The Therapeutic Relationship: A literature review with clinical illustrations.

A Foucaultian view of Power within Masculinity and Psychotherapy.

Julian Wilson

A dissertation submitted to Auckland University of Technology,

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Health Science

2004

Contents

Attestation of Authorship

"I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the qualification of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement is made in the acknowledgments."

Julian Wilson

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge that for this dissertation ethics was approved by AUTEC on 23rd

April, 2002. Number 02/33

Thanks to Gudrun and Andrew, for all the time and effort put into the supervision

of this dissertation. Thanks to David Parker for help with the editing. In addition,

thanks Jody for being supportive through the whole process.

Abstract

This dissertation investigates the low participation of men in psychotherapy. It is a literature review focusing on power, masculinity and therapy, illustrated by clinical work to shed light on this phenomenon.

A Foucaultian view of power is used as the ability to influence others, and understood as separate from ideas of domination to allow power to be seen as a potentially constructive aspect of psychotherapy. Masculinity is positioned and viewed within the ideas of a Foucaultian understanding of power, and attention is given to how masculinity can be used to achieve power. Masculinity achieves this through being used in such a way that it positions itself as unseen, as invisible, as ordinary, as the natural order of things.

The understanding of power is also applied to the therapy setting to find that clients of therapy are positioned within a power structure to be seen, while the therapist remains mostly unseen. The contrast between the position of the client of therapy to be seen and the position of masculinity to be unseen allows an understanding of a conflict in the uses of power, and is suggested to contribute towards why men may not be therapy clients.

It is suggested that the therapist may have to give up the comfortable and safe position of being unseen, being expert, and being knowledgeable, to avoid therapeutic failure with men. This is done by being open with knowledge, explaining techniques and removing the pressure for the client to be seen.

This dissertation concludes that this may be a way to maintain a power relationship where the therapist and the masculinity can still interact and bring about change while allowing the male client to have choice and self-determination within the therapeutic process.

Chapter One: Introduction

Many scholars over the years have commented on the phenomenon that men are less frequently inclined to use psychotherapeutic services than women do for resolving their problems. They were less likely to engage in psychotherapy and usually left therapy earlier than women (Cottone, Drucker, & Javier, 2002; Levant, 1992; O'Neil, 1981; Wilcox & Forrest, 1992). Of course, there are many men who do attend therapy, and likewise many women who find therapy too difficult. Yet there is a noticeable trend for men not to be the clients sitting in the chairs of psychotherapists.

For this dissertation I am focussing on a Foucaultian view where ideas of power, masculinity and therapy overlap. I chose to write about men because I spent one summer working for a construction company, which employed a lot of working class and middle class men. I struggled to try to bring together the ideas, attitudes and culture I had from my psychotherapy training at AUT and the ideas attitudes and culture of the men I was working with. I noticed these men do not think much about therapy and I wondered why these men would seem so out of place in the therapy room. With this as a starting point, I quickly found many interesting and differing views in the literature that would contribute towards understanding men and masculinity. The attitudes I was interested in were around psychological independence, which led me to consider men's relationship with power. I thought that power was an important issue as a lot of the writing about men described issues related to power. A lot of literature also described men's difficulty with psychotherapy. Therefore, I wanted to investigate how power might play a role in

this, and thought that power dynamics in the psychotherapeutic setting may be contributing to the problem. That is, rather than it being something inherent in men's attitudes that makes psychotherapy difficult for them. The power disparity between therapist and clients may be contributing to a problem men have with psychotherapy.

I have used Foucault's ideas of how power is embodied, employed and enacted within relationships to be able to have a deeper understanding of power. I have found no reference in the literature that considered a Foucaultian understanding of power within therapy with men. The aim of this dissertation is to contribute towards making psychotherapy more accessible for men through a thorough investigation of the potential power dynamics in psychotherapy. I believe psychotherapists need to understand how men gain and lose power to help meet men more authentically.

This dissertation contains many limitations to hold in mind. The individual issues of power, masculinity, and psychotherapy I do not address in their entirety as it would be unmanageable for the scope of this dissertation. However, the lens that brings into view the over lap of power, masculinity and psychotherapy may be used to help therapists see how we engage with male clients within our creations of power. This understanding may lead to ways of being with clients that help move the therapy when it gets stuck and may hopefully be part of finding creative ways for psychotherapy to engage with and be useful for male clients. Many other issues can be analysed in understanding the difficulty for men and psychotherapy. I do not intend to say that power is the only problem; my argument is that power is an

important aspect of men within therapy, and I am using Foucault's understanding of power to create a view into this issue.

I found a lot of support for my ideas of men finding therapy difficult in the literature. Some writers like Levant (1992) look for an empathetic approach to the difficulties of men within psychotherapy. However, Levant (1992) does not use concepts of power to help understand men in therapy. Some writers, like Speer (2001), study men and their use of power but do not apply it to the context of men as psychotherapy clients. Writing about power, men, and therapy brings together three areas that have only been marginally discussed together in the existing literature.

This introduction has given a broad overview of the power issues and the dynamics generated in both the psychotherapeutic process and within masculinity. The following chapters will develop an understanding of the underlying dynamics, and informs both clients and psychotherapists about how power is used, and identifies some of the possible problems arising within therapy.

Chapter Two: Method

In this chapter, I will describe the theoretical perspective of a modified systematic literature review, and how I went about the data collection for this dissertation. I will then discuss my position as the author, ethical considerations and the use of illustrative client work.

The Theoretical Perspective

This dissertation study uses concepts of qualitative research within a modified systematic review. According to Dickson (1999), systematic reviews "locate, appraise and synthesise evidence from scientific studies in order to provide informative, empirical answers to scientific research questions" (p. 42). This involves finding and assessing previous research, comparing findings and conclusions to answer questions, and finding areas of further research. However, it must be pointed out that, in psychotherapy, research is often based on the therapists understanding, and as such is subjective (Hinshelwood, 2002). So, while quantitative research can be compared from one piece of research to the next, and comparisons made, qualitative research can not be so systematically approached, as data is subjective. As the biases inherent in the research cannot be controlled for, objective comparison of different research is hard to make. Therefore, the idea of a systematic literature review is modified to acknowledge and work with a subjective area of understanding.

Data Collection

The data collection involves searching the literature for articles or books for perspectives that inform the topics of masculinity, power or therapy. I searched for

points that would connect any of the three nodes together, or explain or create an understanding of how they may interact.

The literature was acquired through AUT's library databases; psych articles and psych info, using searches for books and articles on relevant material. Search results, articles, and books were obtained through AUT library, The University of Auckland library, peers and my supervisor. Those that were not present in any of these sites were ordered through the AUT library's inter-loan system. Searching through the references of these documents generated more search terms. These were included into the word search list.

Database reference sources:

Proquest 5000 International
PsychINFO
Internet
PEP

Word search:

challeng$	feminis$	psychoanaly$
conflict$	foucault$	psycholog$
construct$	gender$	psychotherap$
counsel$	hegemon$	role$
defens$	male$	sex$
difficult$	masculin$	strain$
discourse$	men	therap$
emotion$	power$	

The symbol $ indicates a possible truncation of a word. This means that in the example of psycholog$, any words that have 'psycholog' as the beginning can have any ending, and all the words possible will be searched for, that is, psychology, psychological, psychologist, etc. This kept the search close to the topic, while

looking for constructs and allowing for different grammatical variations given the situations they may have been used in.

Selection Criteria and Synthesis of Material.

I read abstracts of articles to reduce the quantity of articles that were relevant to my three main sub topics. If the writing helped define or expand the definition of the topic, or it linked the topics together, it was included. I excluded writings if they where in a different context of the topic to what I was trying to describe (e.g. using power as an economic factor), or were trying to connect the topic to another point of study outside the range of this dissertation (e.g. masculinity in relation to sexual attitudes). I had a very narrow focus on the topics of interest, and actively maintained this to allow me to develop enough depth of understanding on the topic I was focussing on. I systematically searched for explanation and connection of the topics employed. I used literature that commented on or critiqued the ideas within the topic.

This study reflects my personal position and as such will be biased, because I formulate the area of study, I choose the articles to include and I synthesised the document. This potentially left me only looking for what I wanted to see. However, I did follow up articles that included men and therapy as key words regardless of whether it was for or against the idea of men finding therapy difficult. I selected anything that was close to the topic in an effort to let a wide view of what was going on emerge. This way I allowed the literature to shape the view expressed in this dissertation.

My position.

The method of search and selection means that this document is biased, as I and others (Foucault, 1994; Habermas, 1994) understand that I am not a value free, objective reader, thinker and writer. This dissertation is specifically about masculinity, power, and the effect that different positions have on the interactions between men and psychotherapists. Thus, in stating my position in the interaction between the reader and me, the reader can understand my writing through the lens I write.

I am a heterosexual male, a Pakeha New Zealander, a training psychotherapist, and I have been a psychotherapy client. These aspects create in me a natural affiliation with the people I am writing about, who are also male, Pakeha, heterosexual, and psychotherapist clients. I can empathise with the dynamic they experience as I share these sociological backgrounds with them. Within these cultural similarities, I am also aware that there are many different discourses between individuals. I attempt to be aware of my own construction of masculinity, and the ways it effects me in relation to power and therapy, as well as the ways in which I engage with others. I try to be fair with my interactions; however, I am aware that there are times when I do use my position as a Pakeha male within New Zealand culture for my advantage. I have less cultural barriers to work through to align of myself with other Pakeha males who have something I want, and so I can attain it with more ease. For example, I use alignment to get the plumber to accurately explain the billing of a job rather than accept an unclear bill.

Ethical Considerations.

This was a literature-based research with case studies illustrating it. The use of clients involved an ethical consideration as information that is personal about these clients is being used in this dissertation. The ethics were considered and gained within an application for ethics approval through the School of Psychotherapy. The ethics allowed use of my clinical work with consenting clients with their identity disguised to illustrate points that came from the literature. The AUT ethics committee granted ethical approval number 02/33. The ethics approval form is in the appendix.

Clients.

I saw the clients that illustrate this piece of work in the course of the Master of Health Science in Psychotherapy at the Auckland University of Technology. Clients were asked if they would allow the work to be available for this research. They were told of their rights of confidentiality, and given forms with an explanation of the research and contact details of the supervisor. They could contact the supervisor at their discretion if they wanted to find out more information, had any concerns or if they changed their mind in hindsight and wished to remove themselves from the research. Copies of the forms they were given are in the appendix.

Given the nature of the topic, all the clients that participated in the research were men. I have used vignettes in this dissertation to illustrate my points within the body of this document. As I use them to highlight a point, it is important to recognise that they are just one way of interpreting the therapeutic interaction.

There are many ways to understand the vignettes as there are multiple dynamics occurring. I do limit my explanations to focusing on the points within my argument about masculinity, power or psychotherapy. The illustrations usually show poor points of therapeutic meeting. They are chosen because of their relevance to the point at hand, and do not illustrate the overall therapeutic relationship. I have changed demographic facts about the client to maintain confidentiality.

As Paul is present in many of the clinical illustrations, a brief introduction may be useful to understand the illustrations more fully. Paul is a 45-year-old Pakeha, who owned his own business. He had three children, who lived with their mother, Paul's ex-wife. He and his new partner had moved away from the town where his children lived. He himself was a middle child, with two sisters, and had grown up with a very domineering father. Paul's presenting issue was that he found it difficult to maintain his relationship with his children, while they went through adolescence, with financial pressures form his children and business. He came to therapy in the middle of a working day, so was often 'rushing' when he arrived and left the clinic. He had come to psychotherapy on his partner's suggestion.

In this chapter I have addressed how I went about this study, I have shown the theoretical aspect of the dissertation and how the literature was chosen. I have discussed my position, and potential biases within the work. I described the ethical aspects, and the way clients were involved. In the following chapters I will address aspects of the literature to give an understanding of power, of a masculinity and how these can be present in psychotherapy.

Chapter Three: Power

This chapter will explain firstly, how power is pertinent to the topic of men and masculinity. This will lead into an exploration of how power has been seen as an aspect of force. For this, I use the example of the juridical system. I will explain Foucault's understanding of power using the ideas of the panopticon, resistance and subjectification.   I use this Foucaultian understanding of power to separate power from domination. The Foucaultian understanding of power is used to show how power is present in masculinity and in psychotherapy without it being domination in the following chapters. I give a critique of the Foucaultian understanding of power to highlight the extent and limitations of this way of understanding power. I have illustrated the work with examples of clinical work to demonstrate how aspects of the theory discussed work out in the therapeutic relationship.

Power and men

Power is relevant to the current thinking regarding men in psychotherapy, as the attributes of power are often associated with men (O'Neil, 1981; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). These characteristics are strength, aggression, mastery, independence, ambition, and competition (Rafael & Adeline, 1996). These powerful attributes have been seen to shape the relationship style of men as self-reliant, dominating, competitive, controlling, and achievement orientated (Heppner & Gonzales, 1987). As psychotherapy is based on the idea of relationship, the fact that these attributes are present within the relationship gives us a good reason to want to understand how power functions within this relationship.

Power can be understood as a dominating force in the example of the juridical system. Someone sets the rules, someone enforces the rules, and punishments are given to those who break the rules. Thereby the most powerful few are at the top and the least powerful many are at the bottom in a metaphorical pyramid (Steiner, 1990). 'Power' understood this way allows dictation of what can and cannot be done. One person has 'power' over a second who has no 'power', apart from power given to them by the first person i.e. the right of appeal in court to protest a ruling.

The meaning of power is contextual. Power takes on meaning and definition in reference to a particular relationship or group (Emerson; Thibaut & Kelley cited in (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002); (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Therefore, it would be useful to develop an understanding of power without the implicit issues of domination that arise in relation to masculinity. So far, the understanding of power I have written about has been in close relation to aspects of dominance, to the point where the terms are often interchangeable.

I would like to set up a continuum of words for use within this dissertation, and allocate meanings quite precisely, where out side of this dissertation they may carry an overlapping of meanings. This is to be precise in the concepts I am trying to communicate; power, domination and violence. For this dissertation: a relation of power is one of influencing the freely enacted actions of another e.g. a negotiation with the negation of domination or violence. Domination is, the lack of ability to be able to influence another in an area, defined by the absence of permitting the other party to influence one's actions. Violence is the enforcement of ones will upon another, e.g. the action of being kidnapped. A relationship of power or domination

maintains a person's autonomy as the individual is able to enact their free will, and as such are what I will be focussing on within a therapeutic setting. I included violence in this explanation to give domination a conceptual boundary, where a person's free will is removed.

I will investigate the relationship between the psychotherapist and the male client by understanding it to be a power relationship in which negotiation is possible. The following will explore how power relationships are different from domination.

To achieve this separate view of power from domination, I am relying on the work of Michael Foucault (1926-1984). Foucault is a critical theorist and his understanding of power is only a small part of his philosophical point of view. I will explain several concepts to describe his understanding of power; namely the panopticon, subjectification, knowledge, resistance and powers relation to domination. I will describe these aspects in relation to power to show that Foucault's understanding of power differs from the juridical, dominating style that has been shown previously.

Panopticon

Power, as defined by Michel Foucault, is best seen as "action on the action of others" (Rabinow, 1984). That is power works by shaping the way in which individuals enact their freedom (Rose, 2001). One of the classic examples Foucault uses to describe power is the panopticon. The panopticon is a building designed to use power as a form of social control in a prison environment. It also has immediate implications for the surveillance of public spaces, a setting in which it is

used widely. In the panopticon prisoners are in cells in an outer ring, with transparent walls on the inner and outer circumference. A guard tower is located in the centre with one-way glass in order to be able to see all the cells and contents. Consequently, the prisoners do not know when they watched or not. The possibility of being seen is enough to make the prisoners monitor their behaviour to avoid actions of prohibition or punishment that come with incorrect behaviour.

Similarly, within malls or streets, surveillance cameras, whether being monitored or not, also cause people to monitor their behaviour. The function of knowledge is crucial to this system. Knowing they could be watched causes controlled behaviour. The panopticon works under the premise of the prisoners, or public, knowing that they are visible. The power of the guard works to effect a self-monitoring in the prisoner, by the prisoner's awareness that the guard could see, perceive, and therefore know them in the present. The behaviour that the prisoner adopts is behaviour appropriate for the situation at hand.

Subjectification is a way power can affect the way a person will freely embody a set of actions while still maintaining autonomy over themselves. Subjectification involves the subject understanding themselves in relation to their context. The individual is subjectified when they take on a role. A person is subjectified into a client of psychotherapy when they enter into the presence of a psychotherapist in the context of a psychotherapist's office as a client, where moments before they may have been a passenger on a bus. Subjectification is a dynamic of power as it invokes changes in a person's options in actions, feelings and thoughts that occur by the presence of another. Within groups, subjectification can be thought of as the

construction of subjects or roles that make up the whole of a particular social body (McHoul & Grace, 1998). These are roles that would be meaningless without the rest of the social body present, for example to be a teacher requires a student. The therapist is also subjectified by the presence of the client into the role of a therapist.

Within the example of the panopticon is the dividing aspect of a group of people different from the other such as prisoners/guards, or males/females, clients/therapists. The process of subjectification, which involves the people in their different roles and causes them to actively participate in the roles as part of their self-formation (Rafael & Adeline, 1996). That is, Foucault understands subjectification to be the effect on a person when they know that another person observes them.

Foucault (Foucault, 1994) associates power with knowledge. McHoul and Grace (McHoul & Grace, 1998) expand on this to see power as the ability to influence another which occurs when knowledge exists. Barker (Barker, 1998), adds that power is not synonymous with knowledge, but the two are intimately and productively related. That is, where there is knowledge within a relationship, there is also power within the relationship, and when one occurs, so does the other. To have an effect on the actions of another some form of knowledge will be involved. The degree of power one has is dependant on the exchange of knowledge, and the context of this knowledge. The process of subjectification is an example of this: Within therapy the clients' knowledge that they can be seen, and the therapists' knowledge that they can see and know what the client is doing, subjectifies the client and therapist into being a therapist and a client.

Clinical illustration: 1

Shane was a 19 year old Pakeha male who presented himself wanting help managing his anger in relation to his father. I inquired into his family's dynamics, but when I asked about his relationship to his mother, he thought it was irrelevant and did not want to talk about it. I explained how families work in systems and how relationships within systems can affect others, and he said he saw my point but still did not want to talk about his relationship with his mother. Shane chose to withhold information, which stopped me 'knowing' about his relationship with his mother.

I might deduce from his avoidance of the topic a hypothesis based on psychological ideas, for example the relationship he has with his mother is something he feels protective of. Looking at his resistance through the lens of power, his resistance demonstrates an expression of his way of managing power. By limiting my ability to understand him he limits my ability to have an action on his actions or respond to him, or be effective with him. This also gives him the opportunity to control access to a potential painful aspect of his relationship with his mother.

His withholding of information could be thought of as a lack of therapeutic alliance between client and therapist. An 'alliance' is the client engaging in the relationship with non-neurotic, rational, and realistic attitudes towards the therapist (Clarkson & Pokorny, 1994). However the term 'therapeutic alliance' does not convey the power imbalance that comes with placing oneself in the position of a client under the therapeutic gaze (Guilfoyle, 2002).

Equally, this clinical illustration could be explained through a lack of the establishment of trust. However, trust in the therapeutic relationship contains elements of the client being dependent on the therapist rather than the therapist being dependent on the client (Harvath & Greenberg, 1994). The concept of trust also highlights the power imbalance that occurs with the client entrusting knowledge to the therapist without the therapist reciprocating the knowledge flow within the therapeutic gaze. So looking at this vignette in terms of power shows that Shane has a way of managing power that I was not empathising with. Had I had an understanding of these power dynamics at the time I would have been able to change my approach to find an aspect of him that he was willing to allow me to enter into a relationship with. I would have attempted to create a sense of power for him so he was not having to use so much resistance. I will explore hoe this could be taking place in Chapter Five.

Power exists in social situations (Margolis, 1998), as social situations are places where people can perceive and know each other in a context where interaction is possible (Barker, 1998). The relations of such power are interwoven with other relations, such as production, family and sexuality (Barker, 1998; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The prohibition and punishment inherent in the panopticon model is an extreme illustration of power relations. Power is present in multiple other situations where prohibition and punishment are absent, such as negotiating a location for a picnic, or what topics are talked about within psychotherapy. An important aspect of this understanding of power is that power can be resisted. If

resistance is not possible, we are dealing with domination rather than power (Barker, 1998).

There are many things knowable about the other within a relationship, and so power can occur at many points within a relationship. This matrix of power can be negotiated as movement occurs within the relationship, and thereby determine the nature of a given relationship. These structures of power may change over time. For example, when a relationship changes from a relationship of strangers to one of friends, more aspects of knowledge about each person become available and so the individuals concerned are open to further influences of power. However, at any point in time there are areas within this matrix that are not negotiable, and as such are areas of domination (Barker, 1998; Guilfoyle, 2002). The different arrangements of power and domination can be the difference between remaining a stranger and becoming a friend. Such arrangements can contain aspects such as personal requests, which occur in a friendship relationship, but not with a stranger. The interconnections of influence between people constitute the power structure, and these interconnections outline and support areas of domination (Barker, 1998). People in relationship to each other can communicate areas of power with resistance to power, and communicate areas of domination through resistance not being effective. For example, a psychotherapist may engage with a client in a aspect of relationship such as intimacy, which the client may negotiate within a power relationship. However, due to ethical boundaries, the client cannot assume flexibility around some areas of intimacy such as physical aspects, and so the outlines of a domination relationship present within psychotherapy. At this point, a person can choose whether to avoid or to engage with the outlined domination type

of relationship. The client can stay within the established boundary of the therapeutic relationship or not, yet there are non-negotiable consequences to their decision. For example, the therapist can decide at their discretion to terminate the therapy, as the client enters into an area of domination. Domination or power do not embody the entirety of a relationship, they can occur simultaneously, in different aspects of a relationship.

Limitations

Foucault's understanding of power is the base for this dissertation. A critique is useful to have an understanding of the conceptual boundaries of power. Foucault's view of power is a subjective one as it is "constituted by the conditions under which we live in the present" (Barker, 1998, p. 45). This means that in explaining a concept one uses the historical sources available to create a convincing account of the concept at hand. Different historical sources create different understandings of the concept. Thus, anyone can challenge this understanding of power with a convincing alternative understanding of power. However, the flaw in any challenge will be in its inability to escape this inherent weakness of being a subjective argument. Which means that "[Foucault's] putative objectivity of knowledge is itself put in question...by the unavoidable relativism of an analysis related to the present that can understand itself only as a context-dependent practical enterprise" (Habermas, 1994, p. 89). This point can be reduced to seeing power as a 'speculative possibility' (Rorty, 1999). Yet, given this understanding of power as a speculation, it can bring points into focus that may otherwise go unnoticed in the analysis of psychotherapy situations and allow us conscious choice in what to do with the dynamic.

This chapter has explained how power is important to the topic of men, and how power has been seen as an aspect of domination. I have set up an understanding of power and domination that allow them to be investigated within a relationship without the negative associations of the words included. I explained Foucault's understanding of power using the ideas of the panopticon, resistance and subjectification.   I used this Foucaultian understanding of power to separate it from domination, and I have given a critique of the Foucaultian understanding of power to highlight the extent and limitations of this way of understanding power. Power has been seen as the actions on the freely enacted actions of another. Domination has been seen as the aspect of a relationship where influence is not possible. With these points in mind I now turn to the topic of masculinity, to give understanding of this area in relation to power, before discussing psychotherapy, in relation to both power and masculinity.

Chapter Four: Masculinities

In this chapter, I introduce the topic of masculinity and relate it to the previous chapter on power, in order to view masculinity with a Foucaultian understanding of power. To do this I describe the concept of masculinity, and discuss the relationship that masculinity has had with power. I show how masculinity has been polarised from femininity and that the polarisation contributes to the language involved in the descriptions of men. I show how men can use stereotypes in their understanding of themselves, and how this contributes to the power in the relationship between self and others. I refer to the use of many different descriptions of masculinity to describe the self as flexible masculinity. I look at hegemonic masculinity as the continuation of flexible masculinity from a power relationship into one of domination. Hegemonic masculinity is often seen in relation to power, and I show that it does embody aspects of power and domination, and I use the understanding of resistance to critique the view of men as hegemonic, and to demonstrate that men within a powerful position are not necessarily hegemonic. Finally, I suggest how being flexible in the understanding of the self can be a large contributor to the style of power present within a relationship.

Before entering into a discussion of masculinity, it is important to explain what masculinity is. There are many ways to describe masculinity, for example, biological, developmental, and social. I am limiting the descriptions of masculinity to focus on a Foucaultian understanding, because I have used a Foucaultian view of power as a frame to look within, and want to highlight an area of masculinity in relation to power within this same frame of understanding. The focus I am going to

have is on the discourse of flexible masculinity, and I am aware that in doing so I am exchanging a broad discussion of masculinities for a deeper discussion on a narrower topic.

The concept of masculinity

Masculinity is a word that can have many meanings and can be used in different ways. It can be used to distinguish male from female, and it can go further by being a reference to a scale or measure of the amount of manliness involved. Some men can be very masculine, and others not very masculine at all (Connell, 1995). For example 'he's so masculine!' is a reference to a man's style of being a man. Connell (2000) suggests that it would be more useful to talk of masculinities rather than masculinity due to the range of differences in men that are understood or described by the word masculinity.

Masculinity is a multifaceted concept that can be seen as a discursive practice. This means it is both a description of men, and a set of instructions for how to be a man (Speer, 2001). Descriptions of men are used to measure, or set a standard, which men then use as a comparison in the construction of themselves.

Masculinity has been described to include themes of "dominance, power, control, independence and self-reliance, invulnerability, competitive and goal-driven behaviour, and the submission of affective expression" (Isenhart & Silversmith, 1994, p. 128). These themes may be played out as reduced emotion within relationship, non relational sexuality, or workaholisim (Wester & Vogel, 2002). Men who identify with the above qualities of masculinity and gain esteem from

them may find it hard to participate in therapy that is commonly based on relationship, disclosure, vulnerability, expression, intimacy, and connection (Denkin, 1996; Mahalik & Cournoyer, 2000). Relational psychotherapy may be in stark contrast to a man's internalised masculine ways of being (Robertson & Fitzgerald, 1992).

> Because the male socialization experience is theorized to create negative feelings such as anxiety and shame related to all things feminine, the development of rigid traditional male roles may help stave off the negative feelings associated with femininity much in the same way that psychological defences manage negative affect. (Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry, & Napolitano, 1998, p. 247)

Therefore, psychotherapy that is asking for 'feminine' behaviours from a man may elicit a stronger and resistant masculine response as a defense to manage the fear of losing the masculine sense of identity (Picchioni, 1992).

Clinical illustration: 2.

Paul managed the potential conflict of coming to psychotherapy using two positions. Paul's wife wanted him to come to psychotherapy. Paul used this position to place responsibility for the un-masculine concept of wanting to do psychotherapy onto his wife. He was asking for psychotherapeutic help in managing his relationship, and wanting to feel secure in his own masculinity. Paul managed to enter into psychotherapy with me without taking full responsibility for being there. He also maintained that he chose for himself what he did, and he equally took the position that he did not activity seek to be in this situation. These positions were useful as he used the two of them to avoid the potentially shameful situations of firstly not being his own authority and being made to attend therapy, or secondly actively wanting to attend psychotherapy which was a potentially shameful activity for a man.

The concept of masculinity attempts to describe men, and yet masculinity does not describe all the different experiences of all men. Understandings of masculinity are in "the context of the particular power relationships that constitute, and historically have constituted, our social environment" (Frosh, 1994, p.11). Even though the understanding of masculinity has changed over time; highlighting that masculinity is a social construct, the way masculinity has been understood makes it hard to keep masculinity as a construct out of our understanding of the individual man. As Frosh (1994) explains about both masculinity and femininity:

> [I]n principle they are just positions, ways of seeing and speaking about what we see. In practice, however, they become fixed: the realities of power bolster the reduction from subjective to objective, from psychological to physical, from gender (a psychological and behavioural state) to sex (a chromosomal and anatomical one). It becomes impossible to see them as constructs, and so they become absolutes. (p. 11)

Polarisation makes it easier to think about and understand concepts, but polarising the genders to explain problems does not necessarily make finding the answers easier. For example, asking; 'what can be done about men's lack of interest in psychotherapy', can lead to the answer; 'men need to be more feminine'. I believe that we do not need men to be more androgynous to be able to participate in therapy as this alienates many men; we need to find a way of understanding the situation that allows creative solutions. Traditional methods of dealing with resistant clients need to be modified to understand and meet the context of masculinity (Femiano, 1992). It is my aim for this dissertation to contribute towards expanding presently held views that can restrict men in therapy.

Masculine rhetoric

The way men understand their masculinity informs what they will communicate and know about their masculinity; given a relationship between knowledge and power, how men understand themselves will relate to their relationship with power.

Stereotypes of men exist and individuals use them when creating a description of themselves (Potts, 2001; Wetherell & Edly, 1999). Within a culture stereotypes can be quickly used to describe complex ideas. For instance, to say 'I'm a bloke' communicates easily an idea that would be complicated to define. Descriptions of masculinities can become stereotypes, or vice versa; these stereotypes can become descriptions of men. Stereotypes are psychological constructs which are easy to acquire and hard to lose (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) because they are reinforced by confirmation through one's experience of what is expected. Exceptions are perceived as instances outside of a stereotype, and so do not displace the expectation.

Cultural descriptions of masculinity play a significant part in the representation of an individual's understanding of his own masculinity. This can be observed in the dynamics of socialisation when deviations from widely accepted gender roles result in societal punishments (Blazina, 1997), for example, in the shame-filled cry, 'what are you, a girl!'

Speer (2001) found men placed themselves in a matrix of relationships between many descriptions and evaluations of different types of masculinity.

They used words and inferences to describe, evaluate, and rhetorically position forms of gender relating stereotypes to each other and the self. They rhetorically arranged the positions of the masculinities to create a position for themselves that was appropriate for the particular situation at hand. This was used to demonstrate an authentic identity for the speaker (Speer, 2001), by showing oneself to be able to relate to known forms of masculinity, but not be located in any particular understanding. For example, in the therapy room, a man may associate himself with a 'feminist friendly' form of masculinity, and in the pub a 'bloke' masculinity. That is, men can choose a position for themselves that is authentic and reasonable within a given social situation (Speer, 2001).

From a Foucaultian point of view, relating the understanding of one's self to the situation at hand is an example of subjectification. As a man finds himself in a particular relationship to a person or context he is subjectified into using particular understandings of himself to create a view of himself in relation to the context for himself and others (Rafael & Adeline, 1996). This subjectification is a dynamic of power, as knowledge about himself depends on this changeable understanding of himself, which involves different actions in different situations. In changing, the man maintains the position of the self as ordinary, authentic and reasonable through different situations. Differing descriptions of a man and his understanding of his masculinity can control the knowledge that the therapist can access and relate to.

Clinical illustration: 3.

Because I felt a reduced spontaneity in our conversation I had asked Paul what it was like for him to come to see me and to talk to me about his issues. It was his

view that his masculinity was different to my masculinity. He saw me as 'a student type', and 'younger' which meant it was 'ok' and 'easy' for me to talk about emotions or relationships. He contrasted himself against his description of me, with himself as 'older' and 'in his job' (tradesman). Paul said that because of the type of man he was it meant he could not easily talk about his feelings or relationships. This view of himself meant he had less expectation on himself to communicate these aspects to me, and he said he felt comfortable with his expectations of himself. Paul managed to present himself as 'not being able' to talk about difficult aspects of his relationship with me by contrasting his understanding of my masculinity with his view of his own masculinity. He constructed a reasonable argument that due to his masculinity he could not do what I was suggesting he could do. In this illustration, Paul presented himself as reasonable and authentic in his position of not talking about emotions, based on his understanding of his, and others' masculinities.

This ability to position the self rhetorically as reasonable can be thought of in terms of rationalisation. Rationalisation is a "defence mechanism whereby the individual seeks to 'explain' to himself and others behaviour, motives, attitudes, thoughts, or feelings which are otherwise unacceptable" (Walrond-Skinner, 1986, p. 286). However the act of rhetorically positioning the self as reasonable does more than 'explain' the position, it invites the other person to join in this 'reason' (Donaldson, 1993; Speer, 2001).

Hegemonic Masculinity

This section of the chapter is about a type of masculinity called hegemonic masculinity. I will explain what it is, how it works, how it is understood and what it achieves, and relate it to the understanding of power in the Foucaultian view. Hegemony is important in relation to flexible masculinity as it extends flexible masculinity from power into domination.

Hegemonic masculinity is a form of masculinity that has two defining aspects. Firstly, it creates an understanding of a social hierarchy, and positions itself as foremost within the hierarchy. Secondly, it understands, and attempts to get others to understand this hierarchy as the natural order; ordinary, and un-noteworthy (Donaldson, 1993).

Hegemonic masculinity need not be the most common construction of masculinity. Other masculinities are produced and co-exist at the same time (Wetherell & Edly, 1999). Hegemonic masculinity draws on ideas of varying meanings or types of masculinity, which are used by an individual to rhetorically position and illustrate himself as reasonable, in the same way as flexible masculinity.

In summary, hegemonic masculinity is:

> …a way of being masculine which marginalizes and subordinates not only women's activities but also alternative forms of masculinity such as 'camp' or effeminate masculinity. Typically, it also involves the brutal repression of activities of gay men and their construction as a despised 'other'. (Wetherell & Edly, 1999, p. 336)

In achieving the legitimacy of patriarchy, it guarantees the dominant position of men and the subordination of women (Connell, 1995).

When a person in relationship with hegemonic masculinity accepts the position of this 'reasonable' masculinity, the 'reasonable' masculinity has been able "to impose a definition of the situation, to set the terms in which events are understood" (Donaldson, 1993, p. 645). In terms of a Foucaultian conceptualisation of power and the model of the panopticon discussed in Chapter Three, hegemonic masculinity achieves power by positioning itself in such a way that hegemony is not overtly seen (Speer, 2001). This means that others do not resist the position, as they do not explicitly 'see' the position. The unseen position gains the locus of knowledge and power.

Hegemonic masculinity may be thought of as a set of ideals. It is most clearly portrayed in Western culture in the stereotypical powerful, self assured individual, or the 'hero' (Donaldson, 1993). The 'reasonable' individual could dismiss this 'hero' stereotype as an extreme or immature caricature of masculinity (Wetherell & Edly, 1999), and portray himself as ordinary. However, perhaps the most hegemonic is to be non-hegemonic as Wetherell and Edley (1999) comment:

> The man, for instance, who describes himself as original, as beyond stereotypes, as having a personal worked-out philosophy of masculinity or indeed as just ordinary and average, has not escaped the familiar tropes of gender. He is precisely enmeshed by convention; subjectified, ordered and disciplined at the very moment he rehearses the language of personal taste, unconventionality and autonomy, or ordinariness and normality. (p. 353)

Boundaries to hegemonic masculinity

Speer (2001) and Wetherell and Edley (1999) investigate the area of hegemonic masculinity from a feminist point of view. As such their view can be seen as a continuation of the work of feminism to find an effective way to overcome the

position that hegemonic masculinity places femininity in. They seek a way to understand masculinity in order to effectively respond to and challenge male domination, and to understand how hegemonic masculinity in order to contribute to this goal. With the understanding that male domination is not a natural norm but a social construction, Frosh (1994, p. 95) points out "a rhetoric and practice of opposition is now available to challenge any assumption that male domination is preordained as a simple state of nature" (p.95).

At this point, it is appropriate to analyse the above idea of hegemonic and flexible masculinity and draw out another way of thinking about this flexible use of masculinity. So far, I have shown how masculinity can obtain a hegemonic position using the flexible constructions of masculinity. This argument views men as hegemonic if they try to be reasonable. However, Foucault's understanding of power brings another view into focus; domination occurs when resistance to power is not possible. As long as resistance is possible, the relationship is not one of dominance. Dominance occurs in this system when there is no option available to the other, except to understand masculinity as ordinary. Therefore, men's use of multiple ways of understanding themselves, inviting others to perceive them as ordinary, is not dominance when the other has the ability to resist this understanding of themselves as ordinary. When dominance does occur, for example in understanding an individual as ordinary without any other understanding of the man reasonably available, this perception also has to include the concept of 'first within a hierarchy as the norm' to embody hegemonic masculinity.

Speer (2001) conceives of hegemony as the corollary of using multiple discourses in the understanding of masculinity. There is a difference between power and hegemony. Power is present with resistance, and hegemony with dominance. Use of multiple discourses can result in hegemony as Speer (2001) understands, but I believe does not automatically do so given an understanding of power that allows influence.

Changing knowledge and as such changing power about the self can be used to negate the effectiveness of resistance. This is done by making resistance to one's self seem unreasonable by changing one's position to maintain being 'an ordinary reasonable person' while the other becomes unreasonable (Speer, 2001; Wetherell & Edly, 1999). An example of this is given in clinical illustration four.

Changing one's position not only can affect the resistance used, but also shapes the power relationship, that is, it affects the degree of action that the therapist can have on the male client's actions. Using a flexible understanding of his masculinity, a man can retain the locus of knowledge (Barker, 1998) by influencing the way he is understood. Retaining the locus of knowledge affects the power dynamics; if knowledge is not available to both parties in the relationship, then the power structure is different for the two parties. The knowledge the therapist has of the client is dependent on the knowledge that the client has of himself. If the understanding of the man is changeable, then the action the therapist may have on the man is changeable and dependent on the man.

Clinical illustration: 4.

In his relationship with his wife, Paul would avoid a situation in which he figured he could not get what he wanted without it seeming unreasonable. He avoided arguing with his wife when he felt she could put together a more convincing argument than he could, which would stop him doing what he wanted to do at the time. He found it easier to do what he wanted and make up afterwards. In our therapy work Paul missed a session and, while he was sorry, he went to great lengths to let me know why he had not been at the session we had scheduled, although at the time he had not called me to let me know he was not going to come to therapy. For Paul, being reasonable is a useful position to have in an argument. In the therapeutic relationship, it was hard to have conversations that could cast his present actions as unreasonable, despite his being responsible for those actions. In hindsight, he could say what he should have done, and that his actions at the time were 'stupid'. As we talked about unreasonable actions in the past, he was being reasonable with me in the present. He would not let me know him in the present, as he responded with indefinite answers, a sceptical 'yeah', or 'maybe', yet he kept the appearance of being reasonable when considering his past. When trying to engage with him in the present, with direct questions, like 'how are you doing telling me about this', the responses he gave back were, 'yeah, fine, no problems', with a tone that suggested that if I did not believe him then I was being unreasonable. In doing this, he was maintaining the locus of knowledge and the way that I understood the present. Paul's use of knowledge about himself unconsciously influences the power between us.

People who view themselves as ordinary and reasonable will present themselves as such. However, when being 'reasonable' is used to legitimate social hierarchy, to denigrate others, or to avoid putting one-self into the position of those who so far have been denigrated then it can be seen as a hegemonic psycho-social construct (Donaldson, 1993).

Summary

In this chapter, the literature considered masculinity in relation to power, and I considered this relationship through a Foucaultian lens. This was to offer an alternative view of masculinity than as the polarised opposite of femininity. I have shown how men can use stereotypes in their understanding of themselves, and how this contributes to the power in the relationship with self and others. I also explored a view of hegemonic masculinity and have shown how men can use power yet not be hegemonic. A flexible masculinity does influence power through a man's differing understandings of himself. This on its own is not a detrimental position to take, but in the following chapter on psychotherapy, I show how this position can frustrate the therapy relationship. I suggest that therapists need to rethink their own positions rather than suggest that this flexible masculinity is wrong for therapy.

Chapter Five: Psychotherapy

In this chapter I take the understanding of power discussed in Chapter Three and relate it to the psychotherapeutic setting. I then use the understanding of masculinity covered in the previous chapter and introduce it to the idea of a power situation within psychotherapy.

I use the understanding of power as the action on others' actions. I apply this to see what actions of the psychotherapist within psychotherapy have an action on the client. From a Foucaultian point of view, I describe resistance to power within therapy, and how knowledge interacts with power and resistance. I then discuss the interaction of power and resistance as productive, understanding that in moments of resistance to power change can happen. I describe the way aspects of masculinity may relate to the power situation of therapy and in return, how the therapist within this situation may relate to flexible masculinity. I discuss how power within therapy may resist flexible or hegemonic masculinity and relate this to why men may resist psychotherapy. I show how both the therapist and the masculine client may compete for the same position within the psychotherapy power structure. I suggest that this competition may contribute towards the fact that men do not spend much time in therapy.

For this dissertation I have considered power to be action on one's action, and that power works by shaping the way in which individuals enact their freedom (Rose, 2001). Guilfoyle (2003) considers that "[p]ower within therapy is always an ensemble of actions, in which the individual plays a small role" (p. 336). That is,

therapy constructs or allows certain discourses in which this freedom can occur. This not to say that clients are 'powerless', restricted to a therapists preferred discursive practices (Guilfoyle 2003). Both therapist and client are positioned in, but can also invoke, a range of discourses in their interaction, of which a therapeutic discourse is only one. In a therapeutic discourse, expectations of conduct embrace both participants (Guilfoyle 2003), but it is more than conduct that is affected. It is also how individuals understand themselves within these discourses.

The word 'client' within the therapy setting has been understood as one who "uses services of a professional, and is the subject of a kind of assistance, but is also in a relation of subordination and dependence" (Rose, 2001, para. 6). The therapist is involved in shaping this setting by arranging the place, time, cost, direction, sequence, etiquette and language, in which the client is understood (Rose, 2001; Shapiro, 2000). Within this context the client is positioned to reveal their inner world. The client is positioned to have sense made of their life and their actions. Their inner world is viewed, understood, and changeable under the therapist's gaze (Guilfoyle, 2002). The therapist does not open their personal world in this way in return and is positioned to be unseen, to have the capacity to reshape the meanings, and to be a person of knowledge (Guilfoyle, 2002; Rose, 2001). Therefore, therapy is set up so that the client should be understood by the therapist. However, at times the clients might resist this way of being. In therapy a therapist trying to take the unseen position, while encouraging the client to take the seen position may be competing with a flexible masculinity trying to achieve the unseen position also. This competition for the unseen position may lead to a therapeutic failure if not processed appropriately.

Clinical illustration: 5.

Paul's daughter wanted him to pay for her school ball, and his wife did not want him to pay the entire bill with 'their' money. This was unresolved at the time of our session. After Paul gave me this 'knowledge' about him, he stretched out, yawning, saying 'yep, so that's it really…been a full week'. When I tried to engage with him about the issue, by reflecting on his situation, and what might be going on for him in the present, his replies were non-committed, such us, 'maybe', or 'I don't know'. I had some knowledge of his situation, and hence an opportunity to have an affect on him in his situation, yet he resisted power through the invitation to stop talking about the topic at hand: '…so that's it really'. When I reflected back the emotions of the story, he could maintain his position of trying to remove himself from my 'gaze' by saying 'maybe' to any comment I might have made, thus making the present situation unknowable to me and so dispersing the power I had. At the same time, it might mean that the conflict is too hard for him to discuss and that he does not want to feel incapable in my view. However, this does show a way of resisting power by removing oneself from the therapist's knowledge in the present. The therapist can have an impact on the action of the client when the therapist has knowledge that is applicable to the client. When the client distances himself from what the therapist understands of him then the therapist does not have applicable knowledge about him in the present. At the time of this interaction, Paul kept me from entering into a discussion with him around money, as it was an aspect that he did not let me know him in the present, by evading any questions. He was not allowing me to influence him on this area, and as such can be thought as an area of domination. However, in a later session, we found a lot of meaning within the topic

of money, as we moved out and away from this area of domination, or no discussion, in respect to money.

The power that occurs within psychotherapy is not always easy to identify. It does however come to the surface around areas of resistance. Commonly within psychotherapy the term 'resistance' refers to the client's determination not to allow an unconscious thought to become conscious, as it may be emotionally too painful for the client. This may be the case, for example, when a client is not wanting to experience their current emotions in connection to a past trauma. Resistance is a psychological process mediated by client's openness to potentially painful meanings (Weiner, 1998).

Foucaultian resistance offers a different understanding to psychotherapeutic resistance due to the relationship between power and knowledge. The therapist has knowledge of human processes gained through psychotherapeutic training, and of the client gained through the relationship with the client. When a client is offered 'an interpretation' or 'a reflection on their communication' from the therapist it is a conceptualisation of the client's internal situation, a piece of expert knowledge (Guilfoyle, 2002). In this way, resistance could also be thought of as the client avoiding 'knowledge' of himself or a part of himself that he feels is not acceptable.

Therapists intentionally use knowledge to help clients understand, feel, or know something about themselves. The therapist uses knowledge to form an intervention or reflection for the client, and tries to use knowledge to affect an aspect of the client. The client can accept or reject the therapist's interpretation and in the word

'no' is the client's resistance. "Resistance indicates a refusal of the application of therapeutic knowledge" (Guilfoyle, 2002, p. 86), and therefore can be understood as resistance to an aspect of power. Resistance to power is not limited to a psychological process. Foucaultian resistance can be used to correct a misunderstanding of the therapist, or can be a response to the power tactics of the therapist (Guilfoyle, 2002). Resistance is more visible than power, and because it is a response to power tactics, it can also help the therapist to become aware of the points at which use of power is being resisted by the client (Guilfoyle, 2002). Hopefully the therapist and client are using power and resistance to benefit the client.

Guilfoyle (2002) makes the point that 'resistance' is treated quite uniquely within the therapeutic setting in ways that could appear disrespectful if preformed in other settings. For example, if a client said 'I don't want to talk about that' the therapist might wonder what the reasons might be, and possibly ask more questions. If a colleague in a work setting said the same thing, it would be respectful to leave the topic alone. The power structure of a therapy relationship allows resistance to be processed differently to other situations. When a client resists the therapist's interpretation and thereby highlights the presence of power, the therapist has several options for his or her response. These range from responding to the client a 'not believing' or 'believing' of the client to some degree, or a 'partial acknowledgement' in between. Not believing the client may seem disrespectful, but will maintain the knowledge and the power of the therapist. Completely believing the client and the therapist changing his/her mind on an issue maintains the knowledge and power of the client. These extremes on the continuum of

believing run the risk of becoming domination if resistance and influence are not possible. In allowing knowledge to be influenced, a power relationship is maintained and domination is avoided.

Foucault views power not only as restrictive, but also productive. As it is always exercised in relation to resistance, and it is at that point of resistance that change is possible (Rafael & Adeline, 1996). In trying to make change a possibility, psychotherapy uses resistance differently to non psychotherapeutic situations, and Guilfoyle (2002) promotes respecting and understanding the resistance present to reduce therapeutic failure.

The particular power and resistance relationship within psychotherapy will depend on the client's particular way of managing power within a relationship. The two people present will shape the interactions of the relationship, and as such, it will contain historic and contemporary ways of interacting. The affect of power will also contribute to the style of the relationship, and the therapist can use this knowledge to help the client understand his own use of power (Shapiro, 2000).

Men may participate in a 'feminine' activity to avoid their resistance to therapy being seen as insecurity.

> A paradox plagues the man challenged by the therapeutic process. If he walks (or runs) away from it, he feels down deep that he might in fact be the coward that he suspects 'the enemy' is accusing him of being. The great warrior has turned tail at the very sight and sound of the therapeutic challenge. (Picchioni, 1992, p. 12)

This paradox could be used as a hypothesis to explain Cottone, Drucker, and Javier (2002) finding that men end psychotherapy sooner than women. A man may be

trying to maintain an unseen position, while the therapist wants him, as a client, to take the seen position. If the client does not take the seen position then he may be seen as hypo-emotional, defensive, resistant, unworkable, unable to identify emotions, fearful of intimacy, and unfeeling (Heesacker et al., 1999; Levant, 1992; Meth et al., 1992). On the other side therapy may be viewed by the client "…as a foolish act. [Men] have devoted many years to the task of adding stones to the wall of defence. Why then should they in a moment of weakness agree to lower the drawbridge?" (Picchioni, 1992, p. 13).

The way we as therapists understand gender, will inform how men within therapy are understood. The individual client may resist against the therapist's understanding of him if there is a difference between their understandings of the masculinity present within the man. A client may have to work hard to be seen through the assumptions we make as therapists about gender, power and the individual.

Psychotherapists can tend to perceive the masculinity of male clients as problematic for psychotherapy. This perception may make it hard for a man to get appropriate attention as psychotherapy can place certain expectations on them; ways of behaving that men do not live up to. Isenhart and Silversmith (1994) recognise that "[p]articipating in therapy requires the male to perform 'unmanly' activities: giving up power and control, acknowledging weakness and vulnerabilities, asking for support, and being non-competitive" (p. 131). The male is challenged to question and forgo attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that have been reinforced by years of socialisation.

If this difference in positions is not successfully negotiated, the relationship may end. If the relationship does continue, the style of relationship will involve working within a relationship of power with each other (Barker, 1998; Guilfoyle, 2002).

When a male does not fit a therapeutic mould, it can generate anxiety for the therapist. The therapist needs to learn how to tolerate the anxiety so that the man can be authentically met (Keenan, 2001). Having an understanding of power present between the therapist and the client might allow the therapist a way to understand the relationship further and so be able to be empathetic towards the client.

Psychotherapists may need to review their own expectations, approach and work with males who may be put off by the power structure of therapy. I suggest psychotherapists use an understanding of power to allow them to relate to a flexible masculinity used by a client in psychotherapy.

Summary

From a Foucaultian point of view, I have shown an understanding of the therapeutic situation in respect to resistance, power and knowledge. I described the productive interaction of power and resistance where change can be thought to happen. Themes regarding masculinity and the power situation of therapy, and the therapist relating to flexible masculinity, were explored. How power within therapy can resist flexible masculinity, and how and why men may resist the power of therapy

has been discussed. I considered that both the therapist and the male client may

compete for the unseen position and suggested that this competition may influence

why men do not spend much time in psychotherapy.

Chapter Six: Conclusions

In this final chapter I give a critique of aspects that have been used within this dissertation, and then describe some of the recommendations that therapists could use to improve their therapy using an understanding of power and masculinity. I describe some ways to use an understanding of power with psychotherapy to improve the meeting of men empathically. I propose therapists approach power in masculinity by being transparent and seen, to make the position and tools of the therapist more available, useful and useable by the client. I then comment on using resistance and some aspects to keep in mind, before suggesting aspects of further study that have arisen from this dissertation.

Critique.

The understanding of masculinity and power in relation to psychotherapy within this dissertation came from many articles that use an understanding of discourse and discourse analysis to generate the data to describe and articulate conclusions. In using descriptions of discourse this dissertation uses a particular lens to view the topic of men, power and psychotherapy, and aspects seen through this lens cannot be generalised. Not all therapy, all men, or all power can be understood in the way this dissertation has described it. It does not describe an aspect that can be generalised to a particular group of men either, such as, New Zealand males.

There are many other ways to understand authentically what is going on within therapy, for example; feminist, masculinist, physiological, behavioural, or

psychodynamic approaches. This is only part of a whole, and cannot be used or understood as a comprehensive analysis of relating.

I have described masculinity as a position within a therapeutic relationship. Many other positions could be studied to see how they are used and what they achieve within the therapeutic relationship. I have viewed masculinity as a way of achieving power, and at this point I do focus myself, as masculinity is more than just a source of power. In describing masculinity as using power in therapy, it is an example, and does not mean that other discourses do not do things of a similar nature. Femininity would make an equally valid example of how power is played out.

Recommendations

Not all men have difficulties with power within psychotherapy, so these ideas are not a general approach with all men; each situation needs to be individually considered. As power is present as a component of the dynamics with a man within therapy, then this understanding of power may help a therapist to respond appropriately. Some hypothetical out workings are as follows:

One possibility of this, where different uses of power by the therapist and client may be able to work together constructively, comes from an understanding of authority. Psychotherapy attends to understanding reasons, motivations and consequences of action, of or on, the individual. Given that authority can base itself on reason and motivations to be authoritative, psychotherapy has the ability to authorise authority (Rose, 2001).

So in the relationship of power and masculinity, psychotherapy could be used as a way to help men within their relationships. Using men's ability with power in a considered, authoritative way where they have authority (i.e. the self), and not feel authority is removed (i.e. others).

> "[Considered authority] gives authority a basis which is more than simply brute power or domination - it is democratic and therapeutic, it is in the interests of those over whom it is exercised, and hence it is a virtuous vocation for those who will exercise it". (Rose, 2001, para. 61)

This relies on Rose's (2001) understanding of psychotherapy as being generous in giving away knowledge, language and technique. The client can use the therapist's skills in situations outside of therapy to transform and authorise other aspects of their life and interactions. That is, psychotherapy would need to allow its position in the relationship to be a seen position, to allow the client to understand and use the tools and techniques of psychotherapy for himself. This can occur if the therapist is open and explanatory of the techniques, and the client is aware of the value of learning them. Part of the process to achieve this may include psychotherapists reflecting on how they use power, to see in what way their own authority is privileged over the clients.

Therapists would need to consider changing their own use of power. To not assume the position of expert and knower, in the presence of a masculinity trying to maintain an unseen position. When the therapist releases the authority that comes with the knowing unseen position he/she allows the man to not compete for the unseen position and remain in a power relation rather than having to secure the position through a domination relationship.

Another idea is that the therapist encourages questions from the client, to explain the understanding behind an intervention, to describe the thoughts that lead to comments, to be actively seen to hand over the knowledge. The therapist may increase self disclosure to try and balance the knowledge difference between the client and the therapist. The client may not want to know, but the knowledge that they can ask is an aspect of retaining power placing the client in control of the knowledge balance, rather than the therapist.

The therapist may go very slow, not trying to have the client's emotions spelt out, reducing pressure that may be present on the client to divulge information about himself. This pressure may not be seen as coming from the therapist, as it may be occurring unconsciously in the structure of the therapy setting. The therapist may have to be active in making this aspect of psychotherapy culture conscious to themselves and to the client. This is to keep the relationship between the client and the therapist one where power and resistance are possible, and to avoid the relationship becoming one of domination around areas of emotional expression.

Respecting resistance.

Guilfoyle (2002) pointed out that resistance can be seen as a point of difference in power between the therapist and client. Guilfoyle (2002) also considered respecting resistances to equalise the power in the therapy relationship. This is possible within a power relationship. However, respecting the resistances produced from a hegemonic position respects the underlying domination (Donaldson, 1993). Therefore it would be useful to be able to know when resistance is effective to allow power relations, and when it is ineffective and in domination relations. To allow domination through respecting resistances may not achieve Guilfoyle's

(2002) hope of reduced failure in therapeutic work. This is because psychotherapy works through the relationship (Gelsoa & Hayes, 1998) and so should avoid domination, which prevents influence in a relationship (Barker, 1998; Guilfoyle, 2002). Therefore, in situations of hegemony the techniques of influencing power will not be useful, as the relationship s one of domination.

Future study

Given my critique that respecting resistance is only useful within a power relationship, and not a domination relationship, it would be useful for further research to identify points where domination occurs. Further understanding of how domination happens within relationships opens up ways out of domination, into a power relationship where influence and resistance are possible, for example, when does resistance become domination through multiple positions? It would be good to understand this more, as if the therapist is trying to be more open, to allow power, it would be counter-productive if it were supporting domination.

This dissertation has used the example of flexible masculinity to show an aspect of power within psychotherapy. There are many other positions that people use that will affect the power within the therapeutic relationship. For example, how does the gender of the therapist contribute towards power? What are specific to the individual and what are generalised attributes of power? Do different diagnoses have a relation to themes or styles of power, as they relate to the therapist? Will certain transference and counter transferences occur within differing power relationships? These are some questions that the consideration of other positions within therapy may bring up.

Another aspect that could be investigated further is the idea that change happens in the tension between power and resistance. Understanding the nature of this tension might help understand change. Questions about whether change is general or specific to a situation would be relevant. What does the client experience in these moments of difference, and how do clients describe their experience of change within therapy? As such the tension of power and resistance may prove to be an area where future study could occur.

Summery

I have given a critique of aspects that have been used within this dissertation, and described recommendations for therapists to improve their therapy with an understanding of power and masculinity. I suggested that the therapist could approach power in masculinity with transparency, being seen to make the position and tools of the therapist available to be used by the client, allowing masculinity to consider how and why power is achieved within interactions.

This dissertation has used an understanding of power separated from domination; this separation allows men to be viewed as participants and producers of power, and power to be seen as inherent in all interactions, not to be fixed, or removed, but allowed and worked with in beneficial ways. Psychotherapy can explore how its own understanding of masculinity can influence the power present within therapy and consequently respond more helpfully to male clients if they need an empathetic approach to power.

A Literature Review with Clinical Illustrations

Participant Information Sheet
Principal Supervisor: Andrew Duncan, PhD.
Project Supervisor: Gudrun Frerichs-Penz
Student: Julian Wilson

Department of Psychotherapy and Applied Psychology, AUT,
Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1020

Invitation

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research. I will be studying the therapeutic relationship in order to understand the process and facilitate more effective psychotherapy. Participation is entirely voluntary and your free choice. If you do agree to take part you are free to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to give a reason and you may withdraw any information you have provided up until the completion of data collection. Non-participation will not affect any future care or treatment you currently receive. There will be no costs to you for taking part in this study. There are also no financial benefits for you by taking part in this study. Please sign the consent form if you are interested in being a participant.

What is the purpose of the study?

The research is part of my studies for a Master of Health Science in Psychotherapy. Its purpose is to improve understanding of the therapeutic relationship, to further my education and training as a psychotherapist and to improve our psychotherapeutic relationship.

How was a person chosen to be asked to be part of the study?

All of my clients are being asked if they are willing to participate. If you consent then you may be in the study. Participation will involve use of excerpts from our psychotherapy in my dissertation.

What happens in the study?

I will be reading about and analysing an issue related to the therapeutic relationship and using illustrations from my work with clients in my research. The illustrations will be descriptions of interactions between us. These descriptions will come from tapes of our sessions and my notes. My understandings about these interactions and perhaps our conversations about them will be used to help explain the issue under discussion. I will use the concepts and theories of psychotherapy to further this understanding. This work will be supervised by senior staff in the Department of

Psychotherapy and Applied Psychology and discussed with my fellow students in order to improve my understanding and our psychotherapy. The study will not change the focus of our work or where we meet. The study will run during 2003 unless I ask for your agreement to extend it. The tapes and notes will be held securely for six years according to AUT regulations and then destroyed (except parts which are considered part of your health record which according to health regulations must be kept for 10 years). The study will not affect the length of your psychotherapy.

What are the discomforts and risks?
There are no risks.

What are the benefits?
The research will contribute to the value of your psychotherapy by looking carefully at the process of your psychotherapy.

What compensation is available for injury or negligence?
In the unlikely event of a physical injury as a result of your participation in this study, you will be covered by the accident compensation legislation with its limitations.

How is my privacy protected?
Your name will not be used in the research. Any information gathered will be strictly confidential and seen only by fellow students and supervisors. No material which could personally identify you will be used in any reports on this study. If necessary descriptions may be changed to protect your anonymity.

Costs of Participating
None

Participant Concerns –
Please ask me any questions you have about the project and take any time you need to consider this invitation.
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Madeline Banda, madeline.banda@aut.ac.nz , 917 9999 ext 8044.

Consumer Advocate:
If you wish to talk to a consumer advocate for any reason you may contact the Health Advocates Trust, Ph 0800 20 55 55.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 8th April, 2002 for two years, AUTEC Reference number 02/33

Consent to Participation in Research

Title of Project: **A Literature Review with Clinical Illustrations**

Principal Project Supervisor: **Andrew Duncan, PhD**

Supervisor: **Gudrun Frerichs-Penz**

Researcher: **Julian Wilson**

- I have read and understood the information provided about this research project.

- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered. I know whom to contact if I have any questions about the study.

- I understand that my sessions will be audiotaped or videotaped and parts may be transcribed.

- I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time prior to completion of data collection, without being disadvantaged in any way and withdrawing will in no way affect my future health care. If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed except those required to be kept as part of my health record.

- I understand that my participation in this study is confidential and that no material which could identify me will be used in any reports on this study.

- I agree to take part in this research.

Participant signature: ....

Participant name: ………………………………………

Date: ……………………………………..
(A copy of this form to be retained by the participant)

Project Supervisor Contact Details: Andrew J. Duncan, PhD. 917-9999 ext 7744

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 8th April, 2002 AUTEC Reference number 02/33

MEMORANDUM   **Appendix C**

Academic Registry - Academic Services

To:	Andrew Duncan
From:	**Madeline Banda**
Date:	23rd April, 2002.
Subject:	02/33 The therapeutic relationship: A literature review with clinical illustrations.

Dear Andrew

Your application for ethics approval was considered by AUTEC at their meeting on 8 April 2002.

Your application was approved for a period of two years until April 2004.

You are required to submit the following to AUTEC:

- A brief annual progress report indicating compliance with the ethical approval given.
- A brief statement on the status of the project at the end of the period of approval or on completion of the project, whichever comes sooner.
- A request for renewal of approval if the project has not been completed by the end of the period of approval.

Please note that the Committee grants ethical approval only. If management approval from an institution/organisation is required, it is your responsibility to obtain this.

The Committee wishes you well with your research.

Please include the application number and study title in <u>all</u> correspondence and telephone queries.

Yours sincerely

Madeline Banda

Executive Secretary

AUTEC

References

Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J., L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the
 effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of personality
 and social pyshcology, 83*(6), 1362-1377.

Barker, P. (1998). *Michael Foucault an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh
 University Press.

Blazina, C. (1997). The fear of the feminine in the western psyche and the masculine
 task of disidentification: Their effect on the development of masculine gender
 role conflict. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 6*, 55-68.

Clarkson, P., & Pokorny, M. (Eds.). (1994). *The hand book of psychotherapy*.
 London: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.

Cottone, J., G., Drucker, P., & Javier, R., A. (2002). Gender differences in
 psychotherapy dyads: Changes in psychological symptoms and responsiveness
 to treatment during 3 months of therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research,
 Practice, Training, 39*, 297-308.

Denkin, M. B. (1996). Aspects of maleness that contribute to the difficulties men face in seeking and utilizing psychological services. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering, 56*(11-B), 6441-6613.

Dickson, R. (1999). Systematic reviews. In S. Hamer & G. Collinson (Eds.), *Achieving evidence-based practice: A hand book for practitioners* (pp. 41-60). New York: Bailliere Tindall.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity. *Theory and Society, 22*, 643-657.

Femiano, S. (1992). The function of affect in therapy with men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 1*, 117-124.

Foucault, M. (1994). Two lectures. In M. Kelly (Ed.), *Critique and power: Recasting the Foucault / Habermas debate* (pp. 19-46). Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Frosh, S. (1994). *Sexual difference: masculinity and psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge.

Gelsoa, C. J., & Hayes, J. A. (1998). *The psychotherapy relationship: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Guilfoyle, M. (2002). Power, knowledge and resistance in therapy: Exploring links between discourse and materiality. *International Journal of psychotherapy, 7*, 83-97.

Guilfoyle , M. (2003). Dialogue and power: A critical analysis of power in dialogical

therapy. *Family process, 42*(3), 331-343.

Habermas, J. (1994). Questions concerning the theory of power. In M. Kelly (Ed.),

Critique and power: Recasting the Foucault / Habermas debate (pp. 79-107).

Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Harvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (Eds.). (1994). *The working alliance: Theory,*

research and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Heesacker, M., Wester, S., R., Vogel, D., L., Wentzel, J., T., Mejia-Millan, C., M., &

Goodholm, C., R., Jr. (1999). Gender-based emotional stereotyping. *Journal*

of Counseling Psychology, 46, 483-495.

Heppner, P., P., & Gonzales, D., S. (1987). Men counseling men. In *Handbook of*

counseling & psychotherapy with men. London: Sage.

Hinshelwood, R., D,. (2002). Evidence-based psychoanalysis: Symptoms or

relationships.   Retrieved June 30, 2004, from

http://www.psychematters.com/papers/hinshelwood3.htm

Isenhart, C., E., & Silversmith, D., J. (1994). The influence of the traditional male role

on alcohol abuse and the therapeutic process. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 3*,

127-135.

Keenan, E., K. (2001). Using Foucault's "disciplinary power" and "resistance" in

cross-cultural psychotherapy. *Clinical social work journal, 29*(3), 211-227.

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D., H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and

    inhibition. *Psychological review, 110*(2), 265-284.

Levant, R., F. (1992). Toward the reconstruction of masculinity. *Journal of Family*

    Psychology, 5, 379-402.

Mahalik, J., R., Cournoyer, R., J., DeFranc, W., Cherry, M., & Napolitano, J., M.

    (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defences. *Journal*

    of Counseling Psychology, 45, 247-255.

Mahalik, J., R., & Cournoyer, R. J. (2000). Identifying gender role conflict messages

    that distinguish mildly depressed from nondepressed men. *Psychology of Men*

    & Masculinity, 1, 109-115.

Margolis, J. (1998). Foucault's problematic. In R. Nola (Ed.), *Foucault* (pp. 36-62).

    Essex: Frank Cass Publishers.

McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (1998). *A foucault primer. Discourse, power and the*

    subject. Dunedin: University of Otargo Press.

Meth, R. L., Pasick, R., S., Gordon, B., Allen, J., A., Feldman, L., B., & Gordon, S.

    (1992). *Men in therapy: The challenge of change*. New York: The Guildford

    Press.

O'Neil, J., M. (1981). Male sex role conflict, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological

    implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The*

    Counseling Psychologist, 9(2), 61-80.

Picchioni, A. (1992). Men, masculinity, and therapy. *TCA Journal., 20*(2), 9-17.

Potts, A. (2001). The man with two brains: Hegemonic masculine subjectivity and the
   discursive construction of the unreasonable penis-self. *Journal of Gender
   Studies, 10*, 145-156.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.). (1984). *The Foucault reader*. London: Penguin.

Rafael, A., F., R., & Adeline, R. (1996). Power and caring: a dialectic in nursing.
   Advances in nursing science, 19(1), 3-17.

Robertson, J., M., & Fitzgerald, L., F. (1992). Overcoming the masculine mystique:
   Preferences for alternative forms of assistance among men who avoid
   counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 240-246.

Rorty, R. (1999). Foucault and epistemology. In D. C. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: A critical
   reader* (pp. 41-49). Oxford: Blackwell.

Rose, N. (2001). Power and therapy: Techne and ethos.   Retrieved July 1, 2004, from
   http://academyanalyticarts.org/rose2.html

Shapiro, R. (2000). Power and attachment in the analytic relationship. *Contemorary
   psychoanalysis, 36*, 91-102.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social
   Hierarchy and Oppression* (1 ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Speer, S., A. (2001). Reconsidering the concept of hegemonic masculinity: Discursive psychology, conversation analysis and participants' orientations. *Feminism & Psychology, 11*, 107-135.

Steiner, C. M. (1990). *Scripts people live: Transactional analysis of life scripts* (2 ed.). New York: Grove Press.

Walrond-Skinner, S. (1986). *Dictionary of psychotherapy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weiner, I. B. (1998). *Principles of psychotherapy* (2 ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wester, S., R., & Vogel, D., L. (2002). Working with the masculine mystique: Male gender role conflict, counseling self-efficacy, and the training of male psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 370-376.

Wetherell, M., & Edly, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology, 9*, 335-356.

Wilcox, D., W., & Forrest, L. (1992). The problems of men and counseling: Gender bias or gender truth? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 291-304.