe one has. We strive mightily to keep our self-esteem and to feel we are in control of the situation (Jones & Berglas, 1978; Baumgardner, Lake & Arkin, 1985).

There is increasing research supporting Alfred Adler's 75-year-old ideas that we unconsciously use symptoms (physical complaints, test anxiety, depression, drinking) as an excuse, an "alibi," for poor performance. We also exaggerate the trauma in our background if our personal history can be used to excuse our failures (Snyder, Higgins & Stucky, 1983; Baumgardner, Lake & Arkin, 1985).

What an individual seeks to become determines what he remembers of his has been. In this sense the future determines the past.
-**Rollo May**, *Existence*

No wonder we use excuses so much; they provide their own negative reinforcement, i.e. excuses allow us to escape unpleasant situations (see chapters 4 and 11). But the high price we pay for this temporary relief is distortion of reality--we lie to ourselves, we fail to see things as they really are, one part of us attempts to fool other parts as well as other people. It is also quite clear that if we actually drink, take drugs, have physical complaints, or procrastinate (see chapter 4) as a means of excusing our poor performance or as a self-defeating effort to bolster our self-esteem, we could be in serious trouble if this excuse is used too often. The difficulties we face in this situation are: how do we detect the stresses and self-deception before serious damage is done? How do we control personal traits that normally make us feel better but with close scrutiny make us feel very uncomfortable? Discovering the unconscious is a problem for self-helpers, i.e. all of us. I'll give you the best answer I can.

When an archer misses the mark he turns and looks for the fault within him/herself. Failure to hit the bull's-eye is never the fault of the target. To improve your aim, improve yourself.

The part of us (the "adult") that wants to face the truth must be valued and encouraged. Those of you who have a strong part (the "child") that is impatient with this topic and wants to get on to something else are the ones who most need to ask yourself some questions, such as: Do I give a lot of excuses, like those mentioned above? Am I a procrastinator (they always self-con, see chapter 4)? Do I think I could do a lot better if I really tried? If so, why don't I try to do my very best and honestly observe the results? Do I feel under the weather more than others--tired, headaches, sleepy, tense (see chapter 5)? Do I think the way I was raised and other life experiences are keeping me from getting what I want? Do I so emphasize being free and happy that I overlook doing for others? (See chapter 3) Do I use irrational ideas or set unreasonable goals and create my own sadness or anger? Am I prejudiced? Do I feel superior to certain kinds of people--and might that be a way of hiding my own undesirable traits? Do I feel discriminated against, and do I use that as an excuse for not working harder? Do I have excuses for not asserting myself and not trying new things? (See chapter 8) Do I play games, as described earlier in this chapter, and, thereby, excuse myself for being aggressive or inconsiderate of others?

If you suspect you are deceiving yourself in one or more of these instances, it is important to face the situation squarely. Think about your possible underlying motives. Ask a friend who is frank (and doesn't think you are a candidate for sainthood) if your unconscious might be at work in certain situations? Accept the way you have been, but decide how to improve and start self-improving NOW. Don't continue deceiving yourself and, most importantly, don't continue to be inconsiderate of others without realizing the harm you are doing. We can surely find better ways to reduce our tension than by lying to ourselves and to others.

People—our closest loved ones—cause our problems and provide relief

Most of us humans are filled with social needs. People are the primary sources of our misery and our happiness--the sources of our troubles and our help. Many therapists believe that conflicts with others account for most stress. Thus, if you went to a psychiatrist or psychologist with headaches, anxiety, depression, eating disorder, or

insomnia, he/she would ask you about your relations with others. Therapy often consists of resolving current or former (childhood) interpersonal situations. This focus on relationships comes partly from Adler (1951) who saw adults as striving for power and superiority over others. He encouraged his clients to develop a caring (anti-chauvinistic) "life-style" that lead to self-improvement and served others. Sullivan (1953) also emphasized how interpersonal relationships influence our "self"--our personality and our drives for security, power, pleasure, empathy, physical intimacy and so on. According to these writers, insight helps us change. Then, Berne (1964) wrote *Games People Play*, which we have just reviewed.

Sources of help: Friends, family, self-help groups, therapists

Even if interpersonal stress is not a cause of a problem, other people can often help with the solution. As you may remember from childhood, often a problem doesn't seem so big after we have shared it with another person, especially if he/she holds us lovingly on his/her lap. Often, as adults, we turn to friends and relatives just for comfort (not necessarily for sage advice) when we are in trouble. Friends are a very important part of our lives (Rubin, 1985), even though we change friends from time to time. In addition, there are "arranged friends" in the form of self-help groups, relative strangers offering help to people with special problems. It is usually especially reassuring to talk with people who have had the same problems as you have had. These support groups include the famous Alcoholics Anonymous and hundreds of other specialized groups for dieting, Parents Without Partners, parents of children with terminal illnesses, ex-psychotics, unemployed, abusive parents, people going through divorce, etc. etc. Call your Mental Health Center to locate the self-help group of interest to you. If there is no group near you, find two or three others nearby with similar concerns, if needed consult with a counselor, and start your own self-help group. These experienced, caring self-help groups provide a very valuable service free (see Method # 3 in chapter 5 and Lieberman & Borman, 1979).

A real friend is one who helps us to think our noblest thoughts, put forth our best efforts, and to be our best selves.

As our families scatter in a mobile society and each person is left on their own to make friends (Keyes, 1973), we sometimes become lonely. We may have no friend or relative to turn to when we need emotional support. Because of this isolation and the availability of mental health services, more and more people are seeking professional help with living without people or living with them (Howard, 1971; Schutz, 1975; Verny, 1975). William Schofield (1964)

called psychotherapy "the purchase of friendship." In recent years there has been less of a stigma against "seeing a shrink." Thank goodness! It is a cruel and stupid idea to put down people for seeking help. What's really dumb is to *not* seek help when you need it! Besides individual therapists, there are group therapies, encounter groups, and church groups, like marriage enrichment. Most towns, schools, and hospitals have a psychologist or social worker available. Most counties have a Mental Health Center staffed by competent professionals. All these resources concentrate on helping us get along with each other. Don't hesitate to go for help.

To find our where your local Community Mental Health Center is located, go to: The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Keep in mind, however, that it is difficult to "treat" a relationship (e.g. a marriage) if only one person is in treatment. Likewise, a weekend encounter may help you disclose intimate feelings with your temporary, two-day "friends" but these skills may not generalize to your permanent "friends," like spouse, father, daughter, co-worker, etc. Indeed, some psychologists argue that it is much more effective and reasonable to learn new skills, attitudes, and awareness while interacting with your spouse, friends, relatives and colleagues at work, rather than in encounter groups with "instant friends" (Flanders, 1976). In certain circumstances, however, it is better to not know the other group members (so you can disclose more openly). Several references will help you decide if growth and encounter groups have much to offer you (Egan, 1972; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973; Schutz, 1975; Shiffrin, 1976). It's best just to try it and see.

Relationships within the Family

The family

The central parts of our self-concept are introduced by saying "I am a _____" or "This is what I do." Almost equally important, however, is our identification with our family, as when we say "My father was a _____" or "Our family home is (was) in _____" or "I'd like for you to meet my family ____." Our *family of origin* (Mom, Dad, brothers and sisters) and our childhood are important, permanent parts of us. In addition, our need for intimacy is so strong that most of us expect to marry and have another family of our own, our *family of procreation*. We want emotional closeness; we want to share our lives. Fortunately, 60% of children get along well with their parents. The greatest fear of children is of losing their parents. Early in our lives, our parents know us better than anyone else and they are more likely than anyone else to love us unconditionally throughout much of our lives. Our family of origin also provides us with other life-changing,

life-long relationships, namely, with our siblings. Our brothers and sisters have a powerful impact on us--sometimes fierce loyalty, sometimes bitter rivalry, sometimes both--but siblings are mostly overlooked by current psychology (Bank & Kahn, 1982; Klagsbrun, 1992). Our parents, our siblings, our spouse, and our children are, for most of us, our most important relationships.

No doubt our role in our family of origin influences our role in our family of procreation. Blevins (1993) helps you understand those relationships. Marriage counselors have found that the closeness (separateness vs. togetherness) and the flexibility (adaptability from rigid to chaotic) within each partner's family of origin influence the current relationship. Our marital expectations and conflicts frequently originated in our childhood. The chauvinistic aspects of traditional families are discussed in the last section of this chapter.

Creating a child takes no thought; yet, deciding to have a child is probably the biggest decision you will ever make, so do it carefully. Elizabeth Whelan (1976) has a self-help book that might help with the decision to have a baby or not. Parenting a child is a demanding life-long job.

Child care—useful references (and a little history)

Many of us as parents-to-be had little advanced warning of what an enormous task raising a child really would be. It is truly life altering! There are 24-hour-a-day chores and so many problems we don't know how to handle. Thus, thousands of child care books have been written. Dr. Spock's (Spock & Rothenberg, 1990) and Dr. T. Berry Brazelton's books have calmed and guided many of you readers and your parents. Dr. Spock was eventually criticized for being too permissive, i.e. not authoritarian or punitive enough with children, and too outspoken against the war. Almost everyone agrees that the early years are psychologically crucial, however. Freud said, "The child is father of the man." Harry Harlow (1973), who studied the early development of monkeys, said, "primates love early or they probably hate forever."

Parenting is such a complex area involving efforts to help and change children (as well as to self-help by changing your own parenting) that I will only summarize the major themes of current thinking. Mostly I will help you find useful knowledge.

There are many approaches to child-care, depending on the child's age and the problem. Inform yourself. Universities, public libraries, and bookstores have mountains of books on parenting. There are excellent general reference books covering normal development and how to cope with common problems: For guides to pregnancy and childbirth, see Kitzinger (1985) and Eisenberg, Murkoff & Hathaway (1988). For good advice about baby and child care, see Brazelton (1983, 1984, 1987, 1989 & 1992) and Leach (1983 & 1991). Dr. T. Berry Brazelton is currently America's baby doctor. If you aren't a

reader, several videos show parents how to handle many child rearing problems (see Research Press, Champaign, IL)

Because a teenager must struggle to become his/her own person (to be independent while still dependent) within a controlling environment, the complicated relationships between parents and teenagers have to some extent already been covered in the chapters on anger and dependency. Good general references for coping with this stage of life are Ginott's (1971) highly respected and recommended *Between Parent and Teenager*, Elkind's (1984) *All Grown Up and No Place to Go: Teenagers in Crisis*, and his (1994) *Parenting Your Teenager*, Clarke et al's (1990) *Help! For Parents of School-Age Children and Teenagers*, and Steinberg & Levine's (1990) *You and Your Adolescent: A Parent's Guide for Ages 10-20*. There are circumstances no doubt when "tough love" is needed (get tough, make demands, and let the teenager take responsibility for his/her actions), but many mental health professionals are skeptical of this approach (York, York & Wachtel, 1982). There is little or no research. The experts prefer a gentler approach involving a show of understanding and care, long thoughtful discussions, and warm tolerance instead of cold, immutable punishment (Santrock, Minnett & Campbell, 1994). A good book is Faber & Mazlish's (1980) *How to Talk so Kids Will Listen and Listen so Kids Will Talk*.

One of the more mysterious phenomena in human development is the loss of self-esteem in girls during puberty. Several changes are occurring at this time, such as bodily developments in both sexes, sex hormones surging in boys, sudden intense attractions to boys, looks and popularity become much more important than intelligence and careers, and self-confidence or self-esteem plummets. This problem is discussed in more detail later in this chapter. Look for a flood of books dealing with this problem (Orenstein, 1994; Pipher, 1994), but more research is really needed for us to understand this developmental crisis.

Another pool of ignorance thwarts us as parents, namely, how to raise boys into good men. Considering the level of violence by men, the chauvinistic attitudes of men, their engaging in date rape and sexual harassment, their high rate of unfaithfulness and divorce, and their abandonment of children (not marrying their mothers or infrequently seeing the children and paying support after divorce), why wouldn't any parent worry about the morals of his/her sons? Several psychoanalytic books (Bassoff, 1994; Pittman, 1993; Silverstein & Rashbaum, 1994) address the problem but little relevant research exists, as yet, in this vital area. One area of research is interesting: some boys raised in homes without a father tend to be hyper-masculine, i.e. aggressive, violent, tough, criminal, etc. Girls raised in fatherless homes have sex earlier, get pregnant more often, and have more relationship problems with men. See the Effects of Divorce on Children in the next chapter.

There are an astonishing number of even more specialized books: adoption (Melina, 1989; Melina & Roszia, 1993; McNamara, 1976), prenatal and infant care (Spock & Rothenberg, 1985; U.S. Government Publications), nutrition (Eisenberg, Murkoff & Hathaway, 1986), safe medicine (Abrams, 1990), child birth and nursing (La Leche League, 9616 Minneapolis Ave., Franklin Park, IL 60131; Neifert, 1986, 1991; Eisenberg, Murkoff & Hathaway, 1989), general parenting (Satir, 1988; Ginott, 1965, 1971; Gordon, 1975; Chess & Thomas, 1987; Gardner, 1973), single parenting (Dodsen, 1987; Evans, 1989), step parenting (Burns, 1986; Evans, 1988; Banks, 1990a; see chapter 10), yours, mine, and ours (Bernstein, 1990), part-time fathers (Atkin & Rubin, 1976), better fathering (Barkin, 1988; Levant, 1991), preschool child (Gallinsky & David, 1988), child abuse (see chapter 7 and later in this section), aggressive-angry children (Patterson, 1976, 1987; Samalin, 1991), disabilities (Brutton, Richardson, & Mange, 1975), early childhood fears (Newbridge Communications), stress (Saunders & Remsberg, 1985), sleep problems (Ferber, 1985), bed-wetting (Azrin & Besalel, 1979), discipline (Wyckoff & Unell, 1991; Peters, 1990; Gordon, 1991; Samalin & Jablow, 1988; Dreikurs & Grey, 1970), dealing with two or more children (Samalin, 1996), behavior modification with children (Silverman & Lustig, 1988; Mc Carney & Bauer, 1989; Krumboltz & Krumboltz, 1976), study skills (Schaefer & DiGeronimo, 1994), getting schoolwork done (Greene, 1993; Canter & Canter, 1988), dishonesty and other bad behavior (Hayes, 1991; Samenow, 1989; Ekman, 1991), drugs (Clarke, et al., 1990), teaching values (Eyre & Eyre, 1986; Popkin, 1987), common problems (Schaefer & Millman, 1994), improving family life (Patterson, 1971; Stinnett, et al., 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982; McCubbin & Figley, 1983), overwhelmed parents (Bartz & Rasor, 1978), anxious parents (Schwartzman & Sacks, 1992), pushy parents (Elkind, 1988), co-dependent parents (Becnel, 1992), marital conflict involving children, the struggling working Mom (Crosby, 1991), dealing with teenagers (Nelsen & Lott, 1990; Steinberg & Levine, 1991; Satir, 1972, 1988; see chapter 8), acting-up teenagers (Bayard & Bayard, 1981), a book for black parents (Comer & Poussaint, 1992), when parents do too much (Ashner & Meyerson, 1990), loving your child (Kern, 1987), caring for his/her emotional health (Philadelphia Child Guidance Center, 1993), sex education for a child (Sheffield, 1979; Mayle, 1973, 1975), a thinking child (Shure, 1994), a healthy mind (Greenspan, 1999), a grown-up child (Halpern, 1992), when a child needs therapy (Doft, 1992), and on and on.

One book provides an annotated listing of over 350 children's books written to help them cope with specific problems (Pardeck & Pardeck, 1994). The American Psychological Association's Magination Press (http://www.maginationpress.com/) has published several books written as bibliotherapy for children dealing with a variety of problems, such as divorce, trauma, going to school, physical disability, shyness, adoption, therapy, learning disabilities, ADD, and fears.

Here is my personal *brief summary* of this child care literature: To produce happy, well adjusted, energetic, self-reliant, self-controlled,

friendly, achieving children, (1) show children more love and genuine concern than hate, give more praise than criticism, give more rewards than punishment (see chapters 4 & 11). Spend time with them. (2) Share your feelings and reasons with your children (see "I" statements in chapter 13). Value their ideas; encourage verbal give and take. Touch them lovingly. (3) Be fair, listen empathicly and give respect, resolve differences by talking about problems as equals (see Gordon's, 1975, no-lose method in chapter 13). (4) Distinguish between the person and his/her actions (Ginott, 1969, 1971), rather than "you are a lazy punk" say "I feel furious when I see your filthy room." Dislike the behavior; love the person. (5) Children need to be guided, corrected, and given high goals, values, responsibilities, and self-assigned chores, depending on the child's abilities and needs (Weiten, Lloyd & Lashley, 1990). They need help in becoming thoughtful of others. Encourage physical toughness and emotional strength; discourage dependency and demands for attention. (6) Lastly, I want to add a personal belief: every child deserves well trained parents, a child care specialist, and at least 2-4 hours a day *away from parents*. During this time away, the child should be with a skilled, experienced child care professional or teacher who also loves the child and collaborates or consults weekly with the parents. Raising a good human being should not be left to chance nor to untrained parents; child rearing takes more than a few minutes a day; it should be our highest priority. We need research. How else are we going to produce a much better world?

If you think we humans just naturally love our children and have a "nurturing instinct," you are sadly misinformed. Read some history (McCoy, 1981)! Loving children is a new development! Remember, only 100 years ago, 20% of women were killed by childbirth (or some related complication) and 20% to 50% of infants *died during the first year of life*. Life expectancy was only 45 in 1850. Until the 19th century (only 4 to 7 generations ago) *children were often considered worthless possessions* --"just another mouth to feed" or "unimportant and uninteresting parasites." Children were often unwanted (no birth control), treated coldly (no cuddling and bonding), swaddled, and even beaten regularly and terrorized (some religious folks thought they had to drive out Satan and "the stains of original sin"). Of course, there were always loving families. But, even if you were born into wealth, you would have been sent to a wet nurse's house to live, perhaps, for the first two years. Parents rarely visited. At age 5 or 6, most children started working in the fields with their parents. By 9 or 10, they were often sent to apprentice with a craftsman or to a sweat shop to work. What about schools? The idea of public schools was only incubating during the 1800's. Even by 1900, one third of our states did *not* require students to attend school. Kain (1990) documents that there have *always been lots of single-parent families* (caused by death); *women have always worked outside the home* (as servants and in the fields). Thus, the species has survived in spite of this wide-spread neglect, abuse, and lack of education, but the pathology and ignorance from the neglected earlier generations still may be seeping to the surface. There is great hope, however: the family and the schools have changed remarkably in just 100 years, so maybe the whole species

can improve greatly. If so, the world should already be reaping the rewards of more and more loving child care. Is it? It's hard to tell.

In contrast to 200 years ago, today's family tries to create a loving environment for everyone, especially the children, although both parents frequently work outside the home. Ideally, the family lives for one another, however. Families are supposed to be accepting and tolerant of children so they will develop self-esteem. Yet, families should also provide a sense of purpose, an understanding of rules, values, obligations, and a feeling of where you fit in. Home should be a pleasant, loving environment for growing and interacting. Possibly two-thirds of our families today give fairly good child care. We have come a long way in terms of health and physical comfort! However, we may not have learned much psychology. All of us parents will still need help--therapy, consultation, information--many times during the process of raising a child. Lee Salk (1992) reminds us of the importance of a good family life and gives us advice about nurturing family values and a loving, caring environment.

Problems within the family (Satir)

Families are responsible for producing a healthy, well adjusted, caring, reasonable, productive and loving new generation. That is *an awesome responsibility* and probably the hardest job in the world. Indeed, we are clearly expecting too much from *untrained, often emotionally stressed parents*. We all should help each other achieve those goals (that means we must seek guidance about our most intimate relationships and not hide our parenting "behind closed doors"). The quality of a child's entire life should not be entirely in the hands of his/her parents. Schools help some but there is much more useful knowledge they could be providing all of us before and after we create new lives (see Satir, 1972; Pogrebin, 1983). Furthermore, to promote love and health, families must offer all members friendship, especially time and love--whenever it is needed. "Home is a place you can always go and they have to take you in." Instead of dominating and controlling one another, families can grant equality and freedom to each other. Families can freely give and receive love. That's so much better than fighting for advantages or control.

Virginia Satir (1972, 1988), a renowned therapist, wrote two of the best books about families. She says that troubled families have four areas to improve:

1. *self-esteem* --in healthy families every person feels good about him/herself, not just Dad and/or Mom.
2. *communication* --in healthy families there are clear, honest, direct messages sent and everyone avoids these four responses to threats:
    - a placater--"I always want to do what you want to do." (I'm worthless. Payoff: Hides my needs.)
    - a blamer--"You screwed it up again." (I'm always right. Payoff: Hides my need to be close to the other person.)

- a computer--"I'll calmly give the right answer; I don't want to get emotional about this." (I've got it together...almost. Payoff: Hides all my feelings.)
- a distracter--"I'd rather talk about something else, something irrelevant to the issue at hand." (No body cares what I think anyway. Payoff: Hides everything.)

3. *family rules* --in healthy families rules are flexible and reasonable rather than rigid and inconsiderate. The rules should be democratically arrived at, not dictated.
4. *outside contacts* --in healthy families there are good connections with persons outside the family, so that we are not fearful, placating, or blaming inside or outside the family.

Satir gives detailed suggestions for achieving these healthy conditions in families. We know a lot about how to provide a healthy environment for families. Why aren't we using this knowledge?

Another "classic" about the family is *The Family Crucible* by Napier & Whitaker (1978). It describes a family systems approach to family therapy, but in the process it clarifies how psychological problems evolve from relationships within the family. Perhaps we do not have "individual" problems as much as we have "family" problems, i.e. difficulties arising from interactions and conflicts within our family. What are the common sources of problems according to this viewpoint? Polarization (stress between two or more people), escalation (participants intensify the conflict), triangulation (two people gang up on another, sometimes as a way of avoiding their own troubles), blaming (a "it's your fault" defense), diffusion of identity (the family does not permit a member to be his/her own person and free), and fear of immobility (a fear that the family will disintegrate or die, and you can't escape). Even though this book is for professionals, it can enlighten any reader.

There is growing evidence that advances in modern medicine, better nutrition, sanitation, clear air, and exercise--all the things we obsess about--are not responsible for doubling our life expectancy and improving our general health! What is responsible? Leonard Sagan (1990) says it is *the affection and security associated with the modern family* compared to the hard rural life 200 years ago. Good health involves learning to be self-responsible, to use knowledge, and to be optimistic about controlling your life. Good health is as much a psychological achievement as a medical one. And the family is instrumental in our psychological development. In contrast with the high stress popular magazines constantly write about, modern living, without the threat of wild animals or raiding parties and without families of 10 to 15 (plus 2 or 3 deaths in infancy or childhood), is surely less scary than it used to be. Still each child needs lots of love and attention. In general, small, stable families who want a baby provide more care. But, while our society attends to acid rain, the Spotted Owl, chicken manure in Arkansas rivers, etc., it does little or nothing to improve the psychological-emotional environment within our homes, which is critical to our health and adjustment. Did you

know that fetal and infant death rates for children of married mothers is only half as high as for children of unmarried mothers? Did you know that a teenaged mother is 7 times more likely than an older mother to abuse her child? Did you know that 70% of delinquents have no father at home? Did you know that children of divorce die 2 to 4 years earlier than children from a stable family? Family life may be getting better for some of us but as a society we have a long way to go.

Increased child-care role for fathers

By 1996, it is estimated that 2/3rds of the mothers of even preschoolers will have outside employment. Currently, about 40% of fathers put in over 50 hours per week at work. Companies often expect this kind of dedication. The conflict between career and family is intense. Child-care from Dad is required in a two-career family; about 45% of fathers in 1993 claimed to share the child care responsibilities 50/50 with his wife (only 20% of their wives agreed that the work was shared 50/50). In any case, men in a stable marriage are now more deeply involved in caring for their kids than ever before, and most really like it. However, 25% of all American children born in 1993 had unmarried mothers (in 1995 another estimate was 33%). About 25% of children (60% of black children) are raised by a single parent. About 12% to 16% of all children live with step-families. After a divorce, only 16% of children see their biological father once a week or more. Ten years after a divorce, 2/3rds of children have almost *no* contact with their fathers. How sad (see discussion of the serious effects of divorce in chapter 10).

This evening, 40% of all American children will have no natural father at home to tuck them into bed. If divorced fathers do not have partial custody and/or very active involvement with childrearing, over 50% of them have little contact with their own children after 2 or 3 years. Over 50% of all children will live away from their fathers sometime between birth and 18. The high divorce rate causes serious, long-lasting *personal* problems for many (30%-50%) children of divorce. Blankenhorn (1995) contends that many of our *social* problems--crime, domestic violence, high divorce rates, babies having babies, children on welfare, young men without goals--are due in large part to fathers abandoning their children and leaving home. His solution? A responsible father for every child. How achieved? Through social and moral persuasion and pressure.

The birth of a baby sometimes raises the father's "provider instincts," resulting in his working longer hours *outside* the home. Of course, a few fathers are glad to be out of the house and avoid the crying and dirty diapers. But most are working to provide for the family. On the other hand, the new baby can raise mother's "maternal instincts," resulting in an intense involvement with the baby. Some mothers, especially older, better educated, previously career-oriented women, *monopolize the parenting role*. Some clearly "want to be my baby's main care-giver;" some believe "I can attend to

the baby better than his/her father." This pushes the father aside and he may then get jealous or critical and withdraw. Child-care provided by a controlling older female, say a grandmother or an aunt, can also drive the father away from the child. To avoid these pitfalls it is important to involve the father at birth and ever after. Let him work out his own techniques with the baby, don't criticize or laugh at his early efforts. This tiny little critter needs Dad's style of love and play; Dad will forever cherish the involvement; Mom needs the help; the marriage will be better.

Sometimes both *Mom and Dad* get so involved in attending the baby's needs that they *neglect each other* and the marriage. Over 90% of new parents have more marital conflicts than before the baby. Each parent has to keep a realistic perspective, in spite of this helpless, charming, fascinating little darling. Both parents have equal responsibility and opportunity to love this child but they have an even greater involvement with the spouse. Children are socially dependent on parents for only 12 to 15 years; they have to share their parents with siblings; they are physically in their parents' lives for only 18 to 20 years. The spouse, on the other hand, is our most important relationship for perhaps 60 years. A loving marriage is probably the most important role model you can give your precious child, certainly more healthy than a model of a doting parent.

Good parenting is one of life's major intellectual and emotional challenges. It isn't something that "just happens." We need training and experience *before* our child is born. No society has learned to do this yet. Wise child-rearing requires us to use all the available wisdom about controlling our behavior and emotions (discussed in previous chapters). The communication skills discussed in chapter 13, such as good listening, empathy, and persuasion, are even more needed with loved ones than with strangers. Problems centering around chauvinism in the family are discussed later in this chapter. Love, sex, marriage, and divorce are dealt with in the next chapter. Fanning and McKay (1994) offer men help in achieving a "new masculinity," including being nurturing, unaggressive, and expressive of feelings.

The beginnings of our problems, parent blaming

How psychological problems begin (parent blaming?)

Freud saw psychological problems as originating in childhood, i.e. caused primarily by parents, and this view has been hard to discredit. At the end of this section, Table 9.2 summarizes some of the possible consequences of certain types of parenting and certain circumstances during childhood, such as an alcoholic parent, divorce, abuse, etc. In general, there are *two basic notions* about how the harm is done to children. One idea is that *parents over-control the child*, suppressing the true, basically good nature of the child. The other idea (Pillari, 1992) is that the over-whelming needs of the parents cause them to be *abusive and overly critical*, causing low self-esteem and self-

defeating behavior in the child (who passes it on to the next generation). No doubt, both happen.

It is a humbling experience to have been a kid when everything was the kid's fault and a parent at a time when everything is the parent's fault.

Several well-known therapists (Bradshaw, 1985; Forward, 1989; Miller, 1983) describe harmful child rearing practices, called "poisonous pedagogy." When parents suppress a child's emotions--anger, fears, dependency--and needs--fun, sex, love--the true nature of the child is lost. *The child is so preoccupied with getting Mom and Dad's love* by doing what they want him/her to do, that the child looses sight of his/her own feelings and desires. In short, *the children never get to know their true selves*. Thus, such children are programmed to act out childhood roles ("games" and "scripts"), rather than become their real self. Such children also latch on to compulsions that help them deny or control their suppressed emotions and awareness, thus, the attraction to drugs, music, TV, socializing, exercising, romantic love, sports, etc. (Another consequence is that people who lack self-awareness project their "bad" qualities on to others who are different, such as Blacks, Mexicans, Jews, welfare recipients, etc. See prejudice in chapter 7.)

A psychologist (Caplan, 1989) found that *mothers are blamed* for over 70 kinds of psychological problems. Until very recently, fathers were blamed for very few problems (except in the areas of alcoholism, physical or sexual abuse, and abandonment). This wide-spread mother-blaming is not fair or valid. Phares and Compas (1992) reviewed the relationships between "sick" fathers and psychopathology in their children, and basically found that *it doesn't make much difference which parent is maladjusted*. That is, an alcoholic, a hyperactive, or a brutal father affects his child in the same way a similar-behaving mother does. (An exception may be depression: depressed kids tended to have depressed mothers but not depressed fathers.)

When I was a boy of fourteen, my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be twenty-one I was astonished at how much the old man had learned in seven years.
-Mark Twain

Who is to blame for our faults? If we looked carefully and with an accepting heart, we'd see the deep-rooted reasons for our parents' behavior, even abusive acts. The reasons usually go back generations, either in terms of genes (ability, interests, temperament) or acquired personality traits and needs. Of course, there is also the influence of our friends and culture, and the effects of our social-economic class and religion. Nor should we deny our own responsibility between 5 and 25 for discovering our true self, correcting our childish behavior, and straightening out our distorted thinking, regardless of what our parents did to us or taught us. In short, the blaming should be spread around or stopped altogether.

I had no shoes and complained, until I met a man who had no feet.

If our parents are held partly responsible for our problems, then they surely deserve an equal share of the credit for our good traits too. For instance, research by Koestner, Franz, and Weinberger (1990) has shown that our level of empathy as an adult is positively related to specific characteristics of our parents: (1) Dad's involvement in caring for us, (2) Mom's tolerance for our being dependent, (3) Mom's encouraging us to control our anger and aggression, and (4) Mom's satisfaction from being a mother. We need much more detailed knowledge, such as this, about many connections between childhood experiences and adult adjustment, but we don't need to blame anyone. We can usually forgive ourselves for how we raised our children (see Dwinell & Baetz, 1993).

One approach has been for therapists and clinicians to look backwards and describe or speculate about the parent-child relationship difficulties associated with (causing?) specific problems, such as alcoholism or family violence. Ackerman (1994) describes "emotionally silent" sons from dysfunctional families. A related clinical approach is to describe the common problems associated with (caused by?) specific situations, such as rapidly changing mother-daughter relationships during adolescence (Apter, 1990) or continuing mother-daughter conflicts later in life (Firman & Firman, 1990). Recently, there has been some focus on the problems resulting from certain kinds of father-daughter relationships (Goulter & Minninger, 1994), such as romantic-sexual difficulties (Secunda, 1992) and compulsive, perfectionistic codependency (Ackerman, 1989). Most of these descriptions are based on talking with troubled people, not on objective research. Nevertheless, it may be useful information (it's better than being ignorant). Clinical opinion alone is not good enough, however.

There is advice for adult men (Llardo, 1993) and women (Boynton & Dell, 1995) who want to re-create a healthy, independent relationship with their same sexed parent.

The causes and results of alcoholism and abuse—the clinical vs. research description

Alcoholism, neglect and abuse

Since the "drug counter-culture" of the 1960's, our society has been obsessed with the effects of alcohol and drugs. One positive consequence of this concern is the highlighting of the problems of adult children of alcoholics (ACA's). A flood of self-help books describe ACA's variously as overly anxious and responsible, passive placaters, martyrs, apathetic, substance abusers, poor problem solvers, distrustful, out of touch with their feelings, unable to maintain relationships, codependent, shame-filled, suicidal, and so on. These are the clinical descriptions that come from actual case histories; no doubt *they are valid descriptions of many ACA's lives*. However, when Wright and Heppner (1991) compared ACA's with non-ACA's using objective tests, they found *no differences* on these kinds of characteristics. One possible explanation is that Wright and Heppner surveyed college freshmen and some therapists have contended that the problems of ACA's don't become pronounced until the middle 20's. So, a study of 25-35-year-olds might yield different results. Another possibility is that, while some have serious problems (seen by therapists), many ACA's may not be aware of their problems or may not have problems, at least not serious enough to drive them into therapy. In any case, if you are an ACA with problems, there are many books available: Seixas (1979), Hobe (1990), Messina (1989), Wholey (1988), and Napier (1990). Individual or group therapy may be necessary.

Clinical theories first described the type of *families that produce children who abuse drugs and alcohol*. Only now are objective, scientific studies being done (Glantz & Pickens, 1991). Again, the clinical and objective studies don't entirely agree. One common clinical notion is that young drug users are emotionally over-involved ("enmeshed") with an over-indulging Mom and have distant or strained relationships with Dad. Then, supposedly, the youngsters find a drug-using crowd which provides a way to escape--to a limited degree--from his/her smothering, emotionally ambivalent family situation. Another clinical theory is that the young drug user is unconsciously helping the family carry out certain functions, namely, (a) his/her mischievous behavior (and peer group) diverts attention away from the poor marriage of his/her parents or (b) his/her drug use with friends provides an illusion of "I'm growing up" and "on my own" while holding the family together via his/her defiance of parents'

rules. Surely there is emotional parent-child enmeshment sometimes but not always.

Indeed, objective research (e.g. Volk, et al, 1989) paints a different picture: *teenaged drug users are often uninvolved or disengaged, not enmeshed with a parent* at the time (perhaps earlier). Teenagers, who do not use or abuse drugs, on the other hand, have emotionally close relationships with both parents, especially father, and are willing to take advice from mother (Coombs & Landsverk, 1988). These non-users are also willing to follow the "rules" established by their parents about homework, TV, curfew, etc. (Their parents have more rules and are seen as stricter, but they do not punish more than users' parents. Instead, they use praise more.) Of course, excessive drug-use by an adolescent would ordinarily worsen the parent-child relationships (and kids who cause no trouble have better relations with Mom and Dad), but we still don't know the connection between the start of drug use and family relationships. Surely friends play a big part; general psychological well being and other factors may play a part too. There also appear to be gender differences, e.g. female college students with drinking problems tend to be "too far apart" *or* "too close" with mother and, thus, had a poorer sense of identity. College males with drinking problems did not show this too close-or-too distant relationship with either parent; peer groups may exert more influence on college males (Bartle & Sabatelli, 1989). We have so much more to learn about helpful parenting.

Do abused kids become abusing parents?

It is a popular notion that people who abuse their children were abused themselves. That happens, of course, but it is not predictable. Many abusers were not abused! And, if you were abused, it does not mean you will abuse your children. *Only about 30% of abused children abuse their children*. Secondly, the abuse may not be the same, i.e. a physically abused child may emotionally abuse his/her children.

What is the most common childhood factor in the background of abusive parents? Feeling unloved and unwanted by your parents! The abused-neglected child tends to suffer more problems than normal as an adult: depression, alcoholism, sexual acting out, criminal behavior, and a variety of other psychological problems. The more abuse, the more psychiatric problems. As a society, we pay a heavy price for this neglect through the Criminal Justice System and the Mental Health System. A study of 15 teenaged murderers found that 13 had been murderously abused. See Miller (1983) for a powerfully depressing picture of abuse and the long-range consequences.

The consequences of abuse are worse when the child is mistreated for a long time, early in life (before puberty), by a close family member, and in a very stressful, hurtful, degrading manner (Goleman, 1989). The bad effects are more lasting if the family environment is emotionally cold. Indeed, if the abused child has significant, continuing contact with just one supportive, nurturing adult, this can "save a life."

One more thing: it has been observed by workers in this field that the effects of abuse are often worse when the victim denies that the abuse occurred. They may say, "It wasn't that bad" but will describe horrible atrocities when asked for details. They may say, "I deserved it," feeling they were so bad that harsh punishment was necessary. When parents or other care-takers have been cruel, it is healthy for the child to believe "my parents were wrong" and "I was innocent."

Child sexual abuse (CSA), incest

One hundred years ago, Freud at first thought child sexual abuse was a major factor in many emotional problems in adults. But as he saw more cases, he couldn't believe sexual abuse occurred so often. So, he decided that children had sexual/love wishes and imagined the childhood sexual experiences. Of course, some fantasies or "memories" are almost certainly just fantasies, but today, many therapists (Forward & Buck, 1978) believe real, actual sexual abuse is fairly common. Incoming data seems to support that view. We are left with the difficult problem of deciding when such a memory is real and when is it not. In general, however, clinicians tend to believe a client's report of CSA, unless some unusual experience, like exposure to a biased therapist, has occurred that might tend to "implant" or encourage such a memory.

Sexual abuse of a child or young person is a self-centered, self-gratifying sex act sometimes by a considerably older person who ignores--or doesn't know--the fact that great psychological harm may be done to the victim. CSA acts may range from fondling and masturbation to actual intercourse, sometimes only once or a few times but often for several years. The median age of occurrence is amazingly young--about 9 1/2 or 10 for both boys and girls. (Note: this young age may partly be due to the fact that sexual "assaults"--frequently included in CSA research--are more often committed by brothers or by friends than by adults.) For incest specifically, the contacts start, on average, between 7 to 9 years-of-age!

How often does CSA happen? Of course, surveys vary but in one study 17% (another study found 27%) of women and 12% (other studies found 15% to 20%) of men were inappropriately touched sexually as children, 96% of the time it was by someone they knew, not a stranger. Additional recent surveys have found that 20-45% of women and 10-18% of men were sexually molested as children (Janus & Janus, 1993). The "abuser" of children is usually defined as being at least 5 years older than the victim, and sometimes much older, like a grandfather. (We don't seem to have words for the pushy harassment by siblings and peers that go beyond casual sex "play" or "exploration" but might not reach the criminal "assault" level, e.g., the brother who demands some sex play every time mom and dad leave home.) Between 20% and 30% of adult women have been *forced* to do something sexual before 18, but only 3% of men report having been forced (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael & Michaels, 1994). Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that young boys, as well as girls, are

sexually abused (see Berendzen, 1993, for an unusual case of seduction by a psychotic mother, which supposedly resulted in the victim making obscene phone calls many years later).

Since the abuser of young children may involve a family member or a close friend of the family, the act of sexual abuse will, in those cases, involve a breach of trust which may add greatly to the serious emotional consequences for the child. Between 8% and 15% of all unwanted sexual contact is by an immediate family member (and, considering siblings, maybe the figure is considerably higher). The child trusts, likes, and feels safe with someone who then deceives and uses them, seriously upsetting them. The emotional trauma to a young girl is greatest when incest occurs *before* puberty rather than after and when the offender has previously been well known and liked by the child, i.e. when the abuse is *a betrayal of trust*.

Fairly sophisticated recent research has strongly indicated that it is the actual childhood sexual abuse and *not* some associated family factor (income, education, parenting style, religion) that increases the risk of developing a variety of psychiatric, eating, and addiction disorders years, or even decades later, as an adult (Kendler, Bulik, Silberg, Hettema & Myers, 2000). However, these findings seem to conflict somewhat with other studies showing that the sexual abuse of girls tends to occur in situations where domination of and violence towards women are tolerated (see Interpersonal Violence publications by Sage Publications; Forward & Buck, 1978).

The *initial effects of incest* on the victim may be fear, anger, sadness, shame, guilt, and feeling inferior. Sometimes these feelings are intense. More *long-term effects may include* depression, a very negative self-concept, anxiety attacks, phobias, nightmares, conflicts with parents, difficulty trusting others, sexual problems, and other psychological stress (Blume, 1990). (Note: many other non-sexual experiences may also cause these problems.) As yet, we do not know why being abused results in the victim feeling very negatively about herself. This is important to research. Clearly, even a fairly young child soon realizes and is usually told to keep the sexual activity a secret. Needing to keep it secret would mean to most kids that others would not approve, i.e. maybe that what you are doing, even under pressure, is bad. Imagine the difficulty, as a child, of deciding to keep "the secret" or expose the crime. Imagine further that the offender may be a very important person in your life...and you might have ambivalent feeling about the sexual activities. In short, it can be a terrible experience which is a very high price for a child to pay for some older person's momentary sexual pleasure.

Assorted long-term consequences of abuse: The causal connections are not clear but the relationships are amazing. Abused young girls are three times more likely than other women to later have a psychiatric illness, especially anxiety, depression, anger, and relationship problems, such as distrust. (Remember, CSA may also be related to PTSD and DID, as discussed in chapter 5 under Dealing

with Trauma.) About 40% of women hospitalized with a psychiatric disorder have been sexually abused. We don't know why but women victimized before age 18 are 2.4 times more likely than others to be victimized again as an adult. 30% of women in prison and 90+% of those in prostitution have a history of sexual abuse. Even certain "physical" (perhaps psychosomatic) disorders, such as breast cancer, arthritis, thyroid disease, fibromyalgia (intense pain) and chronic fatigue syndrome, are also associated with sexual abuse (Stein & Barrett-Connor, 2000). Abused young boys are more likely to commit suicide, use drugs, and get in trouble with the law than boys who were not abused. 1/3 of delinquents, 40% of sexual offenders, and 3/4 of serial rapists were molested. The psychological-neurological mechanisms underlying these far reaching processes are not clear, yet.

Sexual abuse of children is obviously a serious problem but little good research has been done about preventing it (Adams, Fay, & Loreen-Martin, 1984). About all we know is that sexually abused children tend to be in situations where a parent is absent, such as working, and, interestingly enough, where the level of family conflict is high (Benedict & Zautra, 1993). Several untested educational programs attempt to teach children about sexual abuse--what it is, who might do it, the many forms it takes, how to know it is happening to you, how to stop it, how to report it, etc. These are commendable efforts, but this is a very complex process for a 5 or 6-year-old child, or even an adult, to handle. A 30-minute discussion at school will probably not be adequate. Also, potential harm can be done (causing nightmares, fear of strangers [or family], negative attitude towards sex, etc.). What about parents, can they help? Yes, but less than 1/3 ever discuss sexual abuse with their children, and, perhaps understandably, less than 1 in 16 ever suggest that a family member might try to abuse them (Reppucci & Haugaard, 1989). Parents need help in this area (for prevention see Adams & Fay, 1981; Adams, Fay, and Loreen-Martin, 1984). The school-based efforts need to be more carefully researched and improved. Unfortunately, society's moral zealots would be enraged if schools attempted to distinguish among (a) psychologically harmful sex, such as abuse, (b) non-sexual contact, such as tickling or wrestling, and (c) good sex, such as self-pleasuring or even "exploring" with same-age friends. Some people want children to be sexless, but that may be another very harmful attitude.

I believe we need, among other things, an intense national effort to teach males that a girl/woman saying *"no" means to stop immediately and permanently*. Certainly, males need to be bluntly disabused of the idea that a young girl or woman will want and enjoy sex play even if she is misled, wooed, flattered, pressured, intoxicated, threatened, or forced. The same confrontation with reality is needed with date rapers, sexual harassers on the job, and rapists. All men must also realize that sex with a minor is a serious crime, even if she agreed to have sex or if she invited it. Most importantly, males must be confronted with how truly horrific sexual abuse, harassment, date rape, and rape can be for the woman. The effects can last for a life

time. The absurd, arrogant male idea that "she will like it" is sick. The violators must be reported (every time!), punished, *and* treated effectively before being released. (See the Rape section in chapter 7.)

Help for teenagers recovering from incest is available in a book (Mather, 1994). There are also several self-help books and programs for female incest victims after they have grown up (Blume, 1990; Poston & Lison, 1990; Jarvis-Kirkendall & Kirkendall, 1989; Bass & Davis, 1988, 1992; Bass & Davis, 1993) and for men too (Lew, 1990; Sonkin, 1992). A spouse can often help a survivor recover (Davis, 1993). However, psychotherapy is probably needed in cases where the reaction to abuse is severe.

An area of special interest is sexual abuse by siblings, usually older brothers. This may be more common than one might think. Certainly it rarely becomes public knowledge; parents may discount the possible seriousness of the sexual activities; it isn't uncommon that a younger sister would initially like a closer but not a sexual relationship. The abuse can, of course, cause a long-lasting traumatic reaction, including self-doubts and low self-esteem, as well as serious family conflicts. Books and articles specifically addressing sibling sexual abuse that might be of interest to survivors include: Shaw, 2000; Canavan, Meyer, and Higgs, 1992; Laiola, (1992); Rudd and Herzberger, 1999). There are also a few other books at Amazon but they are mostly for therapists dealing with sibling incest.

Note: There is no doubt that sexual abuse during childhood is sometimes forgotten...but the associated stress and emotions may cause problems. On the other hand, there is another *note of caution*: some "recovered memories" of sexual abuse may not have actually happened. A few self-help books, including Blume and Bass & Davis, and several therapists have suggested (strongly and repeatedly) that sexual abuse is probably the cause of several adult problems. Naturally, some people will believe the suggestion of sexual abuse from an authority and dwell on that possibility until clear mental images falsely appear. What an injustice to the innocent people falsely accused of sexual abuse! (But not nearly all accused are innocent, so how do you know the plea that "I didn't do it" is the truth?) As a person trying to understand and cope, it is good to look for the causes of your problems, but don't allow anyone (or a group) to tell you repeatedly what "must have happened" to you sexually. There are many ways to get any given symptom. Early childhood memories are very undependable. There are angry camps on both sides of this issue (see sites below). Science still knows very little with certainty about the accuracy of these sexual "memories."

Web sites about sexual abuse

Information about incest and self-help groups for incest victims may be obtained from Survivers of Incest Anonymous (http://www.siawso.org/) ; they will also tell you how to start a local group. Incest Abuse Support

(http://incestabuse.about.com/?once=true&pid=2791&cob=home) is another good site for information, Forums, chat, and links to 20 support groups. Pandora's Box-CSA (http://www.prevent-abuse-now.com/index.htm) and Tamara's House (http://www.tamarashouse.sk.ca/) link to extensive information about CSA.

Sexual assault sites (Also see Rape)

The Rape, Abuse & Incest (http://www.rainn.org/) [1-800-656-HOPE] and the Sexual Assault Care Center (http://www.sacc.to/) are among the nation's largest anti-sexual assault organizations, providing many forms of help and links to extensive information on many related topics. They offer counseling, advice, and information about contacting 850 affiliated Rape Crisis Centers around the nation. Also, there is a place for victims to tell their story, talk with others, and, if they like, identify their offender at This Healing Journey (http://welcome.to/ThisHealingJourney2) .

Male Sexual Abuse sites

National Organization of Male Sexual Victims (http://www.malesurvivor.org/) , Inpsyte Trauma Psychology (http://www.inpsyte.ca/) , Child Abuse Books (http://www.yesican.org) , Sexual Abuse of Males (http://www.jimhopper.com/male-ab/), Male Survivors (http://www.malesurvivor.org/) (click on Male Survivors; also, look for the myths and bookstore sections on this site), and Male Survivor of CSA (http://www.vix.com/menweb/sexabupg.htm) provide several good online articles.

A site about Sexual Offenders

Understanding the Sexual Offender (http://www.angelfire.com/mi/collateral/index.html)

Sites about False Accusations and Blaming your Childhood.

The False Memory Syndrome Foundation on the Memory and Reality Website (http://www.fmsfonline.org/) offers information about "false memories" and "repressed memories" involving sexual abuse. They provide help to persons thought to be falsely accused of CSA. This judgment is a difficult call. <p>There is another legal dilemma worth noting: Alan Dershowitz has written a book, <EM>The Abuse Excuse</EM>, in which he describes the common situation of an accused claiming to be innocent because "I was abused." As a lawyer, Dershowitz fears that the acceptance of psychological explanations for wrong-doing would lead to the end the "rule of law." The law assumes that the accused is responsible for whatever he or she does. This is not a simple matter for a thoughtful determinist (see chapter 14).

A site about Ritual Abuse

Ritual Abuse Resources (http://www.religioustolerance.org/sra.htm)

A site for Mothers of an Abused Child

Info for Mothers (http://www.dvirc.org.au/) .

The effects of traumatic early experiences and poor parenting

This lengthy table summarizes some of the clinical hunches about the long-range consequences of various questionable or potentially destructive behaviors toward a child. These are *speculations* about causes, not proven causes. The speculations usually come from a therapist interviewing several clients with a certain kind of problem, say abusing their children. If the therapist observes that many of the abusive parents were themselves abused as children, he/she may conjecture that the abuse they suffered as a child lead them to abuse their own children. There are several problems with this conclusion, as we just saw: (1) only 30% of abused children become abusers, i.e. the connection isn't always made, and (2) other research shows that many abusers were not abused themselves, i.e. there must be other ways to learn to be abusive. Thus, while the therapist may be reporting accurately his/her observations, he/she is not accurately describing all abusers.

This Table can be considered, at best, a crude, tentative summary of clinical hunches about several possible causes of your problems or about possible consequences of your behavior. Let me emphasize this point again:

It would be really *foolish* for an insecure, passive-dependent young person to see in the table that over-protective parents are thought to be associated with his/her kind of personality and *jump to the conclusion* that his/her parents must have been that way--and that over-protectiveness was the necessary and sufficient cause of his/her dependency. Don't make this mistake. The causes of human problems developing over a period of years are far more complex than that. Therefore, use this table and your readings about your problems to consider many, many possible causes. This is just a stepping stone to greater self-exploration and, eventually, more complete self-understanding. See chapter 15 for many methods, such as doing an autobiography, for gaining insight into your life and problems. Don't despair if you have had a horrible or painful background, many people have overcome all kinds of abominable life experiences (see Rubin, 1996, for inspiring stories of triumph). Wolin & Wolin (1994) also describe how many children have survived unfortunate circumstances and poor child rearing practices.

Table 9.2: Possible outcomes of possibly harmful childhood experiences

Please note: These suggested relationships are only clinical hypotheses and general tendencies, not invariably predictable consequences. Personality development is far too long-term and complicated to predict the outcome of a childhood experience. Furthermore, keep in mind that *all* parents are, at times, hostile, indulging, inconsistent, overprotective, seductive, etc. *and* that some children live through horrible family conditions to become super-healthy, well-adjusted adults (Higgens, 1994). Some children learn to do their own self-assessment and reject "you're awful" or "you can do no wrong" messages. Also, children are not always entirely "passive victims," they sometimes contribute to and even provoke the problems.

If you have problems, treatment and self-help can be effective. Be careful not to erroneously label yourself or your parents as "troubled" and, thus, create a problem where there was none.

Early Childhood Experiences:

Childhood Experience:	*Overprotective Parent(s)*: Over-controlling with orders, reminders, criticism, warnings; parent encourages dependent attachments, discourages skills; child never finds his/her limits
Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult:	*Insecure & passive-dependent*: Submissive, weak, compliant, always needs help; feeling inadequate, child becomes fragile instead of competitive (more women than men). *Or* feeling put down, child procrastinates, daydreams, is forgetful, tired, rebellious, etc.
Childhood Experience:	*Indulgent Pampering Parent(s)*: Tells child he/she is wonderful, grants his/her every wish, showers child with presents & treats, sometimes one parent is more doting & loving than the other.
Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult:	*Narcissistic, demanding, undisciplined.* Wants attention, may be charming, talkative & over-confident as long as things go his/her way, then irritable & blames others when things go wrong. Resents rules, even reasonable ones. Seldom initiates any effort or works hard or cooperates. Feels superior, disregards or exploits others. "Only" children are prone.
Childhood Experience:	*Neglectful Unemotional Parent(s)*: Not hostile, just little time for the child or formal or unexpressive or cold. One parent may be out of the home. Poverty,

work, death or illness may take parent away or reduce communication.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Schizoid, avoids involvements.* If parents can't communicate, child won't learn to either. Withdrawn, feels lonely but keeps people at a distance. Doesn't feel as if he/she belongs to a group or would be accepted. Shows little feeling. Uninsightful & intellectualizing. Being quiet, the child is seen as boring & ignored.

Childhood Experience: *Rejecting Parent(s)*: Openly rejects and puts down the child. Crushes the child's confidence (if Mom and Dad won't love you, who will?). If peer rejection is added, e.g. via poor academic or athletic skills, child's self-esteem is further reduced.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Avoidant: angry or anxious or both.* Child feels unwanted, unloved or least liked. Uncomfortable socially, a lone wolf, self-centered, hurt by real or imagined rejection, immediately becomes hostile or self-critical. May use or hurt others. May be delinquent.

Childhood Experience: *Abusive Parent(s)*: Physical or verbal abuse or both. In some cases, the parents were abusive only with each other, not with the child.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Aggressive or fearful and insecure.* Roughly 1/2 will be "passive" victims, have low esteem, and withdraw. The other 1/2 are angry aggressives. Both types have psychological problems and relate poorly. 1/3 become abusers as parents, but most abusers were not abused. If they only witness parental violence as a child, 1/2 will abuse spouse or be abused. Abused girls tend to marry abusive males, probably because they were deviant and aggressive as teens and married similar men.

Later Childhood Experiences:

Childhood Experience: *Authoritarian, Dogmatic Parent(s)*: Parent is unquestioned boss who is highly demanding, controlling, and emotionally aloof or superior. Unresponsive to the child's needs.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Unhappy, fearful, and irritable and/or dependent.* Moody & sulky, quick to get angry but often is only passive-aggressive, unable to tolerate pressure or stress, aimless or oppositional and not "for" anything. Thinks in absolute terms: "It must be done my way" or "if she wants to break up with me, she is a slut."

Childhood Experience: *Overly Permissive Parent(s)*: Make few demands of the child, allowing him/her free expression of impulses. (The parent may be indulgently responsive to the child's needs or coldly indifferent to the child.)

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Rebellious, impulsive, domineering*. Self-centered but otherwise has poor self-control, disorganized, demanding and aggressive, without explicit ambitions or values, an underachiever.

Childhood Experience: *Perfectionistic Parent(s)*: Caring but demanding of impossible standards from a child, always urging child to do better, child is accepted only when outstanding. Parents compulsive. Teach responsibility to others (guilt). See Elkind (1988).

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Compulsive, tense, self-critical*. Well behaved, conscientious, high goals, achieving but belittles own accomplishments, feels inadequate, may stay perfectionistic or reject parent-imposed ambitions. Intolerant of ambiguity, suppresses emotions, but loyal and lives by the rules.

Childhood Experience: *Type A, Angry Parent(s)*: Tense, pressured, irritable parents (or their opposite).

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Children similar to opposite sex parent.* Some evidence shows that adolescent boys have Type A and anger patterns similar to their mothers'; girls' reactions are similar to fathers'.

Childhood Experience: *Hostile, Punitive Parent(s)*: Parent's anger is vented on child so that it looks like "discipline." Dominant and quick to punish. Parent overreacts and provides a model for mean behavior. (This is different from normal discipline.) Often little or no parental guidance.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Anti-social, feels "no good."* Belligerent, egocentric, distrustful, revengeful, impulsive, defies laws. Feels rejected and "it's a dog eat dog world." May self-punish, feel insecure, & seek punishment. Takes jobs that require a tough person, feels guilt about relaxing. A hateful desire to "get back at" the world or specific people. May fight with other children, become delinquent or schizophrenic.

Childhood Experience: *Dominated-by-Child Parent(s)*: Gives in to temper tantrums, crying, and other pleas. Submissive parents surrender all rights to the demanding child.

Child's Possible *Demanding, impulsive, temper outbursts* Child becomes self-centered, unwilling to work hard, feels

Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: unloved if not "obeyed," overlooks rights of others. When challenged, feels I'm OK, you're not OK.

Childhood Experience: *Adoring, Uncritical Parent(s)*: Child constantly rewarded for "performing." Dramatic behavior or dress reinforced with attention. Parents also seek attention.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Histrionic personality. Always acting.* Manipulates others, theatrical, flighty, flirtatious, childishly immature, and temperamental, poor judgment, emotional but charming. People addicts. Expects everyone to love them; thus, disappointed often.

Childhood Experience: *Hypochondriacal Parent(s)*: Physical aches, fatigue, and other problems are exaggerated.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Worries about health, feels poorly*. Talks about illnesses, gets sympathy, uses as an excuse for not working hard.

Childhood Experience: *Emotional, Inconsistent Parent(s)*: Sometimes yelling, sometimes loving. Hard to predict. Parents may disagree, child is in middle, e. g. one lenient, the other strict. May threaten punish but forgets. Often there is sibling rivalry or
a dethroned King/Queen.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Passive-aggressive, anxious, resistive.* In conflict with parents and other authorities. Stubborn, a loner or rebel, procrastinating, uncooperative, sometimes dependent, irritable, reacts explosively, argumentative, feels misunderstood and mistreated, sometimes eager to leave home. Inconsistent parents produce inconsistent children (quiet and angry) because they don't know what to expect. They learn to rebel while appearing to be compliant.

Childhood Experience: *Alcoholic Parent(s)*: Uses drugs or alcohol to escape problems or handle emotions. May ignore, abuse, shame, lean on, befriend, seduce, or embarrass a child.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Super-responsible, anxious or alcoholic*. Children of alcoholics (COA) experience many reactions:
1. Responsible hero--cares for the family, feels he/she must be in control of everything;
2. Scapegoat--blamed for every-thing, becomes rebellious and alcoholic;
3. the Mascot or Drinker's Buddy--becomes a clown or therapist;
4. the Lost child--feels unimportant, lonely, powerless.

COA's learn three rules: "don't trust, don't talk, and don't feel." COA's are twice as likely to use alcohol and four times as likely to use drugs. Female COA's are prone to fears, depression, marital problems, and problems with children.

Childhood Experience: *Father with Criminal Record*: Antisocial.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Criminal tendencies*. If the child or teenager also sees parent as rejecting, uncaring, and hateful towards him/her, he/she is more likely to be aggressive (fighting and lying).

Childhood Experience: *Ambivalent Parent(s)*: Say one thing and act another way: "I love you" but seems indifferent, "I'm your Mom-Dad" but acts like a buddy or a lover.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Confused, can't form close relations*. Identity crisis, unsure about how to feel with others, may withdraw and become apathetic, thinking may be mixed up.

Childhood Experience: *Overly Involved Parent(s)*: Continues to contact children in college daily, "best friends," become very upset when 18-20 year old child decides to live different life-style, e.g. use drugs occasionally, have sex, marry into another religion, and even refuses to move home after college.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Dependency, guilt, rebelliousness.* Enjoys parent's attention and worry, afraid to not contact or deceive parent, lets parent direct his/her life, or may carefully pursue goals that upset the parent but keeps parent well informed, or may have no goals of his/her own.

Childhood Experience: *Emotionally Seductive Parent(s)*: Child becomes the parent's source of love; thus, lavishes attention on the child. It becomes an abuse "that feels good" but the love dominates the child's life.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Depression, addictions, poor relations*. Child struggles to escape but it is hard or impossible to find a better lover than Mom or Dad. Leads to depression, self-depreciation, eating disorders, addictions, poor love relationships. (See Love, 1991.)

Childhood Experience: *Parents with a Bitter Divorce*: Divorce *may* involve many traumas: hearing fights, seeing abuse, being abused, losing daily contact with one parent, having to move or live at a lower standard, being exposed to

hateful criticism of one or both parents, being blamed or feeling to blame for the divorce, and having to choose which parent to live with.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Problems in school, fearful of love*. Low self-esteem, academic difficulties may continue 10 years or more, anxiety, and feeling great guilt (often without any justification at all). May adjust well during the divorce but as young adults become unhappy, withdrawn, without focus, men become afraid women will not love him and women become afraid men will be unfaithful to her.
Note: if the divorcing parents can be civil and cooperative, the children will be better adjusted and have self-esteem.

Childhood Experience: *Loss of a Parent*: Regardless of the cause of the loss, the risk of depression and other disorders is increased if relations are poor with the surviving parent, anxiety high, and home life unhappy. See section on step-parenting in chapter 10.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Depressive disorder as adults*. About a 75% chance of depression or some kind of psychiatric disorder *if* the relationship with the surviving parent is troubled. Phobias and panic disorders associated with parental death.

Childhood Experience: *Aloof, Unexpressive Father*: Uninvolved with child, except when critical and demanding. Never praises or says, "I love you." Often father is busy earning a living, may be successful.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Feels unfulfilled, obsessed*.
Child yearns for father's approval. Without attention from father, the child feels "empty"--has a big hole inside--which he/she tries to fill with work, sex, making money, or alcohol but that doesn't work. Often is cold and aloof like father but can learn to be loving.

Childhood Experience: *Living with Single Mother*: With or without a step-father. Of course, this may include going through a divorce.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Poorer health, grades, and behavior.* Children have 30% higher risk of health problems and injury, 50+% higher risk of failing a grade or being disciplined, and 30-70% higher risk of having a behavioral problem, e.g. antisocial behavior, social conflicts or withdrawal, and dependency. 70% of delinquents are fatherless.

Childhood Experience: *A Mother Working Outside the Home*: While a 2-career family or single-parent family is busy, there are some advantages besides money: working Moms have fewer

physical ailments and less depression. Also, fathers become more involved in child-care.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *Daughters confident, less traditional*. Over 60% of Moms have outside employment and their daughters seem to benefit. The daughters grow up more confident and with more self-esteem than daughters of home-making mothers. Such daughters are less controlled by traditional sex roles and they have a better relationship with their mothers. Mothers who stay at home have better relationships with their sons.

Childhood Experience: *Picks On or Being Picked on by Sib*: 28% have high conflicts with a sib; 20% were picked on, 17% picked on a sib; often it is mutual aggression.

Child's Possible Reaction as a Child or as an Adult: *More violent, more emotional, fewer coping skills.* More violence in family. Women who were picked on showed more anxiety but men didn't. Perpetrators had higher self-esteem but also greater anxiety. Victims who were passive had more depression and anxiety than those who "fought back" (Graham-Bermann, Cutler, Litzenberger, & Schwartz, 1994).

Common Interpersonal Problems and Skills Needed

This section discusses many problems associated with making and keeping friends (see index at the beginning of the chapter). It also deals with difficulties faced by long-term relationships, such as communicating poorly, being taken for granted, conscious and unconscious controlling of each other, handling difficult people, and driving each other crazy. The next section of the chapter covers gender differences, competition, feelings of superiority, interaction problems between the sexes, gender roles and sexism, chauvinism in child care, chauvinism in schools, and chauvinism at work. Finally, many more useful references are given throughout for dealing with interpersonal problems.

Fear of approaching someone

Most of us are a little uncomfortable meeting new people. Many of us are lonely but still we do not reach out. We may even suspect that others are lonely too but we don't approach them. Or if we do reach out, why do we take out what Bach and Deutsch (1970) call "rejection insurance?" That is, why do we avoid getting emotionally involved with someone or why are we careful to "keep pace" with our new partner

and not get more involved with them than he/she is with us? So we won't get hurt! But is it necessary to protect ourselves?

One problem with holding back is that we miss so many chances to find a relationship. We don't approach someone or we pretend not to care. True, we didn't get hurt, but this decision may have resulted in our staying lonely and without another friend or a partner. Why is it so scary to approach someone? Is it just a fear of rejection? Probably not. Suppose the person you approached told you he/she appreciated your interest in them but explained that he/she was involved right now in another relationship, would you feel terribly hurt? No (disappointed maybe). Even if he/she is less gentle and says, "I don't want to go out," you know he/she doesn't know you well enough to judge your total worth and attractiveness. So the rejection shouldn't mean much. Would the person you approach feel badly? No, he/she will probably feel a nice warm glow inside because your interest is a compliment.

If rejection shouldn't hurt us, then why are we afraid? I think there are three basic reasons. (1) When we disclose that we need a friend or partner, we are admitting we don't have one which is an embarrassment. (2) Being turned down by a stranger may not mean much but it arouses our own self-doubts and self-criticism. We erroneously conclude "Oh, God, I'm not attractive. Others will reject me." (3) Your "child" may become angry about being turned down and say something like, "He/she is so stuck up!" All these unpleasant reactions inside us may stop our reaching out, even though we are aching for friendship. Understanding these sources of stress may help you counter and overcome them. Accept your needs, desensitize your fears (chapter 12), practice your social skills (chapter 13), stop the conscious self-putdowns (chapter 14), and look for unconscious factors (chapter 15). What are some possible hidden motives for not wanting to meet people? "I'm not OK; they won't like me." "They aren't OK; they are probably uninteresting clods." "I don't deserve to have friends and be popular."

Handling the first few minutes

Zunin and Zunin (1973) claim that you commonly have about four minutes to favorably impress someone you are meeting for the first time. Your actions determine, in part, if you make a friend or merely pass some time with a stranger. Several ideas about how to handle the early stages of the initial contact are given in chapter 13 (see social and dating skills) and several useful books are cited there.

When you speak to people--smile. It is a wonderful thing when you meet someone and they just instinctively smile and say "I am mighty glad to know you." There is power in a smile. It is one of the best relaxation exercises of which I know.

-Henry Miller

Becoming a good conversationalist

Many of us fear not knowing what to say after the first few minutes. Conversing is a skill; it takes practice and planning. Unfortunately, many young people resist "preparing" to meet someone, they want to be spontaneous or free flowing (Flanders, 1976). That would be nice but for some of us conversing takes work. The major problem is the fear, i.e. suddenly there is silent pause and we start to panic. If we blush or break out in a sweat, it adds to the embarrassment (and builds our fear of silence). How can we reduce the fear? By becoming better talkers through preparation.

There are two options when talking: continue on the same topic or change it. A good conversationalist is able to ask questions and may be able to share his/her own ideas and experiences. Practice both, pursue the "finer points" of any topic, ask personal questions, and tell your own stories. When a topic is exhausted, don't panic...almost any topic will do (Russell, 1965). Practice having a topic or two ready for instant use; up to a point, continuing a conversation is a compliment. You are offering your interest and time. Lastly, practice ending conversations tactfully: indicate you must do something else, give the person a genuine compliment, and suggest a specific time to see him/her again (if that seems appropriate).

There is so much good in the worst of us, and so much bad in the best of us, that it behooves all of us not to talk about the rest of us.

Developing a friendship

Most of us need friends. Some need lots of friends; others need only one or two. For a few people, their family or work can replace friends altogether. But, in a crisis, about half of us will turn to a friend for help, instead of our family. On the average, Americans claim to have about 5.6 close, intimate friends. Friends serve many purposes: they give us a sense of belonging, they guide our behavior and opinions, they give us emotional support, they give us a chance to talk and enjoy other pleasures, they help us, they give us a chance to help them, they show us that our lives are worthwhile, they reassure us that our thoughts, feelings, and values are okay, they cheer us on (Duck, 1983). Steve Duck has summarized the research about forming friendships and love relationships; his major point is that building a

friendship is not just a matter of doing whatever comes naturally, as many people would like to believe. It requires many complex but learnable skills. Thus, finding, making, and keeping a good friend involves knowledge (working to learn many skills) and effort applying the skills.

One friend in life is much, two are many, and three hardly possible.
-Henry Adams

What characterizes a close, meaningful relationship? Friends (1) spend time together, almost every day. (2) They interact freely, easily, and honestly. They feel safe enough to "be themselves," sharing their private feelings and experiences, both their successes and their failures. (3) To last, both must get more satisfaction than hassle from the relationship. Both must feel they are getting a fair deal. Both must strive to make the other happy. (4) There is a code of ethics between friends based on loyalty and trust. Friends are tolerant of and devoted to each other; they are fair, emotionally supportive, and willing to help whenever needed. Innumerable writers have described friendships (Flanders, 1976), especially among women (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1988; Pogrebin, 1987; Rubin, 1985). To build a friendship, one needs time, the freedom to be oneself, consideration for the other person, and many skills. Let's look at some of the skills.

Finding and making friends

Where are friends found? Wherever we spend time--near home, in our classes, at work, in sports or other activities. What kind of people do we tend to select as friends or as boy/girlfriends? Generally, persons similar to ourselves, i.e. similar interests, values, and attitudes; otherwise, we wouldn't enjoy being with them and they wouldn't provide us emotional support. We don't ordinarily chose friends to expand our minds. Of course, if we are looking for a boy/girlfriend, we also consider their appeal to us, both physically and personality-wise, and try to get as attractive a partner as we can. A major part of making friends is having the courage and skill to start a conversation and invite him/her to do something with you. Broder (1988) offers many suggestions for enjoying the single life. We shouldn't be too desperate to find a friend. See assertiveness, social skills, and role-playing in chapter 13.

Since many people today postpone marriage until their late 20's, these people have time to develop a network of close friends over a period of years. Often friends replace family in many singles' lives. These long-term friends are no longer dropped as soon as we get married. Besides, we have learned that one person, no matter how

wonderful a partner, can't meet all our needs. In fact, about half of married women feel they can talk with a friend about things they wouldn't discuss with their husbands, such as self-doubts, child-rearing problems, trouble in the marriage, etc. As women have increased their own self-esteem and broadened their interests, they have increased their respect for and interest in other women. Women now develop "specialized friends," like a male's tennis buddy or car repair buddy, as well as "intimate friends."

Good advice is to take your time making a friend. It takes, on average, 3 years to become "best friends." There are ups and downs in most friendships; some stresses may actually strengthen the relationship. Confide in each other, but go slow. If you think you are unloading too much or imposing on your friend, ask him/her about it. Remember, almost no relationship will tolerate *total* frankness; we wisely refrain from telling a friend things that will hurt or drive him/her away. Also, be cautious about disclosing damaging information to friends who might pass it on. Avoid expecting too much time and help from just one or two friend(s). Likewise, don't acquire so many friends that you don't have time for your better friends when they need you. Look for opportunities to do things for and with your friends. Friends are valuable treasures but we need time alone.

People addicts and people haters

Some of us are literally addicted to being with other people. We may feel lost, lonely, uncomfortable, afraid, and/or bored when alone. So it is understandable why these people spend most of their time socializing (usually very well because they are so practiced and try so hard) or talking on the phone or planning some social activity. The problem is that we may need to do some things alone: study, work, care for children, read, keep up with current events, plan our future, etc. If we can get good at doing some things alone, we will enjoy the activities more and become more comfortable with ourselves, even enjoy the silence and comfort of being alone (Storr, 1988). If we have a desire to always be with someone, it is important to understand this enslaving need. Perhaps we irrationally believe that we must be having "fun" all the time or that everyone must like us. Perhaps there is still an insecure child inside demanding attention and dominating our life. Perhaps we have grown up with people constantly around us and, thus, feel in a foreign place when alone.

People haters

Others of us just don't like people. Most of us don't like certain kinds of people. Sometimes there are good reasons for our feelings, such as self-serving, inconsiderate, demanding bosses; arrogant, critical, embarrassing teachers; crude, mean, ignorant, prejudiced "clods." Often, though, we do not have good reasons for hating--prejudice, misunderstandings, impossible expectations and so on. The

entire chapter 7 deals with anger, unreasonable dislikes, and prejudice. It also discusses the anger that often occurs in an intimate relationship, such as marriage or between parents and teenagers. Few of us have learned to have Carl Roger's unconditional positive regard or John the Evangelist's philosophy of "turn the other cheek" to forgive everyone. For many unaccepting people it would be easier (than forgiveness--see chapter 7) to try desensitizing our emotions (chapter 12), determinism (chapter 14), challenging our irrational ideas (chapter 14), and gaining insight into the origin of the dislike (chapters 7 & 15).

The only safe and sure way to destroy an enemy is to make him/her a friend.

Self-disclosure and self-acceptance

Humanists, such as Jourard (1974), emphasized the importance of self-disclosure in becoming intimate with another person, either a friend or lover. Self-disclosure is a reflection of a healthy personality. It deepens relationships. Showing your true feelings, your real self, is a part of intimacy. Of course, self-disclosure can be excessive or premature, e.g. "I thought about killing myself last week" or "I really like the shape of your butt" might scare off a new boy/girlfriend (Rubin, 1973). Furthermore, we all have thoughts that are best left unsaid. However, a more common problem is when we assume (often erroneously) others will be unimpressed or won't like us as we really are and, thus, we think we need to pretend to be something we aren't. We pretend in order to impress someone or to hide our shame. Actually, the pretender will probably look phony and feel stressed enough that a relationship will not develop. A better approach is honesty. Not everyone will like us if we're honest, but those that do will at least like our real selves, not our phony selves (see chapter 13).

Not only is self-disclosure mentally healthy, but "opening up" to others is good for your physical health too (Pennebaker, 1990). According to Pennebaker, an authority in health psychology and stress, holding back our thoughts and emotions may cause physical harm and pain. Talking about troubling thoughts relieves internal stress. Interestingly, according to Pennebaker, confessing your secrets to others or just writing down your feelings, as in a diary, are both beneficial.

A friend is a person with whom you dare to be yourself.

Accept yourself and share yourself

If you don't like yourself, you aren't likely to freely reveal yourself to others you care about. This doesn't mean you have to be in love with yourself--you don't have to think you are the greatest; you don't have to be satisfied with every aspect of your personality. You just have to accept yourself and assume you can continue to improve. If you are tolerant of yourself, it is easier to believe that others will accept you, warts and all. Also, you must not be desperate to be liked. If you believe that someone else will love you even if the person you are disclosing to right now starts to loose interest in you, it is easier to take risks and honestly self-disclose. In chapter 6 we saw that some self-critical persons drive others away and become lonely. Self-acceptance and self-confidence enhance most relationships (Powell, 1974). Learning to like your self better is dealt with in chapters 6 and 14.

Self-disclosing does not automatically occur as soon as one sees the advantages for doing so. It takes skill, courage, and practice. Bach and Deutsch (1970) have written a book about *Pairing.* They deal with many situations faced by new lovers or potential lovers, namely, meeting, getting acquainted, selecting a person to date, playing "games," handling sex, breaking up, etc. They illustrate, via many case reports, common conscious deceptions: pretending to be brighter, more confident, more sophisticated, more or less interested in sex, marriage, sports, politics, etc. than we really are. Their solution is to be honest and straight with the other person. Buscaglia (1972) makes the same point with a story about a student in his class who begins to realize that she may be the best banana in the world but when a plum-lover comes along, she tries to make herself into a juicy, delectable plum instead of waiting for a banana-lover. Then when the plum-lover tells her to "split," she doesn't know who she really is. If you have difficulty meeting and getting intimate with someone of the opposite sex, read some of these books about love and practice empathy and honest self-disclosure (see chapters 10 and 13).

At bottom every (person) knows well-enough that he/she is a unique being, only once on this earth; and by no extraordinary chance will such a marvelously picturesque piece of diversity in unity as he/she is, ever be put together a second time.
-Friedrich Nietzsche

Misunderstandings—checking out your hunches

It is obvious that how we respond to others depends on how we perceive the situation. An old adage says everyone has three characteristics:

1. that which he/she has,
2. that which he/she thinks he/she has, and
3. that which others think he/she has.

Similarly, R. D. Laing (1968), a creatively different psychiatrist, suggests there are three powerful determinants of how we behave in a relationship:

1. what we think of the other person and our relationship with him/her,
2. our assumptions about what the other person thinks of us and our relationship, and
3. what we think he/she thinks we think of him/her and our relationship.

Laing believes that relationships and even psychotic or neurotic responses are understandable *if* one realizes how the person is viewing the situation. For example, I once had a client who was arrested for cutting down trees in a park. He cut the trees to let the super-intelligent beings watching him from flying saucers know that he was in trouble (with the law, with his wife, and within his own mind). All of us act just as crazy: "Oh, I won't ask her/him out, she/he wouldn't look twice at me" or "No, no, I wouldn't think of trying out (for sports or a part in a play), they'd think I was a complete dud."

We constantly operate on hunches about what others think or feel, without checking out the hunches. Did you ever wonder why? Perhaps we are afraid to face the truth (or what we fear is the truth). Perhaps we don't think the other person will tell us the truth. Perhaps we'd rather just suspect the worst, rather than ask and have it confirmed for sure. In any case, it is interesting how an indecisive, self-doubting person can nevertheless know for certain "they won't like me." Laing's solution is simple: ask people how they feel: "How do you feel about _____?" or "How do you think I feel about_____?" And, then you disclose these things to each other. We must know what is real in order to act rationally. We have a right to know where the other person stands; we don't have to make most decisions on the basis of guesses or gossip about others. Chapter 13 gives detailed instructions for clearer communication with others and for confirming our impressions of others, as recommended by R. D. Laing.

There is no easy system for formulating questions. Your questions follow the pattern of your thinking. You might remember that the seven interrogative pronouns are who? when? which? what? how? where? and why? They do not cover all the questions you can frame

but they can give you a grip on many a problem.
Edward Hodnett

Empathy responding

No social skill is more important than empathy. Some people are seen as more accepting and less critical or judgmental than others. Such people are called "empathic;" they are easy to talk to; they enable us to "open up." In order to disclose, especially problems and feelings we are ashamed of, we must feel safe, i.e. understood, liked, and accepted by the person with whom we are talking. This is true in therapy...and in friendship...and in love. So, if you want to get to know another person, be empathic, tolerant, and genuinely concerned about his/her welfare. *If you aren't really concerned* about his/her best interests, don't pretend to be. Being empathic--being a true friend--is a cherished gift to offer; it is offering an open heart. Empathy responding is not easy to learn (in fact, no one ever masters all the knowledge and life experience involved). Empathy is emphasized in chapter 13 because it is such a vital attitude and communication skill. Learn it well; use it often.

Anything will give up its secrets if you love it enough. Not only have I found that when I talk to the little flower or to the little peanut they will give up their secrets, but I have found that when I silently commune with people they give up their secrets also--if you love them enough.
-George Washington Carver

Sustaining Long-Term Relationships

Improving relationships--a review

There are so many things a person can do to better relationships. Most are common sense: avoid threatening or putting others down by using titles or by being formal in speech or mannerisms, smile, dress like they do, let others help you and give you information, learn information you can share with them, work together on joint projects, do fun things together too, avoid competition and criticism, help them solve problems, reward their efforts and express your genuine appreciation, and give them your time. Most of us were already "experts" at gaining attention and winning affection by the time we

were three or four; we just need to use the skills we have (and control our negative feelings). If you don't have the social skills, see chapter 13 and, if possible, join a support group.

Sustaining a Long-term Relationship

Thus far, we have discussed some of the problems and skills involved in finding and developing meaningful relationships. Keeping an ongoing relationship alive requires additional work and different skills because there are so many pitfalls. We have lots of barriers to true communication; we take each other for granted; we come to feel things are unfair; we have quarrels; we try to control and manipulate each other. Some of these problems will be discussed in this section. In the next section, we will deal with sex role conflicts and chauvinism at school, work, and between countries. In the next chapter we discuss marriage and other intimate relationships.

Why can't we communicate?

Science and wise people know there are several communication barriers. First, other people won't hear you if you threaten them or make them defensive. Many things are threatening or unpleasant, including someone acting "superior," being ordered around, being "evaluated," etc. Second, we often hear what we want to hear. Especially in highly charged discussions (politics, money, abortion, religion), we can't see the other viewpoint. Third, many of us are sloppy talkers and listeners. We don't express our opinions clearly. We become uninterested, distracted, or self-preoccupied and just don't hear what was said. Fourth, one person in a conversation may be "playing games," as discussed above. This stops honest communication. Fifth, some friends or companions have decided (without discussing it) that "we won't talk about that." Thus, this forbidden topic is never dealt with. It might be a drinking or sexual problem, money management, his/her flirting, or anything. Sixth, there are all kinds of conflicts that interfere with communication: competition, attempts to get one's way, argumentativeness, "if it weren't for you" games, hostile humor, teasing, etc., etc.

Becoming aware of the source of the barriers in your case is critical, so they can be stopped. Replace the destructive communication with relaxed but active listening, clear expression of feelings, and genuine empathy. Let's discuss some of these barriers.

Being "taken for granted"

A common event in a long-term relationship is taking each other for granted. Friends may become less considerate of each other and

impose. Lovers become less enthralled, less thrilled, less attached, and less interested in each other. When this happens, lovers often feel unloved. That's not necessarily the true situation. The love may have just moved into a new phase. It is amazing how we can feel and show little love when together with a loved one but suddenly become aware of how much we love, need, and want him/her just as soon as he/she leaves for a trip (or shows interest in someone else).

Cathrina Bauby (1973) says passive withdrawal (non-communication) is a major problem in long-term relationships. Sometimes this "silence" is a result of being taken for granted and sometimes it is a result of brewing but suppressed anger. It seems like a natural human process to "adapt," i.e. just not notice things that occur over and over, including our spouse regularly doing considerate things for us. We have to remind ourselves to express our appreciation; after several years, there is no strong drive compelling us to show our love. In other relationships, there may be a strong mixture of love and hate. The result may be a hot and cold relationship or a canceling out of + and - feelings and, thus, apathy or indifference or "being taken for granted." There are several remedial steps for apathy: (1) communicate more and listen more empathically, (2) do more together that is enjoyable and/or strengthens the love, (3) reduce your alienating or irritating behaviors, (4) learn to be more tolerant of his/her irritating behavior (via desensitization or private venting), (5) learn how to fight fairly (chapter 7), and (6) challenge your irrational expectations (chapter 14).

For every beauty there is an eye somewhere to see it.
For every truth there is an ear somewhere to hear it.
For every love there is a heart somewhere to receive it.
But though my beauty meets no eye it still doth glow.
Though my truth meets no ear it still doth shine.
But when my love meets no heart it can only break.
-Ivan Panin

Resolving conflicts

No two people want the same thing, not at every choice point. So, there are unavoidable conflicts in all relationships. Of course, both people may hide and deny the conflicts. Sometimes, one person is a martyr and will always give in without a whimper (maybe with an ulcer or a heart attack). In other pairs, one person is the dominant one and must win every conflict, even if he/she has to be deceptive or make nasty personal threats. All three are bad approaches to conflict. There are two much better approaches: (1) agreeing to a fair compromise (getting half of what you want), and (2) developing a creative solution in which both people get most of what they want. Obviously, the latter

is ideal but it will not always be possible. Consider using a win-win negotiation (method #10 in chapter 13), or the "fair fighting" (method #5 in chapter 13) if you are intimates in a long-term relationship.

The only gracious way to accept an insult is to ignore it; if you can't ignore it, top it; if you can't top it, laugh at it; if you can't laugh at it, it's probably deserved.
-Russell Lynes

Control of and by others

Many of us experience strong needs to control others. We want others to see things and do things our way. We want to sell them something. Shostrom (1968) described several types of manipulators:

1. The dictator: wants to control others by orders, i.e. by virtue of his/her authority, position, status, or rank. Such a person believes he/she knows what is right and what you should do.
2. The weakling: controls or defies authority by using his/her weakness, sometimes in powerful ways, such as "Oh, I forgot," "I didn't understand," "I just can't do it," or "I'm so nervous." This is passive-aggressiveness.
3. The calculator: sees the world as a contest of wits. He/she is constantly plotting, conning, pressuring, persuading, selling, seducing, or trying to outwit others.
4. The clinging vine: wants to be cared for, dependent, submissive, and faithful. As a helpless, grateful, cuddly child, he/she gets others to do a lot for him/her. See chapters 5 and 8.
5. The bully: uses his/her anger, toughness, viciousness, and threats to intimidate others and get his/her way. The "tough guy" and "the bitch" are common characters. See chapter 7.

What can you do about being manipulated? First, recognize what is happening. Second, stand up for your rights. Think and decide for yourself; assert yourself (see chapter 13). Build your self-esteem (chapter 14) so that you are not overly dependent on others.

What if you are the manipulator? Controllers or manipulators use five basic methods of persuading or influencing others (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985): (1) Carefully stating the reasons and logic for changing, (2) assertively reminding and urging someone to change, (3) soliciting others to support your proposals, (4) going over someone's head to get support from "higher ups," and (5) working out a deal so you get part of what you want. Naturally, different leaders use different methods: (1) the "steam rollers" go for broke and

aggressively use all the methods--they won't take no for an answer, and may even threaten, shout, and demand, (2) the "rational ones" rely only on hard facts, logical analysis, careful plans, and compromise, (3) the "pleasers" actively persuade others but mostly "politic," focusing on offering "pay offs," flattery, and personal charm, and (4) the "onlookers" mostly stay out of the controversy.

In a second study, Schmidt and Kipnis (1987) found that the "steam rollers" got the lowest job evaluations, contrary to what is taught by some Business Schools. Male "steam rollers" were disliked even more than female "steam rollers," contrary to the common notion that pushy women are the most resented. Sexism does occur, however, when you ask, "Who got the best job evaluations?" "Rational" men and "Pleaser" or "Onlooker" women! Conclusion: men's ideas and women's quiet pleasantness are valued, not women's ideas nor men's pleasant passivity.

Note what methods you use to influence people in different situations. Consider the possible advantages of using the rational approach. Nasty aggressive tactics put others down while soft tactics may put you down. Practice relating to others as intelligent, reasonable equals and in a manner whereby both of you can be winners. Refer to method #16 in chapter 13 for more about influencing others through persuasion.

No human relation gives one possession in another--every two souls are absolutely different. In friendship or in love, the two side by side raise hands together to find what one cannot reach alone.
-Kabil Gibran

Unconscious controlling of others

The manipulations described above involve conscious, overt control (requesting, persuading, buying off, threatening) or conscious-to-the-controller but hidden-to-the-victim control (deception). Beier and Valens (1975) concentrate on a third kind of control--unaware control. Neither controller nor controlee realizes the purpose or goal (like in "games"). The authors say unconscious control is the most common, powerful, and effective control. Many forms of unaware control are learned by young children: cuteness, weakness, illness, fear, anger, sadness, goodness, giving, love, etc. These acts and feelings can all be used to subtly influence others. There is obviously no quick, conscious defense against this control, because we don't know what is happening or how. Is there any defense at all? Yes, learn how to detect the subtle control, then extinguish it by preventing the payoffs. It can be done.

Here are the steps, suggested by Beier and Valens, for avoiding "unaware control." (1) Become as unemotional as possible so you can observe the interaction (with the controlling person) as objectively as possible. (2) Observe *the effects*, i.e. note *the results* of your interactions, and assume that whatever happens (especially repeatedly) was the unconsciously intended outcome. If you got mad...or felt guilty...or gave them a loan, assume that was the other person's unconscious intent. Don't be mislead by the person's words or "logic," don't try to figure out what made you respond the way you did, just note what pay offs the other person's actions and/or feelings lead to. (3) Disengage from the relationship--stop responding in your usual, controlled-by-other-person way. Be understanding, not angry. Listen, but don't rescue him/her. Become passive resistant to the controller; then, observe his/her reaction to your non-response. (4) Next is the key step: now, instead of giving the old manipulated response or no response, *give a new surprising response* that does not go along with what the manipulator expects (and unconsciously wants) but does not threaten him/her either. Example: suppose a person (child, spouse, boss) gets attention and status by being nasty and yelling. You could start responding differently by simply saying, "It's good to express your feelings." You give no argument, you show no fear of his/her long verbal abuse, and you make no concessions and don't cater to his/her whims. (5) Give him/her space--just let the other person find a new and better way to interact with you. You should not try to become a controller of the other person and tell him/her what to do; instead, be free to experiment with different styles of interacting with this person.

How to handle difficult people

Bramson (1981) has suggested several ways of coping with difficult people in the work setting, e.g. hostile co-workers or bosses, complainers, super-agreeables, know-it-all experts, obstructionists, and people who won't decide or won't talk. How to handle the hostile person was discussed at the end of chapter 7. What about the chronic complainers? They are fault-finding, blaming, and certain about what should be done but they never seem able to correct the situation by themselves. Often they have a point--there are real problems--but their complaining is not effective (except it is designed to prove someone else is responsible). *Coping with complainers* involves, first, listening and asking clarifying questions, even if you feel guilty or falsely accused. There are several don'ts: *don't* agree with the complaints, *don't* apologize (not immediately), and *don't* become overly defensive or counter-attack because this only causes them to restate their complaints more heatedly. Secondly, as you gather facts, create a problem-solving attitude. Be serious and supportive. Acknowledge the facts. Get the complaints in writing and in precise detail; get others, including the complainer, involved in collecting more data that might lead to a solution. In addition to what is wrong, ask "What should happen?" If the complainer is unhappy with someone

else, not you, you may want to ask, "Have you told *(the complainee)* yet?" or "Can I tell _____?" or "Can I set up a meeting with them?" Thirdly, plan a specific time to make decisions cooperatively that will help the situation...and do it.

What about the persons who are super nice and smilingly agree with your ideas until some action is required, then they back down or disappear. Such people seek approval. They have learned, probably as children, that one method for getting "love" is by telling people (or pretending) you really care for and/or admire them. Similarly, *the super-agreeables* will often promise more than they deliver: "I'll get the report done today" or "I'd love to help you clean up." They are experts in phoniness, so don't try to "butter them up." Instead, reassure the super-agreeable that you will still like them even if they tell you the truth. Ask them to be candid and make it easy for them to be frank: "What part of my plan is okay but not as good as it could be?" Help them avoid making promises they can't keep: "Are you sure you can have the money by then? How about two weeks later?" Tell and show them you value their friendship. Let them know you are ready to compromise because you know they will be more than fair.

Know-it-all experts are of two types: the *truly competent*, productive, self-assured, genuine expert and the partially informed person *pretending to be an expert*. Both can be a pain. The true expert may act superior and make others feel stupid; they may be bull headed and impatient with differing opinions; they are often self-reliant, don't need or want any help, and don't want to change. If you are going to deal with the true expert as an equal, you must do your homework thoroughly; otherwise, they will dismiss you. First of all, listen to them and accurately paraphrase their points. Don't attack their ideas but rather raise questions that suggest alternatives: "Would you tell me more?" or "What do you think the results will be in five years?" "It probably isn't a viable choice but could we consider...?" Secondly, show your respect for his/her competence but don't put yourself down. Lastly, if the expert can not learn to consider others' ideas, you may be wise to graciously accept a subordinate role as his/her "helper." True experts deserve respect. The pretentious-but-not-real expert is relatively easy to deal with because he/she (unlike liars or cons) is often unaware of how little he/she knows. Such a person can be gently confronted with the facts. Do it when alone with them. Help them save face. They simply want to be admired.

Another "burden" to any group is *the pessimist* --the person who always says, "It won't work" or "We tried that." These angry, bitter people have the power to drag us down because they stir up the old pool of doubt and disappointment within us. So, first of all, avoid being sucked into his/her cesspool of hopelessness. Don't argue with the pessimist; don't immediately offer solutions to the difficulties predicted by the pessimist. Instead, make optimistic statements--showing that change is possible--and encourage the group to brainstorm leading to several possible alternatives. Then ask what are the worst possible consequences of each alternative (this gives the negativist a chance to

do his/her thing but you can use the gloomy predictions in a constructive, problem-solving way). Also ask, "What will happen if we do nothing?" Finally, welcome everyone's help but be willing to do it alone because the pessimist won't volunteer.

Every organization has *a "staller*," a person who puts off decisions for fear someone will be unhappy. Unlike the super-agreeable, the staller is truly interested in being helpful. So, make it easier for him/her to discuss and make decisions. Try to find out what the staller's real concerns are (he/she won't easily reveal negative opinions of you). Don't make demands for quick action. Instead, help the staller examine the facts and make compromises or develop alternative plans (and decide which ones take priority). Give the staller reassurance about his/her decision and support the effective carrying out of the decision.

Several other books offer help with critical, nasty or impossible people (Glass, 1995; Ellis & Lange, 1994; NiCarthy, Gottlieb & Coffman, 1993; Bernstein & Rozen, 1989; Carter, 1990; Solomon, 1990; Brinkman & Kirschner, 1994). Also see the bibliography at the end of this chapter. There is hope.

Love your enemies, for they tell you your faults.

Driving each other crazy

Sometimes our friend or lover does things that "drive us crazy." We probably don't know how he/she does it, we just know we feel very uncomfortable--angry, put off, used, etc. Bach and Duetsch (1979) suggest these feelings arise because this person sends us a mixed message. On the surface, the person seems to be saying "everything is OK, please don't change" but underneath there is a subtle request for a change. It's upsetting because one can't stay the same and change too. Why are the requests for changes hidden and denied? Because it is scary to be critical, maybe even aggressive, and to bluntly ask a friend or partner to change. We are afraid of anger and rejection. Yet, we all have a right to clear information, to our feelings, to some space, and to some power to influence things. In their book, Bach and Duetsch give hundreds of examples of "crazymaking" interactions:

"*Your-wish-is-my-wish*" is when we accommodate every whim of the other person, not out of love but out of fear of having a conflict. Eventually, anyone would want to change this one-sided situation but

might, by then, be reluctant to request the change openly. (See codependency in chapter 8.)

"*Divining*" is expecting your loved one to know exactly what you want; if he/she doesn't know, you conclude that he/she doesn't love you. "*Mind-reading*" is believing you know the thoughts and motives of your partner better than he/she knows him/herself. This leads to "analysis" which is "*let-me-explain-you-to-you* ;" this often drives the other person away since he/she may need some personal space, not a free, unwanted psychoanalysis.

"*Mind-raping*" is telling the other person what to think and how he/she should feel, so that he/she feels confused if his/her thoughts and feelings differ from your prescriptions. "*Mind-ripping*" is when you behave as though the other person has asked you to do something, like giving advice to him/her, only he/she hasn't made such a request.

"*Red-cross-nursing*" is creating a need in another person that only you can fill, thus, making yourself indispensable. Stern (1988) says neediness and perfectionism force us to try to be indispensable and take on too much. "*Overloading*" is giving so many facts or orders that the other person can't possibly handle the situation comfortably. "*Gunny sacking*" is storing up many, many grievances and then dumping them all of a sudden on the other person. Naturally, these kinds of things can drive the other person crazy.

What can be done about these crazymaking situations? Bach and Deutsch recommend these steps: (1) When you feel you are being driven crazy (stung, confused, manipulated), step back from the situation and try to see what is happening. Tactful, direct requests for change will work much better for you than subtle or deceptive manipulation. Remember the other person is making you crazy, in this case, because he/she wants the relationship to continue. Ask yourself: "What changes do they want me to make?" (2) Become aware of the conditions that underlie crazymaking--the other person's fear of rejection, feelings of powerlessness, and fear of requesting a change. (3) Do not react hostilely to the crazymaking, even if it is very bothersome. The villain is not the other person, it is his/her (or your) inability to be open about requesting the changes needed. Bring these desired changes into the open. (4) Respect the other person's rights and your rights, including the rights to honest information, feelings, space, and some power. Try to lessen the fear. (5) Don't read minds. Earnestly ask for clear information, especially how the other person sees the situation and feels. Share your own views and feelings; make yourself vulnerable (this reduces the other person's fears). But limit the discussion to the issue at hand. Find out exactly what changes are wanted now by both of you. (6) Check out your assumptions about the other person. This is called "mind reading with permission" (see checking out our hunches in chapter 13). (7) Try to arrive at a fair compromise with both of you making some desired changes.

Competition and Feeling Superior to Others

Gender differences in values, purposes, self-esteem, and orientation

No human trait is so emphasized as gender. We are deluged, even as infants, with "Oh, you're a *big* boy" or "you are such a *pretty* little girl." Why is this such a critical differentiation? Would it make much difference in a non-sexist society if you were a boy or a girl? No. Yet, as Freud observed, the first thing we instantly determine, when meeting someone new, is gender--is this person male or female? Indeed, it will probably trouble us if we can't tell which gender the person is (even though we have no reason to know)! Maybe this "need to know" has something to do with "knowing how to act" with this person... or establishing a pecking order... or with sex... or all of the above.

In chapters 6 and 8, we focused on feeling inferior, dependency, and submissiveness. Here we will deal with the opposite--male dominance and *feeling superior* to women. (Note: besides gender, humans use several other bases for feeling superior: looks, wealth, education, status, job, race-ethnic group, nationality, religion, morals, size, talent, etc.) Of course, not all men have power and arrogantly dominate women; indeed, according to Farrell (1993), many men are dominated by "the system" and considered disposable. Also, women are given certain advantages and "protected" in many ways that men do not enjoy. Farrell contends that believing (falsely) that men have all the power and advantages leads to women feeling oppressed and angry. As a result of women's unhappiness and criticism, men feel unappreciated. Altogether, the misunderstandings between the sexes are keeping the sexes apart. This is an important thesis. Clearly, each sex has and utilizes power in certain ways and we are getting more equal, but, clearly, the sexes aren't equals yet.

Four major areas of fascinating research highlight male-female differences in dominance or striving for superiority (and the inevitable feelings of success or failure). First is Gilligan and other's work, discussed in chapter 3, showing how women's values differ from men's. Women are concerned with developing personal relationships and helping others; men compete for powerful positions. Second is developmental psychology, showing boys' aggressiveness and resistance to control by females. Third is linguistics, showing how women's fundamental purpose is different from men's when they converse. Men are always "proving themselves;" women are always trying to be liked (excuse my over-generalizations). Fourth is in learning, showing that women attempt to learn in different ways than men. Women try to identify with the person expressing a different opinion so they can see the reasoning and new perspective involved; men almost immediately start to question and argue with the different view. These four aspects of living are worth a little more discussion in

hopes that you can determine if feeling superior or inferior applies to your personal interactions with people.

Ever insurgent let me be,
Make me more daring than devout;
From sleek contentment keep me free,
And fill me with a buoyant doubt.
-Louis Untermeyer

Competition vs. cooperation (values)

Humans seem preoccupied with the question, "Who is best?" In chapter 5, we talked about feeling anxious and inadequate in some tasks (relative to other people). In chapter 6, we dealt with depression and feeling inferior (as a person) to others. In chapter 7, the topics were hostility, discrimination, and feeling superior to others. In chapter 8, there was an extended discussion of dependency and women's socially assigned subordinate roles. Over and over it appears as though we are thinking about "Who is on top?" and "How do I measure up?" This destructive, competitive, win-lose situation, discussed fully by Kohn (1986), is connected with personally feeling superior--chauvinistic--or inferior to others.

It takes Kohn an entire book to summarize the massive data indicating that competition in our society is harmful. Yet, our culture proclaims (without adequate supporting data) just the opposite, that competition is efficient, healthy, and fun. Actually, hard research data documents that people achieve more if they work cooperatively with others (than if they work competitively). We are so brainwashed, we find that hard to believe. (Think of it this way: trying to do your best is very different from trying to beat everyone else.) On the other hand, we can readily accept that a competitive job, school, or social situation, where someone wins by making others fail, causes dreadful stress, resentment of the winner, contempt for the losers, low self-esteem, and major barriers to warm, caring, supportive relationships. What is the solution? Kohn recommends replacing competition with cooperation, i.e. working together, assuming responsibility for helping each other do our best, and uncritically valuing each other's contributions. We need lots of research to help us to know when and how to reduce our competitiveness. To change our goals in life from competition to cooperation, we need new values and a new philosophy of life (see chapter 3). Competition implies a hierarchy; cooperation implies equality.

Kohn is raising fundamental questions about deeply ingrained American ideas, such as "winning is important," "you should be proud of beating someone who is good," and "you must feel badly since you lost." These beliefs in competition remain strong (although all of us have suffered defeats). Our society is in a slow evolution in which

various feelings of superiority are being challenged. For instance, feelings of sexual and racial superiority--chauvinism--have been hot issues for many years (Korda, 1975; Faludi, 1991). But I believe that superiority-inferiority feelings permeate our society, even in many ways we do not commonly acknowledge. Examples: Developed nations feel superior to less developed ones and take pride in beating other countries. Older persons and parents feel superior to youth. Youth feel superior (more "with it") to older persons. Owners and bosses feel superior to workers. The wealthy (even if it was inherited) feel superior to the poor. The smart and/or educated feel superior to the less well trained. Urban dwellers feel superior to persons who live on farms or ranches. The religious feel superior to other religions and non-believers. Women often feel superior to men in terms of morals. Maybe we all strive for some sense of superiority, as Adler suggested. Perhaps this is because we all feel inferior in some ways. Maybe we just grab on to a feeling of superiority whenever we can because it feels good. But, this self-centered I'm-better-than-you attitude causes many interpersonal and societal problems. The good news is: people can and do change their attitudes.

Every person I meet is in some way my superior; and in that I can learn from him/her.

Early developmental differences between boys and girls

Gender prejudice and discrimination results, I assume, from boys and men feeling they are superior to girls and women. Where could such an idea come from? We don't know but some interesting things are known. For instance, before we are 3 years old, there are fascinating differences between how boys and girls interact (DeAngelis, 1989). Boys attempt to dominate, to control, to find out "Am I better than you?" They do this by little contests ("I can build my blocks higher than you") or by being aggressive, if necessary. They establish their status and then continue to try to use power to improve their position in the "pecking order." In contrast, girls and women try to establish and improve their relationships, as if they were always asking "Do you like me?" Because boys and girls want to do different things, boys and girls start avoiding each other at 3 or 4. By age 6, girls so dislike the rough competitive play and domination by boys that they choose girls over boys as playmates 10 to 1. Little boys don't like "girl's games" either (no chance to "prove themselves" or afraid of being a "sissy?"). Indeed, if asked, boys will express horror at the idea of suddenly becoming girls; girls aren't horrified of becoming a boy, they quickly recognize the advantages of being a boy. Boys constantly want to win at active, competitive activities and seem less interested in "winning friends." Several studies have also found that older boys will comply with a male peer's suggestion but will stubbornly not

comply with the same suggestion from a female peer. This is especially true if other males are watching (trying to build their status?).

Radical feminists have contended that our society teaches males to hate females. If so, exactly how is that done? We don't yet know. The Psychoanalysts believe little boys 3 to 6 undergo great turmoil as they must give up their identification with a close, nurturing mother and switch it to a father. In this process, boys may be unwittingly taught to dislike, even disdain female (mother's) characteristics in order to give them up; thus, the "hatred" of women's ways (and little girls) may be generated in little boys. Also, in this early process, boys may learn to suppress their urges to show affection (to mother especially) but also that loosing intimacy (with mother) can cause great pain; perhaps this is the origin of some grown men's fear of intimacy (Hudson & Jacot, 1992). Girls, since they never have to give up their identification with mother, tend to develop a fear of possible separation which results in greater needs for intimate affiliation. On the other hand, girls do have to shift their sexual orientation from a mother-like person to a father-like person, and boys do not. This may help explain boys' greater focus on the female body as a sexual object (more than male bodies being a sexual stimulus for women), boys' greater homophobia, males' greater emphasis on sex and less on closeness, and other differences between male and female sexuality. So, according to Judith Viorst (1986) in *Necessary Losses*, we all suffered a serious loss (boys giving up Mom as identification and girls giving up Mom as a sexual object) that has a permanent impact on our personalities.

Male aggression and female loss of self-esteem

At this point, psychologists don't know for sure how little boys are taught to disdain girls or why boys feel superior, are more aggressive, and are especially uncooperative with females. We only have hunches, but gaining more knowledge is critical. Males commit 90% of all violent crimes; this violence needs to be stopped (Miedzian, 1991; Stoltenberg, 1990). Neither do we know why the self-esteem of girls drops markedly at ages 12 or 13 or why girls are more cooperative and involved in relationships (Gilligan, Lyons & Hanmer, 1990). Before puberty, girls do better than boys in school, have better social skills, and have a lot of confidence. After puberty, girls do less well in school, lose confidence, worry about their bodies and diets, get hurt in relationships, and become more depressed. Actually, interesting recent research indicates that *the drop in math and science grades only occurs in girls from traditional families* in which gender roles are emphasized and the mothers are assigned the child-rearing role. (Good news! 2002 data indicate girls do almost the same as boys in math.) Girls from egalitarian families (who divide the child-care duties more or less equally) were apparently not taught that technical subjects were too hard for them or inappropriate. Girls in egalitarian families also spent seven more hours per week with their fathers than girls in traditional families. These findings are reported in *Psychology Today*, August, 1996, and based on Kimberly A. Updegraff's research as a graduate student at Penn State. Good fathering is important.

Since research gives us only a few hints about the causes of these many changes in girls at puberty, we can only speculate (see Brown & Gilligan, 1993; Orenstein, 1994; Nolen-Hoeksema & Girgus, 1994), but it seems unlikely that genes and hormones cause females to be smarter before puberty and dumber afterwards. I'm betting girls' self-esteem, performance in math (see new data above) and science, and career aspirations plummet because (1) parents and teachers give boys more encouragement in these areas, (2) girls with fantastic looks rate much higher with boys (and girls) than those with fantastic smarts, and (3) high grades become associated with geeks. Thus, the peer culture and attitudes also seem to share some responsibility for crushing girls' spirit. There is no known evidence, yet, that unhappy or psychological dysfunctional families are a major cause of these puberty related deficits, although a child's general adjustment and happiness is generally correlated with family adjustment.

Informed parents can help their daughters (Eagle & Colman, 1993; Debold, Wilson & Malave, 1994; Pipher, 1994) through this stressful period, even though the causes--nature or nurture--for the problems are not known for sure. Girls can help themselves too (Abner & Villarosa, 1996). Considering the divorce rate, abuse rate, crime rate, and the frequency of aggression and wars, one would think we humans would demand research to clarify these fascinating and critical aspects of our children's sex role development. See chapter 6 for a discussion of why females, starting during adolescence, are twice as depressed as males (sexual abuse by men may account for a significant degree of the gender differences in depression).

Differences between men and women in conversation

In my opinion, one of the most beneficial areas of research has been the studies of conversations between males and females. In brief, this research indicates that the young boy-girl interaction styles described above continue for a life-time in our male-female conversational styles. Men and women operate in two very different social worlds. Men are in an ongoing contest, competing with everyone by displaying their competence and skill. Why don't men ask for directions when lost? Because it puts them in a you-know-more-than-I-do position. Women are cautious but persistently seek intimacy; they want emotional support, cooperation, and praise. Given these different orientations, it is no wonder the sexes have trouble communicating!

But if both sexes understand where the other is "coming from," the conflicts can be reduced. Examples: a man can gain an understanding of how his wife can love talking on and on to her female friends about a problem and never receive any advice or criticism. The women are interacting to get support, not solutions. Women can come to understand why men shift the topic to something they did and/or something they know about, rather than asking questions as a woman would (asking questions might suggest the other person knows more). Many men relish getting into lively arguments about politics, sports, or a professional issue. Like boys at play, men are establishing their place

in the pecking order. They enjoy the competitive process, e.g. men like their debate opponents *better* afterwards; women tend to like any challenger or debater *less* afterwards. If we fully recognize these major differences between men and women, we can understand that the man, trying to be helpful, offers his wife a solution to the problem she is sharing; she gets mad because he seems to be assuming that he could handle the problem better than she could. Besides, his giving advice cut her off from telling all the details and her feelings! He can't understand why she becomes mad at him after he tries to help, and then he gets mad at her for being a "typical woman."

Women's ways of knowing

This is a serious communication problem. Women start more conversations than men, ask more questions, attempt to put the other person at ease more, are more supportive of the talker, and generally take more responsibility for the overall social situation. These are valuable, commendable skills. Men not only change the topic more but they do *95% of the interrupting of women* in mixed company. This is observable chauvinism. Kohn (1986) points out that it would be very regrettable if women, in the process of being liberated, became as competitive and concerned with status (feeling superior?) as men are. Males too can learn listening and empathy responding skills (chapter 13) and it will be a better world. Tannen (1990, 1993), Gray (1993), and Elgin (1993) are all good sources of information and help in this general area. Tannen (1994) concentrates on communication between the sexes at work.

Men and women respond differently to new and challenging ideas.

The book, *Women's Ways of Knowing*, by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule (1986) describes a feminine learning style that fits well with women's conversational style. Example: When women hear a new or different idea, they set their doubts and disbelief aside and tune in carefully to what the person is saying; they try to see it from the other person's view point. Women try to understand the other person's opinion as completely and deeply as possible; they cognitively "go with them," wanting to hear the person's views and understand why they think this way. Women seek to make sense of the new idea, to grasp how it can be seen as accurate and useful. This is certainly a "way of knowing" and could be called *the "believing approach*." It involves empathizing with the speaker to cooperatively assimilate the truth together, i.e. cooperating. Women effectively use this same listening style when someone has a personal problem.

Accurate observation is necessary to succeed in most areas. But we must remember that there are two worlds: one we can measure with a stop watch and a ruler, the other we can only feel and judge within our hearts.

Contrast this with a common male approach: When someone expresses a new idea or one you (a male) don't agree with, you immediately start arguing in your head. You try to stay unbiased and coolly impersonal, if you can, but you question the validity of everything--"How do you know that?" "Is that logical?" "How reliably was that measured?" "Aren't some other experimental approaches or control conditions needed?" "Aren't there exceptions or other explanations or conclusions possible?" "What are this person's motives and biases?" This is critical thinking; it is the essence of the scientific method; you could call it *an adversarial or "doubting approach*." You all know this approach; researchers attack each other's conclusions; it is about all you get in school. In academia it is the only respected way of knowing. Too bad. Men like the intellectual game. It is like arguing--trying to find out who is superior. Women frequently dislike this kind of discourse, believing arguments don't influence anyone's thinking and reduce intimacy. Some careful thought will surely convince you that every person needs to use both "ways of knowing." Both are valuable skills.

A discussion is an exchange of knowledge; an argument is an exchange of ignorance.

So, this short review should alert you that when men and women interact with others, they are very different. These interactional styles and personal values may be the differences that cause men and women the most trouble. Let's look at some of the other gender differences.

Society establishes gender roles for men and women

As mentioned above, the different ways of males and females interacting fit nicely with differences in men and women's value

systems (chapter 3). Women value being sensitive and maintaining good relationships, i.e. attachment over achievement; men value gaining status by following "the rules," i.e. achievement over attachment. Since our society values competition and individuals being successful on their own, women's orientation towards caring for others and/or cooperatively building the community is considered (by the male dominated society) to be of lesser importance. These value differences are reflected in the gender roles established by our culture, such as:

Males are urged to excel, e.g. "to become the president"--they are supposed to grow up to be powerful; they don't show their weaknesses; they are valued; they are preferred; they are encouraged more and prepared better for careers than females are; they are expected to be tough, independent, demanding, aggressive, good problem-solvers, and on and on. Thus, men are expected and prepared to strive for superiority. In short, to be "a man" the rules are:

1. Don't be a sissy (be different from women, no whining)
2. Be important (be superior to others)
3. Be tough (be self-sufficient, don't be a quitter)
4. Be powerful (be strong and dominate others, even by violence)

Furthermore, what makes a man a "real catch?" What makes men sexy (besides a great body)? Success! Being better than others and capable of achieving in ways that make money! Surely this motivates men.

Gender roles for women

Women are encouraged to be good mothers --they need, therefore, to first attract a man to depend on; they are expected (by our culture) to be giving, emotional, unstable, weak, and talkative about their problems; they are valued for their looks or charm or smallness but not their strength or brains; they are considered unfeminine ("bad") if they are ambitious, demanding, and tough or rough; they are expected to follow "their man" and give their lives to "their children," and on and on (Pogrebin, 1980). Thus, women are expected to serve others, to sacrifice their ambitions and personal needs in order to please and care for others. See *Too Good for Her Own Good* by Bepko & Krestan, 1990.

And, what makes a woman a "great catch?" What makes women sexy? A pretty face and a great body! Women compete on the basis of their looks. This may interfere with women's motivation to achieve and be successful. Oprah recently asked young people which they would rather be: attractive or intelligent? An amazing percentage said attractive. What counts in this culture is how attractive you are, especially if you are a woman.

Without any doubt, most of the traditional gender or sex roles served a valid and useful purpose 20,000 years ago when we lived in caves and strong, capable hunters were especially valued because they brought home more meat. At the same time, however, some women were regarded as goddesses and bearers of the miracle of birth. Gradually, women became less respected. Then, about 400 years ago, in 1486, two Dominican friars wrote Malleus Maleficarum (The Witches' Hammer), which became religion's guide to witch-hunting for 200 years. "Witch" and "women" were used synonymously. Jane Stanton Hichcock (1995) quotes from that book: "All wickedness is but little to the wickedness of a woman... It is not good to marry: What else is woman but a foe to friendship, an inescapable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic danger, a delectable detriment, an evil of nature, painted with fair colors." This book was endorsed by the Catholic Church, the mother of all Christian churches. We must recognize the roots of our culture.

Within the two career families of today, the women-are-inferior attitude is muted and concealed, but the archaic sex role expectations are still subtly there. The old rules still serve to "put down women and keep them in their place." Sixty years ago, Margaret Mead told us, based on what is done in other cultures, that it wasn't innate for men to be decision-makers and breadwinners or for women to be subservient and raise children. Nevertheless, our culture continues to pressure us to conform to these gender roles and do what we are "supposed to do" (see chapter 8); the cultural, family, and friends' expectations become internalized as our own self-expectations; guilt may result if we don't follow the prescribed roles. Notice how people react to a man who decides to stay home and take care of the kids.

Civilization is the encouragement of differences. Civilization thus becomes a synonym of democracy. Force, violence, pressure, or compulsion with a view to conformity, is both uncivilized and undemocratic.
-Mohandas Gandhi

Gender roles limit what both males and females can do. In effect, these sex roles enslave us--force us to be what others want us to be. We could be free to choose our own life goals and roles (from both male and female gender roles) and that is called androgyny. See Cook (1985), Bem (1976, 1993), Kaplan and Bem (1976), or Lorber (1994) for a discussion of gender roles and inequality. The most recent suggestion is to completely disassociate gender from all personality traits. That makes sense. Why should submissiveness or cooperation be considered feminine? They are human traits, not just traits of women! Just define what each personal trait, such as submissiveness, involves in terms of actions and feelings--and let each human being

decide how submissive or cooperative he/she is and wants to be. Indeed, the current masculine-or-feminine classification of traits is silly, e.g. men are unemotional (that idea really ticks me off!), women are illogical (prove it!), men are independent (then let them clean, cook, and iron!), women are home-oriented (tell my female doctor, dentist and veterinarian that!), men are not concerned about their appearance (Ha!), etc.

The future can be better. A recent survey found that three out of four *mothers*, even of young children, *like or love their work outside the home*. As a culture we can make work even more gratifying. With excellent child care and educational programs we can be more at ease about our children while at work. With families consisting of only one or two children and the productive years extending to 70 or 75, it seems likely that every woman will want and need an interesting career.

Recent history of changes in gender roles

A little history (also see chapter 8): by the 1960's we had developed an affluent society--two kids (thanks to birth control), two cars, TV, dish washers, fast food, etc.--but women, especially educated women, started to realize that life was surely more than buying hamburgers and driving the kids to music lessons or ball practice. Women, clearly capable of achieving in the work place, resented being forced into unrewarding homemaker roles; they wanted to have their freedom, to be liberated (Freidan, 1963). The Women's Movement was one of several gigantic, wonderful ground swells of freedom and idealism in the 1960's. Women all over the nation between 20 and 50 joined "consciousness raising groups" and supported each other to go to college or get a job, to ask their husbands to help with child care, cooking, and cleaning. Women's liberation, coupled with a growing concern about over-population of the world, new birth control methods, equal education for women, and changing economic times, started the long, slow process of changing the traditional, male-dominated family. Women fought for equality and a second income was more and more needed.

In the U.S., the biggest ongoing social evolution in the 1990's is still the fight for gender equality. It seeks equal rights for women: equal pay for equal work, equal educational and career opportunities, equal treatment in the law, finances, politics, sports, etc. It also seeks to eliminate sexual harassment and *sex-role stereotyping* in which women are seen as dependent on and inferior to men; as ignorant about cars, money-matters, and politics; as sexual objects for men to leer at (while the object remains naive and innocent); as neurotic, emotional, irrational, weak characters needing protection; as attractive creatures who wait for the right man to come along, have babies, become good mothers, and then have no idea what to do for the last 40-50 years of their lives. Legally, women and blacks became equal to white men in the 1960's but much changing still remains to be done.

It is hard to even imagine gender equality *if* you are a woman and your father always dominated your mother, *if* your teachers paid more attention to and encouraged boys more; *if* you are afraid your boyfriend or husband might leave you rather than accept you as an equal; *if* your church worships a male god and says the man should head the family; *if* your culture thinks women are exciting sexual objects but emotional, naive, dependent, and weak; *if* women are blamed for teen pregnancy and male violence and the solution is seen as putting women back in the kitchen and men back in charge; *if* your social group thinks women's looks are more important than their brains or hearts; *if* your girlfriends are much more emotionally involved in their relationships than in their activities and achievements; *if* you are scared to live life without a male partner; if you doubt yourself and distrust other women; *if* 44% of the women you know have been degraded and raped or nearly raped, and so on.

What can help you run the gauntlet? Liberated friends are helpful. Reading can raise your consciousness. You can assertively insist on women's rights when confronted with prejudice. You can raise your daughters as competent, self-confident, self-directed (without cultural restrictions), independent decision-makers. It is encouraging to realize other women are making progress (see chapter 8). About 20% of baby boomers have chosen to be childless, compared to 10% a generation earlier. During the last 10 to 20 years, if a couple decides to have children, most women work outside the home after the children are in school, partly because it is satisfying and partly because it has become economically necessary.

Ironically, as the concept of gender equality grows, women see more clearly what they deserve and their oppression is felt more keenly. This hopefully means for couples that equality will gradually be achieved, i.e. first the most troubling unfairness between two people is corrected, then another inequity comes into focus to be corrected, etc., etc. For both men and women the gender conflict may seem like an unending process ("She is never satisfied" and "He gives in a little but it still isn't fair"). Equality is a fantastic revolution in the history of humans--and *we* are living it. It can't be done instantly. We have to be tolerant but constantly demanding that justice be done. We also have to guard against "back lash," e.g. when a women acts more like a man at work (aggressive, loud, hot-headed, arrogant, demanding, and demeaning), she is vilified while a man is more likely to be tolerated and excused. Such behavior is unacceptable; the gender of the inconsiderate person doesn't matter.

In case you are thinking that things have already become pretty equal and fair between men and women in business, consider this: in a recent list of the top 800 CEO's in this country, only one was a woman! And she had started her own business, i.e. she had not been selected by men to head a corporation! Now, do you suppose that *all* of those 799 CEO's are really better managers than any female in the world? Or, are we still prejudice? There is also evidence that bright, ambitious, able, progressive women are paying a price for leading the

way in a not-yet-egalitarian society, namely, self-doubts, depression, eating disorders, headaches, and other illnesses.

Gender roles for men

The old male sex roles gave power and advantages to males but also created problems for men. As noted in chapter 7, boys and men are much more free to express anger than any other emotion. This is related to their high rate (compared to females) of criticizing, scapegoating, and attacking other people. Unfortunately, they are also three times more likely to be hyperactive than girls and they are more likely to believe their problems are caused by outside factors; whereas, females are more self-blaming. Males try to avoid problems; they distract themselves. In contrast, females talk out their problems with friends. It looks like boys are headed for trouble from an early age.

Besides the aggression-related problems of males, one can imagine many other problems: if you are expected to be superior, always perfectly in control of things and "cool" in appearance, it is a constant strain to meet those standards. Also, if you are expected to be a strong, unemotional, independent, competitive, and aggressive "tiger" at work, it is hard to come home and be a "pussy cat," being an interdependent equal, washing the dishes, bathing the kids, sharing your self-doubts and remorse about conflicts at work, and being soft and caringly intimate with others (Fasteau, 1974). Women seem to want both--an ambitious, successful Rockefeller at work and a relaxed, empathic Dr. Spock at home. Men are saying to women, "if you like the drive, intellect, and toughness that gets me promoted and a Mercedes, why do your expect me to be completely different as a dinner partner? You can't have both!" The truth is maybe you can have both, but the point is: some (not many) men feel as dehumanized when they are judged by their job or income or car as women feel when they are judged by their weight or breasts or clothes.

If a male alone is expected to provide well for a family, he will ordinarily have little time to relax and enjoy home life, little time to get to know his own children. Men need freedom too--freedom from all the financial responsibility for the family, freedom from the demand that they be a "real men and not cry or be sissies," freedom from the urge to compete and prove their superiority in every interaction, freedom to be equally involved with child care, freedom to have intimate friendships, freedom from being held responsible for the female's sexual satisfaction, freedom from having their personal worth being based almost entirely on their success at work, etc. (Farrell, 1975, 1993).

Males who adopt *extremely macho* traits and superior attitudes run the risk of several other major problems (Stillson, O'Neil & Owen, 1991). Examples: the highly masculine stereotype has been shown to be associated with family violence, delinquency, fights while drinking, child sexual abuse, and rape. The macho male suppresses feelings

and, thus, has more health and psychological problems as well as more superficial and fragile relationships. These facts should help the tough, loud, dominating, belligerent male re-consider his life style. Almost no one, except a few insecure, hostile buddies, respects the inconsiderate, aggressive male. It is certainly to the credit of enlightened males that they have moved away from the destructive aspects of the highly masculine sex role stereotypes, but Robert Bly (1990) believes many men have become "soft" (insecure and indecisive?) in the process and lost their resolve to do what they think is right. Guard against confusing being good (sensitive to others' needs, assertive, strong, and cooperative) with being weak (self-depreciating, scared, and self-absorbed). Besides Bly, there are other books for adult males having problems with their emotions: Pittman (1992) and Allen (1993).

Naturally, men have felt attacked by feminists and some, like Bly, have recently insisted that the male role should be as a strong leader. However, mental health professionals do not recommend Bly's book (Santrock, Minnett & Campbell, 1994). Perhaps the major spokesperson during the 1980's on male issues has been Herb Goldberg (1976, 1980), a psychologist who denounces the traditional tough, silent, unfeeling, unempathic man. He thinks men are killing themselves by trying to be "true" men. Instead, men should get in touch with their feelings, their bodies, their close relationships (or lack of them), and their basic purposes in life. Goldberg thinks men should stay assertive and independent, but increase their sensitivity to others, their inner awareness of emotions and values, and their commitment to others. In short, they wouldn't become less of a "man" but rather a more complete, wiser, caring man (Fanning & McKay, 1994).

More male-female differences

Are there additional differences between men and women? Yes, there are probably many differences besides physical size and strength, breasts, and genitalia (McLoughlin, 1988). We don't understand why but many more males are conceived and then spontaneously aborted. Color-blindness, hemophilia, leukemia, dyslexia, left-handedness are more common in males. Certain diseases plague women (thyroid & bladder disorders, anemias, spastic colon, varicose veins, migraines, gallstones, arthritis, asthma) but men have deadlier problems (heart disease, strokes, emphysema) and more visual-hearing defects. In summary, women live 7 years longer, although sick more often.

Certain fascinating sex differences start early, e.g. infant girls seem to see faces better and are more responsive to people than boys are. Even as adults, research has shown that women can "read" non-verbal cues and most emotions better than men (not anger). By preschool, boys are more distractible (shorter attention span), aggressive (chapter 7), and more visually oriented. There have also been slight but consistent intellectual (may be nurture, not nature) differences: girls get better grades; high school males do a little better

in math and visual-spatial abilities; females used to do better in verbal abilities (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), although these test score differences are declining and may have disappeared. When older men and women have strokes on the left side, where language functions are thought to be, men are three times more likely to become aphasic (speech problems). This suggests speech is more concentrated on the left side in males than in females. Male and female brains may differ but the innate intellectual differences seem to be very slight.

Even where male and female average physical traits are clearly different--males are bigger, stronger, and faster--there is great overlap, i.e. the fastest female is much faster than most males. All of these group differences can be overcome by individual efforts, i.e. a woman can become very strong through exercise, very proficient in advanced math through classes, a superb combat soldier though training, etc. Just like a man can learn to be a great "mom," a wonderful conversationalist, an empathic listener, and a caring cooperator rather than a dogged competitor.

What and/or who is responsible for generating these gender roles? The genes must influence our physical structure and our health. Hormones surely also play a role: estrogen in females seems to produce better health (for reproducing the species?), especially less heart disease; testosterone in males increases their aggressive response to danger, and may be related to dominance and competitiveness. And, thirdly, we are taught by family and culture that boys (men) should behave certain ways and girls should be different, as discussed above. This may explain why female high school valedictorians outperform men in college but 2/3's start to *lower their aspirations* early in college and few go on to graduate school (exceptions are those women who develop a supportive relationship with a faculty member or who go to a women's college, where they become active "players" and leaders, not just "observers"). See earlier discussion of developmental differences.

Learning our gender roles: What do we want and expect of each sex?

Our parents start teaching us our roles shortly after birth, e.g. boys are cuddled, kissed, and stroked less than girls while girls are less often tossed and handled roughly. In playing with their infants, mothers mirror the young child's expressed emotions. But mothers play down the boy's emotions (in order to keep the boys less excited) while they reflect the baby girl's expressions accurately. Could this possibly be an early cause of adolescent boys denying emotional experiences and not telling others how they feel? We don't know. In addition, remember that boys between 4 and 7 must shift their identities from Mom to Dad. In that process, boys are chided for being a sissy ("like a girl") and we start shoving them on to bicycles and into Little League; they are praised for being tough; boys start to think they are superior or should be. From then on, schools, churches, governments, entertainment, and employers reinforce the idea that males are superior.

Another fascinating facet of gender sex roles is the fantastic emphasis in our culture on women's attractiveness (discussed in chapter 8). Clothing, hair styling, beauty aids, perfumes, special diets, exercise, and fitness aids cost uncountable hours and billions of dollars. The women's role forms only half of the commercially choreographed intercourse between the sexes: women agonizing over every detail of their appearance and men yearning and vying for the most beautiful play mate they can get. These "traps" consume enormous human energy. Rodin (1992) suggests ways women can avoid finding so much of her meaning in her body, but the other half of the solution involves teaching men to find other parts of females more attractive than her body, such as her brain and interesting ideas, her healthy personality, her interesting conversation, her good values and acts, her purposeful life, etc. If that could be done, it would provide a major revolution.

Misunderstandings between men and women about roles

There are lots of misunderstandings between men and women about gender roles. For example, many women think males want a maid--a wife who stays home, cooks, cleans, and isn't too smart. But many males *say* they want, more than anything else, a capable, assertive, happy partner, not just a housekeeper. Yet, about 40% of women feel like they are their husband's housekeeper and only 28% feel like his lover. That's sad. On the other hand, men think women want a big, burly, hairy, tough, handsome, "he-man" stud with money for a partner. Well, handsome maybe, but females do not admire an overly macho male. Even 15-20 years ago, being loving, gentle, warm, caring, intelligent, capable, self-confident, and willing to stand up for his beliefs was more important to women than being tough and fighting (Rambo type) or influential and obsessed with power (Donald Trump type) or a hunk making out sexually with lots of women (Tavris, 1977). What are the 1995 ideals?

It may surprise you but about 50% of *Psychology Today* respondents (both women *and* men) said *the ideal male* would above all else be introspective, wise, compassionate, and concerned with his own personal growth, i.e. self-actualizing (Keen & Zur, 1989). Another 25% said the ideal man's one "ultimate concern" would be "his family, i.e. being a good husband and father," 12% said his highest priority would be "helping others," 7% said "religion," only 4% said "his work," and the remaining 2% mentioned art, making money, sports or play, and political activity. The male *least admired* is cynical, selfish, materialistic, and violent (including personally fighting, watching violent sports, and hunting). Note that the ambitious, urbane, critical, sophisticated, organization man of the 1950's, willing to do anything to make it to the top, is *not* valued by these young, well educated respondents. However, it would be foolish to believe success is no longer highly valued. (Indeed, men predict business will change women, i.e. "power corrupts;" women think women will change the system.)

Surveys usually show that men support "women's issues," such as abortion and day care, more than women do! Surveys also have shown that women believe women's liberation has benefited men more then women! That is, women have assumed more responsibility for financially supporting the family (almost 60% are employed) than men have assumed for caring for the house and family. Hochschild (1989) interviewed 50 two-career couples and found that the women worked 15 hours more each week than their husbands did. Other studies report that 50-70% of women say their husbands don't do their share of the housework. It is interesting that 75% of women say men have excessive expectations of them in terms of housework and child care, but 80% of the women feel men underestimate women's ability at the work place. Hochschild offers solutions to this unfairness.

It seems clear that most women have changed in the last 30 years and many men have too. But *many men still have a lot of changing to do*. The ideals have already changed or are changing; males need to listen more, aggress less, and cooperate more. Husbands of working women are supposed to do an equal share of the housework and child care (remember 70% of such women believe their man isn't doing his share). Men must also take more responsibility for seeing that women are accepted, respected, and treated equally where they work. Men must challenge their male friends who still have the arrogant, unthinking, or sick chauvinist ideas underlying physical and sexual abuse and sexual harassment. Since overly masculine men don't take suggestions or orders from women well, males sympathetic with females must take the lead in vigorously confronting other males who are unaccepting, unfair, or abusive. This won't be easy. And, women need to provide other women with support groups and networks to counter the power-seeking "good old boys."

Among my college students, I often raise the question of why men have to do most of the approaching and asking out. The women invariably say that if they did the approaching, men would think they were being too aggressive or were sexually promiscuous, and, thus, wouldn't respect or like them. Almost 100% of men laugh at these notions and say they would love to be approached. Give it a try, women. Women have to do some changing too. None of us like to take the lead and then be rejected (see "meeting people" above).

What determines *who will be the boss* in a marriage? Mostly the *education of the wife*. Peplau, Rubin and Hill (1977) found that among dating couples 95% of the women and 87% of the men *say* that each sex should have exactly equal power in decision-making. But, less than half of the couples felt their relationship was, in fact, egalitarian. Among the remaining couples, two-thirds of the women and three-quarters of the men felt the man was more in control. *Three factors are related to power*: (1) the couple's ideas about gender roles, e.g. traditionalists think the man should make the *final* decisions, (2) the degree to which each one is "in love" or dependent on the other (the less involved partner has more power), and (3) the female's education (if she drops out of college, she is more likely to be dominated; if she

gets a graduate degree, she will probably have equal power). So, for an egalitarian relationship, the couple needs to be roughly equal in ability, in love, in neediness, and in education.

Who organizes and runs the family? Regardless of who is "the ultimate boss," there is an opportunity for someone to gain some satisfaction or status and power by becoming the family organizer or director. Often that is the wife, either as an assigned role (by the boss) or as a desired acquired role. Stern (1988) writes about *The Indispensable Woman*, who wants to be needed. So, she takes on a job for extra money, does the grocery shopping, cooking, cleaning, and laundry, keeps track of everyone's clothes and tries to monitor how everyone looks each morning, wants to look fantastic herself, finds the baby sitters, keeps everybody's schedule and makes sure they are on time, plans family activities and "lessons" for the children, helps her husband socialize, is sure the family would fall apart if she didn't run things for everyone, and feels overburdened and unappreciated! Solution: admit the overload is your fault (if it is), reassign some responsibilities and drop others, stop expecting perfection, and take time to find a life of your own. Bepko and Krestan (1990) have a similar notion, namely, that women are strongly driven to be "good" and please others; consequently, they take on too much and often feel insecure or unsure that they are good enough. Solution: stop kowtowing and self-sacrificing.

There are hundreds of books about sexism and how to deal with it. Some of the better early references about women's rights are Freidan (1963), Bengis's (1973) attack on men, Boston Women's (1972) well known catalog, Friedman's (1983) refutation of the idea that you're no body until somebody loves you, Friese, Parsons, Johnson, Ruble & Zellman's (1978) textbook, and Paulsen & Kuhn's (1976) handbook.

Feminists have kept up the attack on the unfairness. Susan Faludi (1991) describes many subtle but calculated scare tactics and attacks on feminism, including the frequent description of the single woman as neurotic, emotional, and miserable (e.g. Fatal Attraction), the erroneous but frightening contention that no males will be available for the single female over 30, the spreading of false rumors that women careerists were taking over law, medicine, dental, and other professions, and on and on for 460 pages. One of the most scathing attacks on men is MacKinnon's (1987) *Feminism Unmodified*, in which she underscores that 44% of women are raped or about raped because "men consider women inferior." See the discussion of date rape under premarital sex in chapter 10. She and others say pornography defiles all women because it portrays them as inferior, as sexual objects without personal significance or a soul. Men get defensive when they read these charges, but we all--men and women--must face reality, especially unpleasant reality.

There can be no doubt that many men still discount or put down women in many ways. Change is slow; it must also be sure. Brownmiller's (1984) book on *Femininity* is a gold mine of information.

Levine's (1992) *My Enemy, My Love* provides some interesting theories about why males and females frequently get angry with each other. An excellent analysis of gender stereotyping, including the misjudgment of women and mythical gender differences, has been done by Tavris (1992), a social psychologist and good writer.

Chauvinism

Chauvinism as a nation

Christopher Lasch (1979; 1984), a psychoanalytical historian, says we Americans are narcissistic and self-centered. We seek immediate happiness. Our society and even our therapies, he says, are designed to help us forget others and deny our moral responsibilities. We have little interest in the past or the future. We are trying to survive hard times, as best as we can, by focusing on our wants. Our affluent world is threatened; that makes us passive and defensive, it takes the fight out of us. We are holed up; we are not out there striving to make the world better--to feed the hungry, to treat the sick, to teach.... By being self-absorbed we hardly notice the suffering of others. We excuse our indifference to others. Lasch thinks we dream of success, greatness, and being happy in order to deny our frailties, fears, weaknesses, dependencies, and guilty consciences. We hope for easy political solutions to huge social problems.

According to Lasch, chauvinism and narcissism go together; they are opposed by the logic of democracy and the Golden Rule. Germany's insecurity before 1940 created an extreme chauvinism, leading to wars of conquest and to gas chambers. In that same Germany, the holocaust victims, feeling helpless, walked passively to their death and Anne Frank's family died carrying on "business as usual." Many Jews denied the dangers they faced. Many other people did nothing to help the Jews. In a similar way, during the "Cold War" the American people and the Soviet people (combining Hitler's arrogance with the holocaust victim's helplessness) conformed to their leaders' orders, namely, to prepare to destroy ourselves to "defend our way of life." The Cold War is over but we are still driven by the same pathological personality traits--the same willingness to let others think for us. When the world is in trouble, we--the people--must think for ourselves (not just unthinkingly follow a leader) and do something, we can't withdraw inside ourselves, like Narcissus. Perhaps seeing our motives more clearly, re-affirming our basic values, and gaining greater self-control (not national pride and political control by a glib leader) will reduce our hostile indifference to others (see chapters 3 and 7).

I would define liberty to be a power to do as we would be done by. The definition of liberty to be the power of doing whatever the law permits, meaning the civil laws, does not seem satisfactory.
-John Adams

Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.
-Thomas Jefferson

Chauvinism as parents and in child care

When conservative politicians, like Presidents Reagan and Bush, and anti-ERA people, like Phyllis Shafley, speak of keeping the *traditional* family strong, they usually mean keeping families emotionally close, with the father as the head. The threats to a patriarchal family are, in the words of a conservative minister, "uppity women" and "uppity children." Any suggestion of women having careers and democratically sharing power in the family threatens male dominance. Pogrebin (1983) contends that the traditional family really means "keep men in power, women in the kitchen, and children in awe." She says such *a traditional family is essentially child-hating*. Many parents fear and dislike children who are independent and defiant, feeling "their will must be broken." Thus, these parents have little empathy or respect for children and democratic decision-making. Such parents are dominant, over-controlling, and sometimes harsh and aloof with children. Such parenting may have permanent negative effects (see Table 9.2).

While some traditionalists adamantly favor (primarily for religious reasons) the rights of a 6-week-old fetus over the rights of the mother, when it comes to family decisions these same people frequently think it is absurd to give older children and teenaged daughters and sons the same rights, privileges, opportunities, and choices as parents have (Pogrebin, 1983). We must also ask ourselves: why are we so adamant about saving tiny unwanted fetuses but never demand that we save the lives of starving and sick children around the world?

How can chauvinism be reduced? As pointed out in the 1960's, we need to concentrate on the family and child rearing. About 55%-60% of today's families are traditional, only about 40% have nontraditional attitudes, i.e. children and parents have equal rights, boys and girls should have the same chances and choices, and "people in authority don't always know best." Pogrebin proposes several political-social-economic solutions for better child care: housing for all families, meaningful careers for both parents, tax breaks for having children and elderly in your home, professionally run day care centers, getting fathers highly involved in child care, increasing mutual respect and love within the family, etc. It's not clear how all these changes can be

accomplished, nor what the outcomes of the changes would be. However, some of these changes can be brought about by individual self-control.

About 70 years ago, Alfred Adler advocated democratic attitudes towards children, stressing mutual respect, encouragement, and reason. He opposed using rewards--bribes?--and punishment (because they underscore that the parent is in power and has the rewards to give); he opposed over-protecting, over-demanding and over-powering the child (Corsini & Painter, 1975; Dreikurs & Soltz, 1976). Discipline could be maintained, Adler thought, with family conferences and by using "natural consequences" (warning once and then letting the child learn from his/her mistakes) and "logical consequences" (agreeing to reasonable rules *in advance*, such as "you'll have to leave the room if you disrupt a conversation or someone watching TV").

When does child-care end? There are families in which the children dominate the parents; they may be indulged and catered to by self-sacrificing parents until they are 22 to 25. Indeed, most college students today expect their parents to pay for their education and parents seem to accept that responsibility. Related to this prolonged dependency, many parents get extremely upset if their "grownup children," say 20-years-old, make decisions they don't approve of, such as majoring in certain subjects, experimenting with drugs, dating another race or religion, living with someone of the opposite sex, etc. Why are parents so controlling? Why do they feel it is their right? Why do they distrust their 20-year-old's judgment? Why aren't college and post-college students more independent? As a society we don't seem to know how or when to let our children go free. Until the 1930's, children were commonly expected to be "on their own" after 14 (8th grade). Now, it is 22 (college). Will it be 30 in 2050 or back to 14?

It is hard for me to agree with Pogrebin that children, in general, are hated by traditional parents. I think children are most people's greatest treasure and joy. If children are hated, why do traditional and non-traditional parents give them so much--even paying for college--and expect so little from them? In my opinion, we may be harming our children, not because we dislike them, but because we fear that they will dislike us. By giving them everything and wanting their approval, we parents unintentionally keep them weak, dependent, insecure, and unable to help themselves. We need to research the consequences of prolonged dependency, either in college or in interminable welfare programs (see chapter 8). I think we should investigate the results of young people, starting at 12 or 13, being given much more personal, financial, and social responsibility than they are given now.

There are people who wish they had never had children and, fortunately, there is less social pressure to have children today. The world has enough children already (we let 42,000 die needlessly every day). If children would make you unhappy and unproductive or if you would make your children unhappy or unproductive, then don't have children. It is unwise to put social pressure on every couple to have

children. Starvation is enough reason to press every couple to not have more than two children.

Chauvinism in schools

Child care workers and teachers are in control of children almost as much as parents. In two career families, the nursery school has the child 9 or 10 hours a day. Shouldn't children be trained and educated from 1 to 5? If yes, we need trained child care workers. We also expect a lot from schools even though we assign one teacher to care for and teach 25 or 30 children. What can schools do if we parents send them students who have little practice at self-discipline, little understanding of the importance of learning, and little sense of their responsibility to make a contribution to the world? The fact is that schools from kindergarten to Ph. D. programs are chauvinistic in the sense that teachers assume they know what courses the students should take, when to read which chapters, when and how to evaluate the student's progress, etc. As long as students do not take responsibility for their own educational-career plans and motivation, someone else will (and often do a poor job of it).

Furthermore, recent research has shown that teachers (both male and female) unwittingly deal with boys differently than girls. They call on boys more often than girls; they give boys more time to reason out the answer; they encourage boys more to improve their performance (Sadker & Sadker, 1985). This boys-are-more-important attitude must change. In addition, schools are fully aware that male sports are more valued and given priority over female sports. The argument is that girls do not go out for sports as much as boys do. That's true, but if it is good for boys, why isn't it good for girls? As a society, we don't encourage, reward, and value girls in sports as much as boys. That needs to be changed too. Girls themselves and their parents also have to take some responsibility for having less interest in sports (and excessive interest in being "cute"). Perhaps as students gain self-awareness, new values, self-responsibility, and self-control, there will be less need for controls--presumptuous authority--in the schools and at home (Ernst, 1977).

Chauvinism at work

The greatest amount of unrecognized and unchallenged chauvinism is at work. We are in awe of the boss or owner. We certainly are awestruck by high authorities--the president of the U.S., the president of GM, any multi-millionaire, the state Governor, a local judge, general manager of a factory, president or dean of an university, etc. Indeed, we seem to want to believe that our authorities are superhuman...super-able (we like to pretend the president doesn't have speech-writers), super-smooth (we want them to always be prepared and right), and super-good (no vices), which, by contrast, only makes us ordinary people look inferior to leaders. Yet, my experience suggests to me that many people off the street, given a

little training, could do a very acceptable job in most of the positions just mentioned.

Our leaders are not incompetent, although Peter (1970) suggested that leaders get promoted until they can't handle their jobs very well. And, there they stay--at their "level of incompetence." Actually, most leaders, like the rest of us, have some special talents. My point is that ordinary people are not nearly as incompetent, relative to leaders, as we seem to feel. Many ordinary workers could supervise at least as well as their bosses; many students could teach and administrate as well as their instructors and deans; my father, a farm laborer with an 8th grade education, could probably have been just as good a state representative, governor, or even president as the actual leaders--a business man, a congressman, a general, an actor, a lawyer, etc. (He would have certainly been harder working, less self-centered, and more honest!) We must stop putting ourselves down and pumping up people who are in "superior" positions. Frederick Douglass, a black Abolitionist in the 1850's, contended that the oppressed handed over the power to the tyrant through their own self-depreciation and subservience. I think Douglass was right. At work many of us are still in master-slave relationships. Why? Partly because we sell ourselves short and have not yet assumed the responsibility for running our lives at work. *Our* welfare, as well as the owner's profit, depends on the quality of our product at work.

Work is so important: (1) it is where we spend much of our lifetime and utilize our talents, (2) it is our primary way of doing good for others beyond the family, (3) it is a major determinant of the quality of our lives, and (4) it is often filled with opportunities to relate to others and to gain real satisfaction. It is pathetic when people spend 50 years doing something they don't like and have little control over.

It would be worth a great deal of planning and energy for each of us to make our work enriching and enjoyable. How? (1) *Select your career carefully*, finding something interesting and challenging. Prepare for the job well--planning *superior training* for your life's work is your responsibility! No one else can or will do it for you. Then, do an excellent job and be proud of your work. (2) *Keep in mind the benefits others get from your work*; this will increase your intrinsic satisfaction. The benefits would be more clear if the dress-maker occasionally got to see women trying on clothes he/she has made, if the farmer got to see hungry people in Africa being fed his/her grain, if the worker in a pharmaceutical plant got to visit hospitals where his/her drugs are saving lives, etc. (3) *Assume more responsibility for producing a better product* more efficiently and in a more satisfying manner. Ideally, everyone should be involved in decision-making at work (see decision-making methods in chapter 13). There is solid evidence that good group decision-making is superior to decisions by individuals in power (Janis & Mann, 1977). Perhaps every boss should be just as accountable to subordinates (who would serve as an executive committee) as to his/her supervisors, both groups should be able to advise and fire him/her.

(4) *Accept the responsibility of assuring that your occupation does as much for others as possible*. We can not depend on governments, professions, and corporate management to be as moral and wise as we could be. Neither management nor labor unions will willingly give power back to the workers (Lasch, 1984, p. 51); we will have to take more responsibility for decisions at work and demand that wrongs be righted and that the products of our work serve others well. Perhaps work can become more of a way of enriching our lives, of giving to others, and less of a way for a few to make big profits. For example, how can we as laborers in steel mills and auto factories continue to demand $25 per hour when such high wages put us out of work? How can we as farmers accept payments for not producing and a distribution system that doesn't get our food to hungry people? How can we as educators think there is an over-supply of teachers when more than half the world can't read (actually 50% of Americans can't read well)? How can medical schools reduce enrollment when U.S. physicians make $200,000/year and there still are 2 or 3 billion people with little or no medical care? How can professionals "push" only the expensive forms of treatment and neglect the cheaper methods that might help many more? Each of us can become part of the solution, not part of the problem. This is part of learning to relate to and care for others in a self-responsible way.

Ideas are funny little things. They won't work unless you do.

Selected References for Understanding Relationships

Bernstein, A. J. & Rozen, S. C. (1992). *Neanderthals at work: How people and politics can drive you crazy...and what you can do about them*. New York: Wiley.

Brehm, S. S. (1985). *Intimate relationships*. New York: Random House.

Burns, D. D. (1985). *Intimate connections*. New York: New American Library.

Gazda, G. M., Asbury, F. R., Balzer, F. J., Childers, W. C., & Walters, R. P. (1991). *Human relations development*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Glass, L. (1995). *Toxic people: 10 ways of dealing with people who make your life miserable*.

Hamachek, D. E. (1982). *Encounters with others*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Horner, A. (1995). *The wish for power and the fear of having it*. New York: Aronson.

Johnson, D. W. (1981). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kleinke, C. L. (1986). *Meeting & understanding people*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Madenes, C. & Madenes, C. (1994). *The secret meaning of money: How it binds together families in love, envy, compassion, or anger*.

Marsh, P. (1988). *Eye to eye: How people interact*. Topsfield, Mass: Salem House Publishers.

Miller, S., Wackman, D., Nunnally, E., & Saline, C. (1981). *Straight talk*. New York: Signet.

NiCarthy, G., Gottlieb, N. & Coffman, S. (1993). *You don't have to take it: A woman's guide to confronting emotional abuse at work*. Seal Press Feminist.

Reese, B. L. & Brandt, R. (1987). *Effective human relations in organizations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Viorst, J. (1986). *Necessary losses*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bibliography

References cited in this chapter are listed in the Bibliography (see link on the book title page). Please note that references are on pages according to the first letter of the senior author's last name (see alphabetical links at the bottom of the main Bibliography page).