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Abstract: Over the years, it has become clear to me that the groups of students I like best are also the ones who learn the best: when I am at my most real, most energetic and most open, then those groups of students learn best. When I am less giving of myself, my students learn less well. Consequently, I have become interested in how my work as a psychotherapist, in which the relationship is key, can inform my work as a trainer. I have realised that one of the most effective tools we have in teaching is ourselves – our personality, our imagination, our humour. When I can establish a relationship with a group, as with a client, I am more effective. I call this the effective teaching alliance. This workshop discusses the importance of the teaching alliance, and offers a simple theoretical tool. This is the relationship quadrant, which is adapted from a model first developed by Ernst (1971). I will use it to explain how we might develop and use the relationship to be more effective trainers. This paper also draws on the work of Irving Yalom and Chip and Dan Heath.
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If you ask someone to recall their best or their worst teachers even years or decades later, why can they remember individuals with clarity and feeling? Is it because of the crucial significance of the teacher-student relationship? This paper is a practice paper, offering an original training dynamic that can be used as a reflective paradigm. It is intended for those who lead groups either as trainers, managers or other forms of leadership.

I have taught, in some capacity, for over 40 years, and over that time it has become clear to me that the groups of participants I like best are also the ones who learn the best: when I am at my most real, most energetic and most open, both I and they work and learn better. When I am less giving of myself, my participants learn less well. One of the most effective tools we have in teaching is ourselves – our personality, our imagination, our humour. (Hill and Hawk 2000). Various authors, including Yalom (1991) and Hunt and West (2006) have established a link between the effectiveness of establishing a relationship in teaching, as in therapy.

Consequently, my interest is in how as trainers and educators we can best develop an environment in which the best learning will take place. I have examined ways in which my work as a psychotherapist, in which the relationship is a key element, can inform my work as a trainer. In psychotherapy, reflection on the relationship is considered so vital that there is a formal structure (compulsory supervision) in place for examining the dynamic between therapist and client. No such structure exists in the training field, so educators need to develop their own ways of reflecting on practice in order to improve own performance and student experience. If is true that effective teaching is linked to reflective practice (Gioveannelli 2003) then education and educators may benefit from a study of the “Border Land” (Hunt and West 2006) between the two disciplines.
So, in assuming an answer of yes to the above question, this paper offers a tool, developed over years of analysis of my own teaching/training practice. It is called “maintaining the effective teaching alliance.”

Socrates, who is famously quoted by Plato (circa 348) as saying “the unexamined life is not worth living” might have agreed.

Whilst I have used the word “teaching”, it is equally applicable to any situation in which there is an educative component (i.e. in which one person is responsible for imparting knowledge that others wish to acquire). Consequently, this paper uses the words educator and trainer interchangeably. The terms “she and “he” are also used randomly and interchangeably.

Effective – and Ineffective - Dynamics

This section describes four, easily distinguishable dynamics, or teaching alliances, that can be seen in the training room. Each dynamic is shown as a quadrant in a larger diagram. The quadrants are described below, working clockwise on the diagram, starting with the top right-hand quadrant. This builds on the work of Ernst (1973), who suggested that there were four ways of being in the world, and that the way to better communication is to understand and use each of them.

I suggest that each dynamic has some strengths, and may be useful in some circumstances but three of them can be seen to have many weaknesses. Most trainers, if willing dispassionately to examine their own practice, should recognise themselves in at least one of these three dynamics, at least some of the time. However, a willingness to reflect and monitor will help create conditions to adapt individual styles to move themselves into the fourth quadrant, where the teaching alliance is at its most effective (Miller et al 2008).

Whilst it is likely that trainers may move around the quadrants according to variants such as low mood, it is important to recognise that each trainer is likely to have a variety of styles, and may move around the quadrants (Ernst 1973) but the careful analysis of each session is a good starting point.

Dynamic 1 - The Coercive Teaching Alliance (Controlling Educator)

In this quadrant, the educator’s stance is forceful and rather rigid. Participants are expected to be ready to start exactly on time, and to listen quietly to the lecture. Boundaries, such as timings of beginnings and endings, may be rigorously enforced. In addition, students may experience themselves as being mocked (for not knowing the right answer) or not being heard.

Trainers in this quadrant may be very conscious of how much there is to get through in a short space of time. However, participants are likely to experience the trainer as unnecessarily rigid, inflexible, and even aggressive, even when this is not the intention. Participants may feel bullied, overwhelmed, and under-valued, because this style leaves no room for negotiation; the facilitator is too rigid in her approach and over-concerned with her message. A facilitator in this dynamic gives a clear message, of seeing herself as the expert and being uninterested in allowing debate or discussion. Participants become passive recipients of the material, knowing the facts, but unable to apply them.

The strength of this approach is that clear boundaries are maintained, and plenty of information will be given, often in a clear and straightforward manner. However, participants are
likely to be resentful of a style that makes the trainer so clearly the expert and leaves little
time for reflection or discussion.

The educator in this group needs to remember to allow for flexibility and discussion, and
to see learning as reciprocal.

The trainer’s energy has gone into being seen as having expertise rather than sharing
knowledge.

**Dynamic 2 – The Concessionary Teaching Alliance (Passive Educator)**

In this quadrant, the trainer’s stance is over-anxious and placatory. In his attempts to please
participants debate may be allowed to over-run inappropriately, often at the expense of the
material. The educator does not recognise the need to impart and/or explain information
clearly or is unable to be assertive enough, even when he himself is knowledgeable. So much
time is allowed for discussion, not all of it relevant, that expertise is not being shared and
reflected upon.

Whist the trainer in this quadrant is likely to be pleasant and likeable, she runs the risk of
participants under-valuing the training, as well as the trainer, and may experience herself as
being bullied, when student demands on her time escalate unrealistically followed by com-
plaints when not all the demands can be met.

Behaviourally, this dynamic can be recognised by the trainer who, whilst well-prepared,
is not able to control discussions appropriately, and who finishes sessions with material still
uncovered. This trainer is also likely to experience large amounts of stress as he is so anxious
to please, and yet all her efforts seem to go unrewarded.

The strength of this approach is that plenty of time is given for debate, but boundaries are
not well-held, and important points may not be made. The trainer is likely to finish sessions
exhausted and may burn out early. The educator’s energy has gone into placating the group
rather than sharing of expertise.

The educator in this group needs to learn to be more confident, both in the fact that he has
something to say worth saying, and in keeping debate relevant (holding boundaries for the
group).

**Dynamic 3 – The Collusive Teaching Alliance (Manipulative Educator)**

In this quadrant, the trainer is anxious to get through the session as quickly as possible (Ernst
1973). Consciously or unconsciously, she asks the group to collude with her in the relaxation
of boundaries. She does this by appearing to offer, for example, an attractive choice of late
starting and early finishing times. Initially this appears attractive, but quite soon group-
members are likely to feel they have been manipulated and will experience strong feelings
of discontent.

Boundaries become elastic, or non-existent. Because the trainer is so lacking in interest,
participants too will become disenchanted, often shown in coming late (as sessions start late
anyway) or not coming at all.

An example is of a group of students who, at the beginning of the year, commented that
they were having a very easy time in this particular class as the tutor only used half the
available time, but who then formally complained at the end of the academic year.
The educator’s energy goes into getting away from the group, rather than being with the group, and as the group react to this, they too may stay away.

The trainer who employs this tactic explicitly does not want to be training, for reasons that may include: over-stressful life, inability to concentrate, lack of motivation or interest, or burnout. Any trainers finding themselves consistently in this quadrant may need to consider a career break or change.

**Dynamic 4: Collaborative Dynamic (Effective Educator)**

In this quadrant the teaching alliance is at its most effective. The trainer is well-prepared, knowledgeable, and enthusiastic. She is clear about the important points that need to be addressed in the session. However, she is open to hearing from, and learning from the participants, and has built in time to allow for this.

Whilst being open to challenges from the group, she is also able to hold boundaries, not only of time, but also in keeping discussions relevant to the application of knowledge. Because plenty of time is allowed for the facts to be explored in exercises or debate, either structured (essential for large groups) or unstructured (more suitable in small groups of under 15 participants), participants feel engaged and valued, and consequently learn at a deep level (i.e. facts are not only assimilated, but application is understood).

Whilst this may sound simple, it actually it takes a trainer with high energy, one who is confident enough in her own knowledge base to enjoy being challenged. Trainers in this quadrant aspire to Socrates’ definition of wisdom – an open awareness of one’s own ignorance. Participants feel valued and interested, and learn faster and deeply.

The trainer in this quadrant is able to put whatever problems may be current in her own life on hold, in order to be totally available to participants during the session.

**Learning to move through the Quadrants**

Whilst understanding one’s own style is important, it is equally important to have a way of reflecting on, and moving, if desirable, to another quadrant in the box. The list of questions below offers a useful checklist for both before and after sessions.

**Reflective Questions to ask before the Session**

- Am I ready to work today, and if not, what I am going to do?
- Am I looking forward to working with this group? What will I most enjoy about this group?
- Am I completely at ease with the material I am presenting?
- Am I clear about the points I want to make today?
- Am I enthusiastic about the material?
- Am I interested in hearing what the participants have to say?
- Have I allowed enough time for questions and participation?
- Am I looking forward to getting feedback from participants?
Reflective Questions to ask after the Session

- Did I maintain boundaries (start/finish on time, keep discussions relevant, and allow time for different participants to speak)
- Did I get through the most important points (and if not, what went wrong)
- As far as I could tell, were participants fully engaged (and if not, did I make time to find out why not?)
- Was there useful debate and conversation?
- Did I allow time for feedback?

Conclusion

It will be clear that the most useful dynamic is the left-hand-top quadrant. This is because the other three dynamics all dis-empower the participants, and to some degree, dis-empower the trainer too. Since people learn best when they feel liked and approved of (Hill and Hawk 2000), this means that the teaching alliance is ineffective. The trainer who is interested in getting the most from the group, will therefore be motivated to reflect on own performance in order to move into the collaborative dynamic, (effective teaching alliance) and thus offer improved learning opportunities.

Good training, in whatever field is not easy. A useful analogy may be to see the group as a family, with the trainer as parent. The group needs to be nourished (so enough information needs to be given) stimulated (time for discussion and thought) and also to feel safe (boundaries maintained). The trainer who considers his part in this, at least for much of the time, will be more effective than the trainer who does not, and who does not pay attention to their own processes.

Of course, it is not new to suggest that trainers who develop strong relationships with participants are seen as more effective trainers than those that do not. There has been much written about the need to develop strong relationships with participants, and to encourage participants to become reflexive learners (Dewy, 1993, Schon 1995) in order for them to become independent thinkers.

However, much of the current literature assumes that those who are, or who will be effective trainers, already have the necessary disposition (Giovannelli 2003, Hubble Miller et al 2008). There is very little written about how to develop a reflective way of being in order to utilise best practice. This paper offers a way for practitioners to fill that gap.
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