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Abstract

Longer therapies can have a major impact on services by lengthening waiting lists. This exploratory study of one National Health Service (NHS) adult mental health psychology department aims to understand why therapists gave longer therapies to a few of their patients. There is a paucity of research on this topic in the literature. A longer therapy was defined as one of 26 or more sessions since some research has shown that at around this number the rate of improvement levels off. A qualitative research methodology using grounded theory was employed to analyse data obtained from interviewing nine psychologists.

The main findings comprised two related themes: the stages that therapy goes through, during which it becomes extended; and balancing competing demands while carrying out the therapy. These conflicts may be coped with in different ways, but they often result in the therapist finding it difficult to stop therapy, even when they review frequently. The therapist may then ask a colleague for advice to help them stop. The therapist may keep their feelings, and behaviour secret, which may make it difficult for them to maintain their self-esteem. The conflicts may remain unresolved.

The methodology and findings are discussed critically. Recommendations are made, from the findings and using ideas from the literature, to help the members of the department (and other therapists) stop therapy sooner, and to become more open about the length of the therapies they give.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Topic of investigation

This dissertation is concerned with uncovering the factors leading therapists (psychologists) to offer many more sessions, than they usually do, to some of their patients. This occurs in the context of other demands on the therapist, many of which may create a pull towards a briefer therapy. Giving longer therapies can become a problem because it can have a disproportionate effect on waiting lists compared to shorter therapies.

1.2 Background

Recently, partly because of evidence-based research findings and also because of financial considerations, shorter psychological treatments have been encouraged in the NHS, and Trusts are expecting therapists to see more patients. Additional factors, such as long waiting lists, departmental policies and pragmatic reasons, may all be pushing this drive towards relatively short-term treatments (Startup, 1994).

It is possible that the length of therapy (in the NHS) is now shorter, on average, than in the past (Startup, 1994). But this may not be a consistent phenomenon. It should be noted that clinicians often ignore research findings, including those of treatment length (Morrow-Bradley and Elliott, 1986; Roth, 1999; Waddell, 2001). Firth, Shapiro, and Parry (1986) suggest that therapists often covertly depend on a fall-back possibility of extending the number of sessions despite what has been agreed. Punter (1995) found that, in an NHS psychotherapy department, treatment length of patients allocated to short-term individual therapy was between two and 249 weeks. Thirty-two percent had therapy for between one
and 4.7 years and this was no different from those allocated to long-term treatment. By most accepted definitions this would not be considered ‘short-term’. Punter’s study was an audit and did not explore the reasons why some of these therapies had exceeded what must have been agreed at assessment.

A similar phenomenon was found in an audit carried out in the psychology department under investigation for this study. The norm in the department was giving around ten sessions of therapy but some psychologists offered considerably more to a few patients. It was found that 22 long-term patients took up as much time as about 170 ‘average’ 13-session patients (Westbrook, 1999). Indeed, four of these 22 patients had had as many sessions as more than 100 ‘average’ patients. Westbrook’s audit did not investigate the reasons for this occurrence.

It would seem reasonable to surmise that, when some patients get considerably more than the ‘average’ number of sessions, this can have severe consequences for waiting lists and for the service. It seems likely that the length of the waiting list will increase, resulting in a much longer wait for many patients. Given that long-term therapy may not necessarily be more effective than short-term (see Section 1.3) it is important to increase our understanding about why this phenomenon occurs, whether in the department under investigation or in others. The current study is an attempt to explore possible reasons for this happening, in one Adult Mental Health Psychology Department. Problems around finding an optimal length of therapy had exercised the department for some years, and the present study is an attempt to find out more. If the reasons were known it might be possible, in this one department or in others, to devise ways of ameliorating their negative effects, as well as endorsing when it is justified. For this study, longer therapies are defined as those of
26 or more sessions (Section 1.4), and brief therapy as up to ten sessions. Although the focus of the study is parochial, the findings are likely to have relevance to therapists in other departments.

1.3 Literature review

1.3.1 Length of therapy

As already suggested, samples from individual clinics and epidemiological studies have often found that a comparatively small proportion of patients consumes a disproportionate amount of resources i.e. these patients have many more sessions than do most patients (Garfield, 1986; Vessey, Howard, Lueger, Kächele, and Mergenthaler, 1994; Westbrook, 1999). For example, Howard, Davidson, O'Mahoney, Orlinsky, and Brown (1989), when studying 405 patients, found that 32% of patients used 77% of all sessions. Garfield (1986) found that, even where an unlimited number of sessions was on offer, the median number of sessions was only five to six, in other words, most patients have few sessions while a few will have a great many sessions.

1.3.1.1 Is more therapy better?

Therapists have long had an assumption of 'more is better' (Stiles and Shapiro, 1989). Guinan (1995) and Jones (1998) are critical of the 'rapid throughput model' that clinical psychologists have adopted as a response to NHS 'reforms'. Older studies, often of psychodynamic therapy, have backed the 'more is better' assumption (Howard, Kopta, Krause, and Orlinsky, 1986; Orlinsky, Grawe, and Parks, 1994; Seligman, 1995). More recently, Stiles (1996) has stated, in the context of process-outcome research, that 'more of a good thing is better when one is not already getting enough', which could apply to length
of therapy as well as process factors. However, this begs the question of knowing when the point of ‘enough’ has been reached, and how it should be measured. Steenbarger (1994) suggests that there may be a continuum of patients where, at one end, are those who readily form a treatment alliance and have a focal problem, who can achieve their goals in very few sessions (e.g. 10). At the other end of the continuum, are those patients who have diffuse problem patterns and with whom building a treatment alliance takes time. The latter group of patients would need more sessions.

1.3.1.2 The ‘dose-effect’ relationship

The curve of outcome and treatment duration is not necessarily linear and has been found to be negatively accelerated. In other words, a point is reached (which differs with factors such as type of patient and treatment modality) when more does not mean substantially better. This is the well-known ‘dose-effect’ relationship (Howard et al., 1986; Orlinsky et al., 1994). For example, Howard et al. (1986) using 15 studies, found that 25% of patients had improved after one session, 50% after eight sessions, and 75% of patients had improved by 26 sessions. After this, the rate of improvement slowed down significantly. It seems that most therapeutic benefits occur in the earlier stages of therapy (Lambert and Bergin, 1994). Kopta, Howard, Lowry, and Beutler (1994) from a sample of 685 patients, estimated that after 58 sessions, 75% of outpatients (i.e. mainly those with anxiety, depression or personality disorders, and a few with psychosis) would have shown symptomatic recovery.

1.3.1.3 Mediating factors

Some researchers have investigated factors that may mediate duration and outcome of therapy (e.g. patient factors – the patient’s inter-personal functioning, involvement and
expectation; therapist factors – influence and capacity for relatedness; and context-related factors such as patient-therapist match) (Steenbarger, 1994). Others have described stages in therapy (Shapiro, Barkham, Reynolds, Hardy, and Stiles, 1992; Stiles, Elliott, Llewelyn, Firth-Cozens, Margison, Shapiro, and Hardy, 1990); phases that therapy needs to go through to be effective (Howard, Lueger, Maling, and Martinovich, 1993); or universal change processes (Orlinsky et al. 1994; Kolden, 1996).

From such studies it is possible to conclude that it is not at all easy to generalise about what would be an optimal length of therapy for an individual patient, especially since this could vary according to who decides what is ‘optimal’ – the patient, therapist or manager.

1.3.1.4 Outcome with brief therapy

Koss and Shiang (1994), in a review, suggest that outcome research on brief therapy indicates that it can result in positive change, particularly when specific client groups are studied. Shapiro, Barkham, Rees, Hardy, Reynolds, and Startup (1995) have shown that an eight-session therapy for depression can be effective, and as effective as one of 16 sessions. Further analysis of these data showed that, whilst change in symptoms was roughly linear (i.e. not negatively accelerated) for both groups, change was more rapid in the short, time-limited group (Barkham, Rees, Stiles, Shapiro, Hardy, and Reynolds, 1996; Reynolds, Stiles, Barkham, Shapiro, Hardy, and Rees, 1996). However, both groups had relatively short therapy and may not have had sufficient sessions to demonstrate negative acceleration. The findings from a small-scale study (carried out in the department under investigation), comparing the effectiveness of long-term and short-term therapy for 29 patients with long-standing difficulties, showed that giving ten sessions can be effective, and as effective as 30
sessions (Westbrook, 2001). The therapists in this study were very experienced and had frequent supervision, which may have helped them pace the sessions and maintain focus. Although it seems that briefer therapies can be effective and most change can occur in the early sessions of therapy, this may vary with symptomatology. Other patient-, therapist- and context-related factors can also affect the number of sessions required for change and outcome obtained.

Importantly, the research quoted above relies on grouped findings and each individual patient may, in practice, be very different in the number of sessions they need for an effective therapy.

1.3.2 Clinical judgement

Therapists can use clinical judgement to determine treatment length, and this is an example of the decision-making people carry out in everyday life. Generally, people try to make accurate and rational judgements, even though this may not always be successful. Some kinds of clinical judgement are easier to make than others, for example, Garb (1994) commented that clinicians are better at monitoring improvement by observing changes in mental state than at predicting outcome.

Much of the literature on clinical judgement relates to making diagnoses and few researchers have investigated therapist decisions about treatment, especially its duration. O'Donohue, Fisher, Plaud, and Curtis (1990) state that clinicians tend not to use systematic processes regarding which assessment and treatment methods to use. This was also found by Gilje and Klose (2000) in psychiatric nurses who used intuitive interpretative decision-
making more than rational decision-making when planning an intervention. Rabinowitz (1993) points out that practitioners’ biases can occur at different stages of decision-making – at input, processing, output-action, and feedback.

To help themselves, especially when dealing with complex decision-making, it appears that people use various strategies (heuristics), which may or may not be in their awareness, to simplify the process. These strategies make decisions easier, and often more accurate but can lead to errors when the assumptions they are based on are incorrect, thus leading to bias. Common strategies are that clinicians make early judgements and resist modifying them in the light of further evidence; or choose what readily comes to mind when estimating the frequency of an occurrence, rather than looking at the evidence (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974, cited in Garnham and Oakhill, 1994, page 160). Watts (1980) refers to the adoption of heuristics as a high-risk strategy, and suggests that clinicians increasingly take up these strategies with clinical training and as they become more experienced.

The research literature is also concerned with how clinicians might go about minimising biases (Arkes, 1981; Garb, 1994; Rabinowitz, 1993). Watts (1980) thought that clinical judgement could be improved by training clinicians to use objective low-risk styles, e.g. obtaining objective information, as well as to use more ‘qualitative’ judgements such as those derived from observations. Reducing bias tends to involve collecting appropriate information and considering alternative hypotheses; relying less on memory and more on notes; and being familiar with the empirical evidence rather than relying on one’s own experiences.
While the participants in this study are likely to be using clinical judgement when making decisions about when to extend or stop therapy, other factors, such as the patient and the system, will also have an effect.

1.4 Rationale and aims of the study

The main points discussed above may now be summarised. The research literature has long suggested that positive outcome increases with duration of therapy, but it seems that there may be diminishing returns after a certain point. In some studies this negative acceleration occurred after 26 sessions (Howard et al., 1986). Recent group findings show that briefer therapies can be effective, although it can be difficult to determine the most appropriate length of treatment in individual cases. Yet research evidence suggests that findings are not always acted upon by clinicians in their own practice. Even in settings that tend to offer brief therapy, therapists are likely to offer a few patients considerably more than the average number of sessions.

Although very few patients may be involved, it is clear from first principles, that a large increase in sessions above the norm for a service could lead to problems and have a substantial effect on its waiting list. To decrease this effect, it could be argued that these extra sessions should be discouraged, or at least justified (e.g. by a proportionate improvement in the patient; or by preventing expensive hospitalisation). At the very least, it is likely that therapists are offering more sessions for what they believe to be a good reason. If the factors leading to ‘extra’ sessions were better understood and were more explicitly known, it might be possible to find ways of minimising their negative effect, e.g. even slightly fewer sessions will have a beneficial effect on the service.
The research mentioned above does not inform about what prompts therapists to offer the number of sessions they do offer, or when during therapy, this occurs. The decisions are likely to be made in the context of other demands upon them, apart from the patient, such as from the setting in which they work. There is no research that tries to understand the beliefs and decisions of individual therapists.

This study aims to discover and examine what therapists (psychologists) believed had led them to offering 'longer-term' therapy to some of their patients. A longer therapy is defined here as 26 or more sessions, i.e. using Howard et al.'s (1986) cut-off (the number after which 75% of patients had improved, and after which there was negative acceleration). This study is exploratory and uses a qualitative research methodology.

The research question is 'what factors are associated with therapists offering 26 or more sessions of therapy?'

As with qualitative research in general, there will be no predetermined hypotheses. The theme emerging from the findings can be viewed as a hypothesis that could be tested in the future.

1.5 Methodological issues

1.5.1 Qualitative research

The methodology used in a research project flows from the research question (Barker, Pistrang, and Elliott, 2002; Henwood and Pidgeon, 1995). A quantitative methodology looks for cause-effect relationships through the testing of hypotheses. This approach is not
possible with the research question for this study because there is no previous research from which to devise a research methodology using hypothetico-deductive methods. The study is therefore exploratory, and aims to find and understand idiosyncratic meanings, as well as exploring the participants’ subjective viewpoints. The study also recognises the importance of the social context and its nuances. These requirements are more readily satisfied by a qualitative methodology. The study aims to understand and find meanings surrounding the offer of longer therapy through open-ended exploration using induction. Again, this is more readily achieved through a qualitative discovery-oriented approach.

It is important to understand that, when using a qualitative approach, knowledge is built up within a social context which includes the participants and the researcher. Thus it is not objective but instead gives their multiple perspectives (McLeod, 2001). The findings do not aim to be the fixed truth and thus are likely to be temporary and tentative (Stiles, 1993). However, by increasing understanding, new possibilities are opened up. Reflexivity on the part of the researcher is particularly important. The researcher analyses their own assumptions but stands back from them (McLeod, 2001; Willig, 2001). Although qualitative research is discovery-orientated, the findings also need to be ‘realistic’ in order to be plausible (McLeod, 2001).

1.5.1.1 Trustworthiness

In qualitative research there is nothing strictly comparable to the reliability and validity criteria used in quantitative research methods because it does not aim for objectivity. Nevertheless, qualitative researchers are concerned about quality standards for their research (Elliott, Fischer, and Rennie, 1999; Mays and Pope, 1999; McLeod, 2001; Smith,

Stiles (1993) suggests some criteria for procedural trustworthiness standards through the trustworthiness of data which include the researcher’s ‘forestructure’ (which has been referred to as ‘owning one’s own perspective’ by Elliott et al., 1999); describing the social context of the research; disclosing the researcher’s internal processes; iteration, i.e. repeatedly going between interpretation and data; engagement with the material; and grounding of interpretations in the data. In other words, the steps taken are transparent to others.

Stiles (1993) refers to the trustworthiness of the interpretations of the data or conclusions as being whether an interpretation is internally consistent and useful. This can be determined through the impact of the interpretations on the participants, researcher and reader. It can also be determined by the following methods: triangulation (e.g. seeking information from multiple data sources or from several perspectives); a clear exposition of the methods of data collection and analysis; and coherence, i.e. narrative truth or resonance.

Stiles (1993) and Elliott et al. (1999), in particular, have set out guidelines for carrying out good qualitative research in psychology, and this study will be assessed in relation to some of these criteria in the Discussion (Section 4). However, Barbour (2001) warns against an over-reliance on checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research. She maintains that these ‘technical fixes’ cannot confer rigour unless the principles of qualitative research have been applied systematically and thoroughly.
1.5.1.2 Generalisability

The concept of generalisability, which is used to show how representative an observation is, is a further aspect of reliability and validity, and considered to be important in quantitative research. The current study has a local and specific context, and like most qualitative research, does not aim to be generalisable. Nevertheless, the findings may be transferable to similar psychology or psychotherapy departments.

1.5.2 Grounded theory

There are different kinds of qualitative research but grounded theory is particularly suitable to investigate the proposed research question and is used here. A grounded theory methodology is increasingly being carried out in health care settings (e.g. Pope and Mays, 1999) and by clinical psychologists (e.g. Clegg, Standen, and Jones, 1996; Corrie and Callanan, 2001; King, 2001; McVey, Madill, and Fielding, 2001; Middle and Kennerley, 2001; Tweed and Salter, 2002).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) first laid down rigorous, systematic guidelines for grounded theory analysis. Later, Strauss and Corbin (1998) set out some procedural rules for grounded theory. Grounded theory's interpretative methods can be used to investigate subjective experience and processes (Charmaz, 1995). A grounded theory analysis is inductive, i.e. concepts and relationships are synthesised from the raw data using interpretations, which are then put together into an explanatory narrative. The research question is broad, open-ended and action-oriented and is answered by being 'grounded' in the data, i.e. the participants' responses (McLeod, 2001). The concepts are derived from the data and are not pre-conceived. There is a constant interplay or 'flip-flop' between the researcher's conceptualisations and the data (Pidgeon, 1996). As the researcher immerses
themselves in the data, meanings are made explicit. The technique of constant comparison is important in grounded theory analysis. Here, data, categories and concepts are continually compared so that similarities and differences can be found. Theoretical sampling is also used so that more data are added, e.g. through further interviews, if they can add to the data. Data collection and analysis are carried out simultaneously. Reflexivity on the part of the researcher means they are not left unchanged.

The data are analysed and interpreted by means of different kinds of coding whereby they are conceptualised and categorised in order to find overarching categories or themes that can describe the data and the phenomenon being investigated. Thus, a theme or themes are identified, and then an attempt is made to verify, confirm and qualify it by searching through the data. The theme that emerges from the data can be seen as the hypothesis (or theory).
2 Method

2.1 Design

A grounded theory design was chosen (Section 1.5). Data were collected through semi-structured, open-ended interviews (anonymised transcripts of which are available from the researcher). Apart from demographic and other quantifiable information from the participants, the interview schedule included five prompt questions around the topic of interest, and questions to bring about closure. The interviews were analysed according to grounded theory principles. The quality criteria on qualitative research in psychology of Stiles (1993) and Elliott, Fischer, and Rennie (1999) were followed as far as was possible, and Pope and Mays' (1999) questions were considered. This included checking the findings with feedback from the participants.

2.1.1 Semi-structured interview

This was in three parts (Appendix 1). First, the interview gathered information about the participants, i.e. how long they had been qualified, how many patients they usually saw in a week, and roughly how many they had seen for 26 or more sessions.

Second, was the open-ended part of the interview in which participants were invited to talk about the patients who had had a longer therapy. The prompt questions on the interview schedule illustrated the area of interest and asked about when participants decided to offer more sessions, and stop therapy; their reasons for offering more and the goals of therapy; and whether supervision or line managers had played a part in their decision. In practice
these questions were not asked in any particular order. Exact prompts were not used when participants spontaneously covered the material.

Thirdly, the interview was drawn to a close by inviting the participant to mention anything else, and by getting feedback about how they felt, and whether they would view anything differently as a result of the interview.

Participants were numbered in the order they were interviewed. Interviews took place over a four-month span: five were in the first month, three in the second month and the last in the fourth month.

2.1.2 Participants' feedback

As one check on the trustworthiness of the findings, about ten months after the interviews, the researcher sent a synopsis of the findings to the participants asking for their feedback.

2.2 Context and choice of department

The phenomenon of giving longer therapies probably occurs in many NHS psychology and psychotherapy departments. The department from which the participants for this study came was the one in which the researcher worked.

The Adult Mental Health Psychology Department, which has about 30 members, is part of an NHS Mental Health Trust and psychologists work in Community Mental Health Teams (CMHTs), as well as in tertiary psychology services, e.g. eating disorders, and with more complex patients. Most members carry out cognitive therapy whilst some also practise
cognitive-analytic and psychodynamic therapies. A wide range of patients is seen but those with psychosis were excluded from the study since treatment length guidelines applied differently to them. There is a focus on time-limited therapy and the department has long had a guideline of limiting therapy to around ten sessions. In practice, this guideline is not strictly adhered to.

2.3 Participants

Participants were qualified clinical or counselling psychologists who had seen at least one patient for 26 or more sessions.

Eleven psychologists volunteered to take part. One of these became a pilot while another had seen relevant patients in another Trust and was excluded. Since the sample included a wide range of experience, and included those working in tertiary services and in CMHTs, the number of participants seemed to be adequate. It was a convenience sample.

Participants were numbered 3 to 11, in sequence. Participant Number 1, the pilot interview, was excluded from the study. Participant Number 2 was excluded because the therapist had only seen longer-term patients in another Trust.

2.3.1 Participants' attributes

All participants, except one, were female; one was a Counselling Psychologist, the others being Clinical Psychologists. Table 2-1 shows that the participants covered a wide range in terms of the number of years they had been qualified, the number of their patients that had had a longer therapy, and the number of sessions they had given that were in excess of 26,
as well as overall percentages. Just over half of the participants (55%) had been qualified for less than 10 years, and 45% for over 10 years. More than half (56%) had seen fewer than 10 patients for 26 or more sessions; the rest had seen more than 10 patients for this long. Less than half the participants (44%) had given up to 50 sessions, while the remainder had given more – one participant giving more than 200 sessions.

Table 2-1 Quantitative information about the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code number</th>
<th>Years qualified</th>
<th>No. of patients having 26 or more sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code number</th>
<th>Maximum number of sessions given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Procedure

2.4.1 Ethical considerations

The study was given ethical approval by the local Applied and Qualitative Research Ethics Committee (Appendix 2). There was managerial approval by the Clinical Director (Appendix 3), and confirmation of indemnity insurance by the Chief Executive of the Trust (Appendix 4). The ethics committee raised some issues to do with potential harm to the participants, role contamination, and anonymity. These were addressed before starting the study:

- The committee had assumed there was a policy in the department to limit therapy to ten sessions and that 'going against the cost-effective policy' could be harmful to the participants. In fact, this is a guideline not a rule. It is understood in the department that some patients will need more sessions and it is well-known that people, from the Head of Department down, have given more. Thus, potential harm was assumed to be unlikely.

- The researcher was not in a supervisory or line management role with any participant, therefore, there was no role contamination. The participants volunteered, after receiving information about the study, and were not personally approached about taking part.

- Anonymity was ensured by collecting as little identifying information as possible and then grouping it. All identifying information was removed from the transcripts. Only about one third from a department of about 30 people volunteered to take part, which further safeguarded anonymity.
Two further issues may also have had ethical implications. First, is whether there are disadvantages or benefits to the participants from taking part. It was thought that the department, and hence the participants, would stand to gain from the findings, especially if the outcome were some user-friendly recommendations. Second, is that the researcher knew the participants, some of them for many years. It was not known whether this would help or hinder how openly they would talk, but since participants had volunteered it was hoped that the problem would be minimal.

2.4.2 Recruitment of participants

A Preliminary Announcement (Appendix 5) and Information Leaflet (Appendix 6) explaining the purpose to the study and emphasising that participation was voluntary, and that contributions would not be identifiable but anonymous, were presented at a departmental meeting and sent out to members of the department in its weekly information sheet. Volunteers contacted the researcher and interviews were arranged for at least two weeks later, to give a cooling-off period during which they could withdraw from the study.

2.4.3 Interview

Participants signed a Consent Form (Appendix 7) before being interviewed and taped. Seven interviews took place in the researcher’s office in the main psychology department, the other two at the participant’s team base. Each interview took between 45 and 60 minutes. It was carried out in an open-ended conversational style.
2.4.4 Transcription of tapes

Tapes were transcribed and the transcriber signed a Confidentiality Form (Appendix 8).

The researcher then listened to all the tapes and filled in small sections of the transcripts that were inaudible to the transcriber. The transcripts were printed out and lines numbered. Identifying information, such as names, were anonymised. Copies of these anonymised transcripts are available from the researcher.

2.5 Data analysis

The methods for this were derived from those suggested by Pidgeon and Henwood (1996) and Strauss and Corbin (1998). Two main techniques were used to code the data, and in the process of doing this, the researcher became immersed in the data. Firstly, data and categories were compared using constant comparison. For example, categories derived from one interview were compared to see if they could be combined. This process was also done with categories from different interviews, that is, between interviews. At the same time, there was iteration between the data and interpretation of the data, that is, in a repeating cycle, so that the interpretations were checked out. By these means categories became increasingly refined.

The analysis of the data took place while data collection was in progress (so that subsequent interviews could be influenced by previous ones). Although these processes are described as though they are linear and in discrete steps, in practice they take place in parallel, and the steps may merge.
2.5.1 Coding

Categories were first built up through the process of low-level, open coding. Each interview was coded and categorised separately. The categories from different interviews were then combined. They were combined using axial coding, and were interpreted, to find overarching categories or themes, using selective coding.

2.5.1.1 Open coding

For each interview, phrases and segments relevant to the topic were highlighted in the transcripts and copied onto record cards (together with line and interview number). These were the concepts. Cards were grouped into categories with common properties. Category labels were participants’ quotes or the researcher’s conceptualisations.

2.5.1.2 Axial coding

The categories were increasingly refined or revised by being grouped or split by the process of axial coding or category integration. This involved combining categories across interviews and it may be viewed as putting the jigsaw together (McLeod, 2001). These categories were listed on paper.

2.5.1.3 Selective coding

The higher level categories which had been discovered through axial coding were now integrated so that an overarching theme or themes could emerge.
2.5.2 Narrative

The findings were now summarised into an overarching narrative.

2.5.3 Memos

During the analytic process the researcher also wrote memos, containing thoughts and interpretations, to facilitate the development of categories.

2.5.4 Trustworthiness

2.5.4.1 Procedural trustworthiness

The researcher had an awareness of Stiles' (1993) criteria for procedural trustworthiness (Section 1.5.1.1).

2.5.4.2 Credibility checks

It was not possible, within the constraints of this study, to carry out all the credibility checks recommended by Stiles (1993), such as triangulation (in which the findings are compared with other data sources). The researcher was alert to how her thinking was affected by the material. Feedback was obtained in the following ways:

- Feedback from participants was sought in writing by asking the participants for their feedback on the findings. None replied to a detailed account of the findings, so they were sent a short 1½ page summary, to which all responded.
• Feedback from 6 psychologist readers of the findings, to see if the material was coherent and resonated with them.

• The researcher discussed the data and findings with two colleagues throughout the research process.

• A non-psychologist ‘auditor’ open-coded Transcript No. 6.

2.5.5 Researcher’s forestructure

The researcher is a long-established member of the psychology department being investigated and has known the participants, to varying extents and for differing lengths of time. She has worked in the tertiary psychology service for many years but did not join a Community Mental Health Team (apart from doing occasional sessions) until just before Participant No. 7’s interview. Although most of her clinical work is cognitive therapy, she also works cognitive-analytically and psychodynamically, and does not advocate that there is one best model of therapy. She has seen a few patients for a very long time, e.g. 200 sessions for a psychodynamic therapy and 100 sessions for a cognitive therapy, but is also comfortable doing very brief therapy, e.g. four sessions, when this seems appropriate. She is interested in audit and waiting lists.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction

Although the results are described as though they were arrived at in a linear fashion, it should be remembered that the analysis involved constant comparison across the data and categories, and a repeated process between interpreting and going back to the raw data. The abbreviations used in quotes are shown in Box 3-1.

Box 3-1 Abbreviations used in quotes

Transcripts are identified by their number, and line numbers, e.g. 3/1-5 denotes lines one to five of Participant No. 3’s transcript

… denotes short pause in the interview

[… ] denotes material from the transcript has been omitted

3.2 Coding

3.2.1 Open coding

First, each transcript was coded separately. Concepts were identified from segments (usually in the form of short phrases) of the text and given concept labels, in the participants’ or researcher’s words, to reflect their meaning. For example, the segment of bold text in the following extract was given the concept label ‘hard to finish’:

6/27-28 […] they still had ongoing problems that they were struggling with that made it hard to finish sessions [...].
The concepts from each interview were then clustered together into *categories*, by looking for similarities. For example, in Participant No. 6's transcript (Appendix 9), the following concepts, relating to the therapist's difficulty in stopping therapy, were combined to form the category ‘Hard to finish’, the label being retained in this instance (Box 3-2).

**Box 3-2 Concepts forming the category ‘Hard to finish’, for Participant No. 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I find it difficult to discharge people who are anxious about being discharged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because she was very low weight, therefore, very difficult to pull out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was taking account of their symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was responding to their anxiety between sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients were anxious about ending the sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If long-term therapy, danger of dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Difficult to carry on] because of the waiting list and breaking rules in some way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20, I think, is this OK?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing problems made it harder to finish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete list of categories for each interview is shown in Appendix 10. There were between seven and 25 categories per interview, each category having been constructed from between two to 25 concepts. For example, for Participant No. 6’s transcript, there were another six categories in addition to the category ‘Hard to finish’ (Box 3-3).

**Box 3-3 All categories for Participant No. 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion in supervision/line management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review -- how to decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed feelings (re continuing or ending). Indecision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on/difficult to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.2.2 Axial coding

During axial coding, the categories from all transcripts were examined for relationships (e.g. similarities) so that categories could be combined and refined. At the same time, the researcher continued checking that the categories fitted with the raw data. Each category, derived by open coding from the individual transcripts, was then subsumed within a higher order, combined category across the transcripts. This produced a list of 23 combined categories across the participants (Box 3-4).

Box 3-4 Combined categories for all participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure from others (to take on or succeed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for taking on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hard and fast rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and aims of therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement/trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for offering more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes have to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy versus maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being demanded of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying a burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painful awakening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying what one does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting something out of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To illustrate the process, all the categories for Participant No. 6 were subsumed into four of the combined categories, as shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 The combined categories under which Participant No. 6’s categories were subsumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 6’s categories</th>
<th>Combined categories for all participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion in supervision/line management</td>
<td>Difficult to stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed feelings (re continuing or ending). Indecision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on/difficult to stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review – how to decide</td>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of patient</td>
<td>Type of patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between categories was elaborated and clarified further through forming links between them that could be used to explain certain phenomena such as different stages of therapy. The nine categories that emerged are shown in Table 3-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined categories derived from open coding</th>
<th>Categories derived from axial coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from others (to take on or succeed)</td>
<td>1. Taking the patient on: ‘No hard and fast rules’ about who is taken on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for taking on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hard and fast rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and aims of therapy</td>
<td>2. Starting therapy: ‘Starting with a trial run’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement/trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for offering more</td>
<td>3. Offering more sessions: ‘It doesn’t seem sensible to cut out half the tumour’ but ‘Not within the spirit of what we should be doing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>4. Reviews: ‘Considering the options’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
<td>5. Stopping therapy: ‘Gained enough’ or ‘Shutting up shop’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>6. Trying to be a good psychologist: While ‘putting them back together again quickly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy versus maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being demanded of</td>
<td>7. Carrying a burden: Trying to ‘make amends’ and Being ‘set up’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying a burden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubting</td>
<td>8. ‘Painful awakening to reality’: There has been a ‘learning process’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painful awakening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting something out of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was material relating to most categories in each transcript, especially for categories 1 to 5 (Appendix 10). However, some categories were not derived from every transcript.

Table 3-3 shows the categories that were derived from each participant’s transcript (✓ denoting the presence of material relevant to each category).

Table 3-3 Who said what (axial coding categories derived from each participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code number</th>
<th>Axial coding categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for axial coding categories:

1. Taking the patient on
2. Starting therapy
3. Offering more sessions
4. Reviews
5. Stopping therapy
6. Trying to be a good psychologist
7. Carrying a burden
8. Painful awakening to reality
9. Managing self-esteem
3.2.3 Selective coding

The process of selective coding now took place in that the nine categories derived from axial coding were integrated to find an overarching category that could explain the topic of the study. From this, the overarching category 'going through the stages of therapy while balancing competing demands' emerged (Table 3-3). It comprised two themes – going through the stages of therapy; and balancing competing demands.

Table 3-4 Overarching categories, derived from axial-coding-categories, by selective coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories derived from axial coding</th>
<th>Overarching categories derived from selective coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taking the patient on: ‘No hard and fast rules’ about who is taken on</td>
<td>A. The stages of therapy: ‘Breaking the rules in some way’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Starting therapy: ‘Starting with a trial run’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offering more sessions: ‘It doesn’t seem sensible to cut out half the tumour’ but ‘Not within the spirit of what we should be doing’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviews: ‘Considering the options’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stopping therapy: ‘Gained enough’ or ‘Shutting up shop’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trying to be a good psychologist: While ‘putting them back together again quickly’</td>
<td>B. Balancing competing demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Carrying a burden: Trying to ‘make amends’ and Being ‘set up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ‘Painful awakening to reality’: There has been a ‘learning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.4 Memo-writing

During the analysis of the interviews, the researcher jotted down thoughts of anything that might help with the analysis, in the form of memos and a diary. Presenting extracts here is an example of procedural trustworthiness, showing the researcher’s reflexivity and giving evidence to other readers. Samples of memos relating to three transcripts are reproduced in Appendix 11. An extract from the memo written while coding the transcript of Participant No. 6 follows:

*The impression I have is of people really putting themselves out for their patients. There may be a satisfaction for oneself from that, but the patient’s well-being definitely comes first. Therapists are doing something against the odds. That, despite the pressures, therapists try to do a good job, not just a pragmatic job. And that they are really helping people when they do this (on the whole). This should be valued – people shouldn’t have to feel bad about this (and keep it a secret), as some seem to do.*
3.3 The findings: Going through the stages of therapy while balancing competing demands

The following is a description of the content of the nine main categories that emerged from the coding process. The categories are illustrated with quotes from the data to confirm their trustworthiness.

3.3.1 Going through the stages of therapy: ‘Breaking the rules in some way’

3.3.1.1 Taking the patient on: ‘No hard and fast rules’ about who is taken on

Few patients in the psychology department have a therapy of more than 20 sessions (Westbrook, 1999). This study focuses on a very small but important minority of patients. All participants, except Participant No. 6, gave more sessions to patients with complex, long-standing problems. This included those who had had multiple childhood traumas. They often had interpersonal problems. The patients might have had much previous treatment, including hospitalisation, and could be at risk of self-harm or suicide. In addition, they could be severely depressed or have various anxiety disorders including Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, and eating disorders. Participant No. 6 said they gave more sessions to patients who had severe problems such as depression and agoraphobia, rather than those with personality disorders. Patients with psychosis were excluded from the study (Section 2.2).
There are no ‘hard and fast rules’ (4/485) about taking patients on. It cannot be predicted at the outset, or even at later stages, who is likely to receive and benefit from a longer therapy, or what the exact number of sessions will be. This may be because the severity of the problems may not be known, or how the patient will respond to therapy:

10/42-44 And often of course there’s...not infrequently the case you start off with isn’t the case you finish up with. They either divulge, or other circumstances reveal maybe greater pathology than you first thought.

The psychologist may be the only one in the multidisciplinary team who can offer them therapy but this reduces demands on the service as a whole (7/421-423), or otherwise may have little choice about taking a patient on:

10/9-18 So, sometimes you might handle people that can maybe go elsewhere in a larger set-up. [...] ...more and more severe particularly so-called personality disorder patients are getting referred to our service, and often then finish with me.

Thus, there are many individual reasons for taking on a patient for a longer therapy, and no hard and fast rules about it.

3.3.1.2 Starting therapy: ‘Starting with a trial run’ (11/10-11)

Psychologists see their role as facilitating change. Therefore it is important that the patient should be able to use therapy, and change, even if only minimally. It is expected that it may take time to engage and have a constructive therapeutic relationship with the patient who needs more sessions. Testing out these factors also takes time and may involve frequent reviews. Because of these uncertainties, therapy is often started with a ‘trial run’ of a few
sessions to see if the patient will respond (5/135-139), which, if successful, will allow therapy to continue:

11/8-12 The kinds of people who I take on are, and who are referred to me, are nearly always people with very complex longstanding problems, who have had lots of previous treatment. The intention is, in some cases, to start with a trial run to see if they will respond to cognitive therapy, and in practice, most of them show some signs of responding, and so one continues with them.

Goals can vary from extremely modest such as helping someone to function at a basic level, to more profound change.

10/201-204 I mean I think one has variable targets according to the person and their circumstances. I'm working with a chap just now who I have known for almost five years, and who was an inpatient for two and a half years, and my ambition for him is to get him able to go and take his dog out […]

3.3.1.3 Offering more sessions: 'It doesn't seem sensible to cut out half the tumour' (10/25) but 'Not within the spirit of what we should be doing' (3/175-176)

The heart of this research is about why therapists offer more sessions, particularly when there seem to be many factors against doing so. External pressures, including departmental guidelines, are forces towards keeping therapy brief. Offering one patient more sessions means others lose out because the waiting list becomes longer. But psychologists may resist these pressures and give more sessions.

These reasons may be because the patient is making progress. The psychologist continues therapy, possibly to try and reach the goal and do therapy 'properly' (11/169; 4/157-161; 5/223-228) and because 'it doesn't seem sensible to cut out half the tumour' (10/25).
Paradoxically, therapy may continue because of a lack of progress. Early impressions of the patient may have been mistaken when they do not make the hoped-for progress. Then the therapist may offer more sessions in the hope that progress can still be made or because of the patient’s ongoing problems:

4/204-205 ... she in fact was not psychologically minded, and I kept thinking that she could be, ...

8/351-352 And that I just kept, kept on going and going and going, thinking, surely something is going to make a difference to your mood, and...

Therapy may continue because it follows a ‘lengthy, erratic course’ (10/32) or shows ‘fluctuating movement’:

11/86-89 The people I go on with are likely to be the people who engage well in the end, and with whom I have the sense that there really is some potential for change, or genuine movement, of fluctuating movement, so that they make gains and then lose them.

The therapist may fear that the patient could deteriorate or die (10/30-32) or the patient may have crises:

6/159-162 And I think because she was very low weight it was very difficult to pull out, because of the risks of deteriorating, and she was very anxious about that as well, so that’s why we sort of continued, and she’s made steady progress.

The examples above could be understood as the therapist getting into a vicious circle with a partial reinforcement effect (Figure 3-1).
As therapy comes to an end the therapist may want to have a proper, planned ending, which then means having more sessions:

4/79-80 ... we had to have a very planned end, and that meant stating something that was reasonable, which wasn’t just two sessions from then. So that’s how it ended up with there being thirty, […]

However, the patient may have an adverse reaction to a proposed ending. This could be to do with the patient’s attachment to the therapist:

8/509 [pause] A lot, a lot of crying at any sign of ending.

3/69-71 ... the main reason why I’m carrying on seeing him, but the main reason is that he has become very attached to me, and that attachment in some sense is useful for keeping him alive.

Other professionals, the patient or their family, may pressure or flatter the therapist into continuing:
But there was a real resistance from people outside of the Health Service, from the Social Services Department not to pull out, you know, pull back on the therapy. Although actually the goals that she had identified weren't workable really.

And there was a CPN who had particularly said, he must have T. [participant], [...]

Five of these therapists are relatively unaccustomed to working in a longer-term way and thus may lose therapeutic focus and drift. Drift may come about when the therapist stops reviewing (with the patient or supervisor). It is as though the therapist loses their self-critical capacity. The therapy 'takes on a life of its own':

Then it sort of rolled on a bit I think for another, another ten sessions. I think in a way, the last sixteen sessions probably, or the last ten sessions, [pause] [...] The whole thing seemed to take on a life of its own in a way, so...

I think I haven't been clear enough about what I'm doing, and I've allowed myself to drift, and be what I...excused myself, and I've drifted by saying it's creative and interesting. (laughs) But I think sometimes it hasn't been.

Discussing the therapy with someone, such as a supervisor, line manager or colleague (11/152; 3/317-327), can stop drift and bring about a resolution but in the absence of an explicit suggestion to stop, the therapist may still continue:

In the absence of somebody saying, you know, what about discharging this person, I think I'm more likely to carry on.

The therapist may stop telling their supervisor about the patient:
the funny thing is, I didn't really discuss it with him. In some ways I...I wonder if it was sort of a bit of a secret.

3.3.1.4 Reviews: 'Considering the options' (6/180)

Reviews are intended to be the means by which therapy stops, and they may be overt or implicit. Although not every participant mentioned reviews, they were implicit in their material. Reviews can occur at any stage of the therapy process. Interestingly, reviews can also have less overt functions and can be a means of intentionally extending therapy (as mentioned in Section 3.3.1.3):

6/29-30 I think with all those people I did sort of take it five sessions at a time, but just kept going.

At other times the reviews do not seem to have fulfilled their function:

6/247-249 Some people when you have a review, it really does feel like you are deciding whether to continue or not, with other people, I think there's a sort of assumption, you're going to continue but let's just check it out and think about it.

3.3.1.5 Stopping therapy: 'Gained enough' (11/482) or 'Shutting up shop' (10/257)

Despite all the difficulties mentioned above, therapy does stop, i.e. the therapist does reach a point of negotiating an ending. Just as more sessions may be offered because therapy may or may not be going well, so therapy may stop for these same reasons, that is, because it is going well, or badly:

11/481-482 In most cases they just feel they've gained enough for the time being.
If it seems they're not getting anywhere, then you sort of shut up shop on that particular individual, or you'd just be plugging away mindlessly.

This judgement itself can change, in that a modification of the goals may transform a therapy from failure to (comparative) success, and so make termination easier. For example, if the goal was to produce change in the patient but this does not succeed, then changing the goal to, say, producing a clear formulation of the problems so that the patient can gain understanding, will produce 'success'.

There seems to be conflict between viewing a longer therapy as helping a patient towards independent functioning while, at the same time, being concerned that the increasing number of sessions could be encouraging dependence. It may be easier to make the decision to stop because one does not want to foster dependency:

So I'm very aware of the possibility of encouraging too much dependency and working always towards fostering somebody's independence and ability to make choices and decisions that are functional for them. And as people do that, it would certainly come to my mind, now is the time to stop.

It is easier for the therapist to stop if external factors leave them no choice, e.g. leaving the team or going on maternity leave. Similarly, it may be easier if the patient decides to finish or leaves:

I'm just finishing with a patient who I've seen for 117 sessions, and she happens to be moving... I think I would have found it really difficult to end with her if she wasn't going to F, even though intellectually I know this is probably the right time for her to move on.
It seems as if stopping may be a more difficult decision for the psychologist to make on their own unless they have others to help them. For example, the line manager, supervisor, colleague, the team or the patient's family, can help the therapist stop now, rather than continue:

4/59-63 And, and I just kept thinking that it would help, (laughs) and it could help, and that we were making progress, but actually, we weren't. (laughs) And, we got to thirty sessions, just we, I decided on discussion with Y. [line manager] that I really had to end, that she wasn't going to be able to benefit from it, and she'd had a fair go, it wasn't making any difference.

3.3.2 Balancing competing demands

This theme is exemplified here:

9/445-448 [...] the thrust of the moment seems to be about reducing wait times. And I'm sure that if one was to expand on that, it's reducing wait times, yet offering people a high quality service, but sometimes I think that's quite difficult to do with people who have got very longstanding complex needs.

3.3.2.1 Trying to be a good psychologist: While 'putting them back together again quickly' (3/139)

The participants are trying to function as good psychologists according to what they perceive are the criteria of their training:

9/549-551 ... I was still in the sort of slightly idealised role of...the role of the psychologist is to enable people to help themselves, and we shouldn't be sort of pressurised to do that in x number of sessions.
The participants see themselves mainly as cognitive therapists and have an expectation that the patient will change and improve their functioning during therapy rather than working on maintaining a patient's functioning (11/203-206). Because of this, the psychologist resists taking on a more monitoring role:

7/320-325 *And I wouldn't carry on...although I talked about key working, I don't think I would carry on seeing somebody as their key worker unless I thought that it needed a psychologist to be doing this work, [...]*. I wouldn't take somebody on for maintenance long-term, if I thought that somebody else within the team could be doing that.

Fulfilling the role of the psychologist may be difficult to achieve when there is pressure (coming from outside but, maybe, also from oneself) to give as few sessions as possible (9/445-446), which can set up conflict and dissatisfaction:

3/137-140 *...also I think, I was getting very disheartened in the kind of patient-bashing kind of way of working, by which I mean seeing a lot of people really fast, putting them back together again quickly, to some level of functioning, and then discharging them, without ever feeling that you've done a really thorough job.*

3.3.2.2 Carrying a burden: Trying to 'make amends' (3/196) and Being 'set up' (11/551)

Working with the patients who are offered more sessions can be difficult and burdensome:

10/86-89 *Other clinical psychologists I've had working with me, they've either been relatively young or inexperienced, and one has felt that whilst their technical personal knowledge may be more than adequate for the job, sometimes a burden of coping with suicide people is not something you want to rest on their shoulders, so you carry that lot.*
In addition, there are external and internal pressures on the therapist. As already mentioned, others (the team, the patient or their family and other professionals) may make demands of the therapist. These may range from expecting the impossible miracle cure to denigrating what the psychologist is doing, so making it harder to feel valued:

11/543-552 [...] there is sometimes the opposite when somebody starts talking about things, you can't stop them and they get fantastically distressed, and provoke crises in their lives, and then people say it's all you cognitive therapists making them worse, and you shouldn't do it. [...] people hold on to somebody who's in crisis, saying, 'Eventually the psychologist will see you. And then, they'll deal with it, and it'll all be better.' And one's, you know, set up to be the person who's going to change a situation which is probably impossible to change.

The therapists have a great sense of responsibility towards their patients, and have empathy for them. The psychologist may want to make amends for previous failed interventions (3/193-196) or the patient's adverse life circumstances:

9/220-222 [...] the emotional thing for me that kept me wanting to really help this person was that, he was actually a really, really nice person, and he had so much potential, and his life was so sad, and so unfair. It was actually quite distressing.

3.3.2.3 'Painful awakening to reality' (9/421): There has been a 'learning process' (9/564-565)

Through the processes of gaining experience in the job, and of trying to do ones best with these complex cases, there may be a 'painful awakening to reality' (9/421) that one cannot do enough for all ones patients:
When I'm relating it to you now, some of it feels like, that a lack of experience played a role, and perhaps a lack of awareness about the pressure on services. It's almost like a sort of, painful awakening to the reality of what we can actually do, [...] 

The psychologist may feel guilty at the realisation that some patients may get a better service than others because some patients with long-standing complex needs will have a brief intervention which is unlikely to fulfil their needs. The psychologist may doubt the quality of the therapy they offer and have misgivings about its length. They may feel shame or guilt, and believe that they should do better:

Because I tend to think, oh my god! it's so terrible to have so many sessions, you know. The ultimate therapist is the one who can do things in three sessions or less.

I never feel sure that I'm actually providing therapy properly or right.

These issues are particularly pertinent for the more junior psychologists, and those who work in CMHTs. There is frustration at being unable to do what one would really want to do, such as get a patient significantly better regardless of how long this takes. As they go through their career they may become more aware of the waiting list and the thrust to keep therapy brief, and may feel they have to work within shorter time-limits:

what I'm now faced with is, when I look at the wait list, and I see people with complex, very long-term problems, I sort of feel a bit of a heart sink, what can we do with this patient in ten sessions? Not a lot. Therefore, what can we offer them really? There's been a complete shift in my mind as to, what can I do to help this patient, what can I do to help this patient help themselves, as to, how on earth are we going to get this patient through the wait list quickly? How on earth are we going to get them functioning with the limited number of sessions that we're able to offer? So it's more of a...it's more of a cognitive shift on my part now.
The psychologist learns with increasing experience but it does not seem enough:

8/213-214 As you sort of learn more and more, you become more, I do, become more and more aware of how little you do actually know.

3.3.2.4 Managing self-esteem: ‘Relative imperviousness to pessimism’ (11/614-615) and ‘A sense of humility’ (11/369)

It seems that the psychologists interviewed for this study were sometimes at something of an impasse about providing what they thought they should be providing, in the way they thought best. They had to find a way of balancing these conflicting pressures while being able to continue doing their work without burning out. Being able to justify the longer therapies they had given was important in preserving their self-esteem and self-respect:

3/170-176 So out of that work I have done a lot of thinking, and clear planning, of how I can make treatment shorter, but it's still not very short, I'm offering now thirty sessions, but how I can make treatment shorter. So I think, I've tried to use it as almost a kind of form of CPD for me as a test for doing something that might actually be very useful, I'm not sure. And that was I think my way of justifying doing something that I know is not with...within the spirit of what we should be doing.

The many satisfactions gained from doing this longer-term therapy (e.g. exercising the ‘proper’ role of the psychologist; having more opportunity of getting someone better; having a more grateful patient) can compensate for the difficulties (11/610-615). The therapists learn and change as they do their work, and find it rewarding:

10/180-182 But, there are needy people, and it's very pleasant when they go out the door smiling. I find that rewarding, and that overlaps with my job responsibility.
However, one aspect of the enduring dilemma is summed up as follows:

6/61-64 I think it's more this expectation that we can only offer very short-term treatment given the waiting list we have, and, [pause], breaking the rules in some way. I think it's like I'm still struggling with those issues really. When you see somebody for thirty sessions, it does have a look of... It's quite difficult.

3.4 Narrative

The content and relationships between the two themes of the overarching category can be summarised as a short narrative, as follows:

First, participants describe the stages of therapy taken with the patients they see for longer. The psychologist may make decisions, for example, about offering more sessions or about finishing therapy, at any stage of therapy. These decisions may be revoked or modified, often during reviews, so that the stages may not form a linear sequence. Although the therapist is usually trying to keep the therapy time-limited and focused, therapy becomes extended. This may be seen as 'breaking the rules in some way' (6/62) and can give rise to a conflict between wanting to continue and reaching a satisfactory goal, yet feeling one ought to stop because of the external pressures to keep therapy brief. However, it seems that, once extended, therapy often continues. This may be because therapy drifts but can also be because of the patient's crises, or the therapist's attempts to keep the patient alive.

Although reviews are carried out, they may not immediately lead to termination of therapy: planning an ending may lead to more sessions. Therapists may stop discussing the therapy with their line manager, as though it has become a secret. Eventually, they may seek advice from a colleague to either help them stop or give them permission to continue.
Second, the competing demands experienced by the participants underpin the themes. There is a difficult balancing act to maintain between the following conflicts – doing their best for the patients (which may not be enough); complying with the demands of the setting; and trying to fulfil the role they were trained for. The participants try to negotiate their way through the, possibly unrealistic, expectations of others and want to make it up to people who may have had bad earlier experiences. These pressures, and those they put on themselves to be responsible, place a burden on them.

The pressures may be experienced slightly differently within different types of team or setting, and over time (i.e. with increasing experience). The pressures towards 'putting them back together quickly' (3/139) may be greater in a Community Mental Health Team (CMHT) than in tertiary services. A newly qualified psychologist may be less aware of the waiting list, and so feel less constrained about the number of sessions they offer (9/420-421). As they gain experience there is the 'painful awakening to reality' (9/421), i.e. the realisation that therapy should be brief, if possible, and that one probably cannot do enough for the patient, given the waiting list and pressure of referrals. When the psychologist gives someone more sessions they may think this reflects their lack of skill (8/577-578). Therapists often realise how much there is still to learn (8/213-214). They can feel shame and doubt, and even very experienced psychologists may have uncertainties about whether their work is good enough (11/571-572). But the psychologists go on working hard and creatively, for many years, and have to find ways of coping with these stresses and keeping up their self-esteem. They are able to justify what they do, and get something positive out of their work, although it may be difficult to bring these feelings into the open and share them with others.
The findings may be visualised as a disc surrounded by a broken circle (Figure 3-2). The central disc represents the four 'demands' while the broken circle represents the five stages of therapy. The disc can turn independently of the circle, which remains stationary. Thus, if the disc were to spin and then stop (like a roulette wheel), each of the four demands could come to rest opposite any of the five stages of therapy. This demonstrates how any of the demands can occur during any stage of therapy. For example, 'Trying to be a good psychologist' could face 'Stopping therapy', as on the diagram, showing that this demand can affect that stage of therapy. But, after the disc has spun round, 'Trying to be a good psychologist' could also stop opposite any of the other stages of therapy, and thus affect those stages. In other words, the competing demands can apply to any (or all) stage of therapy.
Figure 3-2 The two themes
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3.5 **Credibility checks**

Credibility checks were carried out, which entailed getting people’s responses to the interviews and to the written findings.

3.5.1 **Effect of the interview on the participants**

At the end of the interview participants were asked how being interviewed had affected them (Appendix 12), and whether they would see anything differently now (Appendix 13). They said they had felt ‘fine’ about being interviewed.

In response to the second question, three participants said they had already started to make changes (i.e. carry out reviews; acknowledging it had been a mistake to take one of the patients on; and being clearer about setting session limits). The future actions mentioned referred to all stages of the therapy process. These were – being more overt about who to take on; making contracts; reviewing; checking out case management with someone else; and how to end. The remaining participant wanted to think about guilt because it was a question they hadn’t been able to answer.

One participant was concerned about being identified. The researcher had also become aware of this during the interview and had felt uncomfortable. After the interview had finished the participant then revealed more information about their feelings (see Appendix 14 for the researcher’s memo about her responses to this). The researcher could not ethically use this information.
3.5.2 Respondent credibility checks

This was an important means of checking the credibility of the findings. After getting almost no response to a detailed report of the findings, a short synopsis of the findings was sent to the participants to see whether it resonated with them, and whether they wanted to add anything. All participants replied and details of their feedback is in Appendix 15. They were broadly in agreement with the findings, e.g. ‘This seems a fair summary. I don’t think that I personally raised issues in all the categories but they seem reasonable. I can’t see that you’ve left anything out’ (Participant No. 4). Participant No. 11 felt that there was too much emphasis on conflicts and not enough on positives, while others said that they had not experienced all the issues mentioned. Participant No. 5 commented that ‘therapy should be brief – if possible – but a recognition that some individuals will require longer. I guess it is about recognising one’s limitations.’ Participant No. 7 added that ‘other difficulties in CMHTs include keeping people on because others are burdened, or you feel (arrogantly) that there’s no one else to see them.’ Participant No. 9 thought that ‘there are some general rules [about taking the patient on], but not when it comes to extending. It’s not always clear, no consensus amongst department.’ In the context of managing conflict, Participant No. 10 thought that there should be ‘recognition that therapy should be briefer rather than brief.’ Participant No. 8 said ‘… a few months down the line – and with more experience, I think I would think differently about things now and do things slightly differently.’ Participant No. 8 added,

[…] as I have gained more experience, particularly with complex cases, I tend to be better at dealing with things like crises at every session. […] And, maybe it’s negative, I have perhaps become a bit “harder” – tending perhaps to think more quickly – if there is very little sign of progress perhaps we should stop.

The researcher made sure the points raised were covered in the findings.
3.5.3 Readers

Six psychologists (five from the department in question and one from another) read drafts of the dissertation and thought that the findings made sense to them.

In addition, two psychologist colleagues gave critical and constructive feedback during the whole research process, including on the evolution of the emerging categories. By discussing agreements and disagreements, their alternative perspectives facilitated the researcher in refining the categories.

3.5.4 Auditor

The auditor open-coded Transcript No. 6 after reading two other transcripts and the detailed results. The auditor had the researcher’s list of categories for that transcript. They came up with 28 categories, 15 (54%) of which approximated to the researcher’s. The large number of categories suggested that the list was at a ‘lower’ level of coding than that of the researcher’s seven rather similar categories for that transcript.
4 Discussion

4.1 Aims of the study

The study attempted to explore the reasons why a small sample of psychologists gave longer therapies, so that ways could be suggested of shortening longer therapies, should this be appropriate. The research also contributes towards understanding therapists' decision-making when they have to deal with conflicting demands.

4.2 Summary of the findings

Two related themes emerged from the analysis of the data: the stages that therapy goes through during which it becomes extended, and balancing competing demands while carrying out the therapy.

Therapists encounter various problems, which result in therapy becoming extended. Therapy may become extended because of factors related to the patient, such as the patient going through a crisis, or through others putting pressure on the therapist to continue. In addition to this, and importantly, it seems that the therapist sometimes finds it difficult to stop therapy, even when they review frequently; and that, once over the ten-session guideline, it is almost as if the guideline no longer applies. Therapists may stop informing their supervisor or line manager about what they are doing and it is as though the therapy becomes a secret. However, when they find it difficult to stop, the therapist may ask a colleague for advice, to make the decision to help them draw therapy to a close.
The degree of the demands on the therapist varies with the kind of team in which they work, and with their experience. These demands give rise to conflicts, which are not easily resolved. The demands can result in the therapist feeling burdened, unable to fulfil the role of psychologist as they would wish to, and unable to do as much for the patient as they would like. This may result in the psychologist having doubts about their work. Nevertheless, they can justify what they have done, and often get satisfaction from doing longer-term therapy with the patients. Despite the conflicts, they may be able to maintain their self-esteem, although this may not be shown openly. However, the dilemma about going against the prevailing culture persists.

4.3 Discussion of the findings

There is an expectation in the psychology department, and the wider system of the CMHT, that therapy should be brief, and the department has had a guideline for some years recommending that therapy be kept within ten sessions. Despite this, the participants gave longer therapies to a few patients.

The two main themes describe problems encountered by the therapists which arise from their conflict between keeping therapy brief and extending it. The conflicts from the first theme may be to do with the patient (such as, the patient being worse than originally thought, or the patient not making progress); or may be to do with others (for example, pressure from other professionals to go on seeing the patient). From the second theme, the conflicting demands on the therapist may result in self-doubt and keeping the therapy secret.

The outcome of these conflicts is that therapy continues and may be difficult to stop. This may not be the best outcome because the therapy has gone on for too long and resources are
wasted. It is possible that the therapists’ decision-making could be improved, if they could be helped to stop therapy sooner. This might necessitate a more open culture, where problems and behaviour could be discussed openly. Recommendations for change are discussed in Section 4.6.1.

4.4 Methodological issues

4.4.1 Design of the study

In the Introduction (Section 1.5) the case was made that, in order to answer the research question and since there was no predetermined hypothesis, a qualitative research design based upon grounded theory was more appropriate for the study than a quantitative design. The value of this was demonstrated when the researcher’s preconceptions and ideas about why longer therapies are given were found to be insufficient and to lack the variation given by the participants. Talking to the participants in an open-ended interview gave richer information which was unlikely to be gained in another way.

4.4.1.1 Alternative designs

It is possible that the research question could have been answered in a quantitative way by using a questionnaire. If this had been done, then the sample could have included therapists from other departments, to make the results more generalisable. However, such a questionnaire is not available and would have to be designed. This would have necessitated an open-ended qualitative pilot study – such as the current study.
4.4.1.2 Data collection and analysis

Data collection and analysis take place simultaneously in qualitative research, and should be as transparent as possible so that readers can judge how the conclusions have been drawn. The researcher should therefore present a clear account of the whole process as was, hopefully, done in the Method and Results Sections.

However, with hindsight, the researcher realised that she could have been more flexible in developing the interviews as she went from one to the next, by paying more attention to what earlier interviewees had said. She could also have been more probing with her questions and asked the interviewees to supply more detail. However, she considers that the information obtained was still sufficient to answer the research question.

The researcher may have lost focus in some interviews by not asking all the prompt questions. Although this could be seen as a limitation, it meant that rich data were obtained by allowing the interview to take on a life of its own. The researcher’s impression was that a loss of focus did not result in useless information being collected, rather, that the data were richer.

4.4.2 Procedural trustworthiness

Stiles’ (1993) term, procedural trustworthiness, refers to ways of establishing some kind of repeatability of the findings by giving others enough evidence to draw their own conclusions (which could be agreeing with the findings or suggesting alternatives).
4.4.2.1 Owning one’s perspective

The position of the researcher at the start of the study was stated in the Researcher’s Forestructure (Section 2.5.5). Her position changed during the course of the project in that it made her consider the value of reviewing more frequently herself and setting more concrete goals in future. Some of the researcher’s responses to the data have been alluded to in the memo for Participant No. 6 (Section 3.2.4) and in Appendix 11, as well as her unease during one participant’s interview (Section 3.5.1 and Appendix 14).

4.4.2.2 Situating the sample

The participants volunteered for the study and the sample was thus a convenience sample. The researcher had pragmatically aimed for a sample of between 6 and 12 participants. The sample seemed to represent a fair cross-section of the department (in terms of experience, number of longer-term patients seen, maximum number of sessions given, and settings worked in).

Because of the small size of the sample, men were under-represented and Counselling Psychologists over-represented, compared to the whole department. There was no a priori reason to expect differences in the responses, by gender or professional qualification.

The participants and researcher came from a department with a tradition of brief cognitive therapy. The researcher had known the participants for variable lengths of time. It is possible that the researcher is known in the department as an experienced therapist who also does other therapies. To what extent these factors influenced the participants (and if so, how) cannot be evaluated but it was hoped any effect, e.g. of a power imbalance, would be minimal. However, the experience with one participant who disclosed information after the
interview suggests that at least this participant may not have been as open as the researcher had hoped, and that maybe others also kept back relevant information.

4.4.2.3 Grounding in examples

Efforts have been made to illustrate each step of the data analysis, results and particularly the findings, with quotes from the interview transcripts so that others can follow the process and see how interpretations were arrived at. However, the word limit required by the dissertation has only allowed the inclusion of short quotations (apart from the transcript in Appendix 9). A consequence of this is that the ‘flavour’ of the interviews may be lost and there is less opportunity for the reader to make their own judgements. Few, short quotes may also give the impression that the findings are less grounded in the data than they actually are.

4.4.2.4 Iteration

This refers to the cycling between the interpretations and the interviews (Stiles, 1993). The Method (Section 2.5) and Results (Section 3.2) have described how the categories were developed by the researcher through a process of continually alternating between finding categories and checking them out with the raw data. During this process the researcher became immersed in the material, which helped to understand the participants’ views.

Iteration can also involve the participants, for example, by asking them to comment on the transcripts, so that interpretations could be revised (Stiles, 1993). In this study the participants gave feedback on a short summary of the findings (Section 3.5.2)
4.4.3 Credibility checks

Credibility checks are a way of ensuring that interpretations are internally consistent, and the research true to some underlying reality (Stiles, 1993). These checks can be used to reduce biases and increase trustworthiness but cannot completely eradicate errors. Different ways of carrying out credibility checks are mentioned in the literature (Elliott et al., 1999; Mays and Pope, 1999; Smith, 1996; Stiles, 1993). It can be done by getting feedback from the participants; comparing the findings with other data sources (triangulation); putting the findings into a coherent framework; looking at whether the findings have answered the research questions; seeing whether the participants have changed as a result of the interviews; and by both researcher and participants having a reflexive attitude to the research process. Some of these are now discussed. It was not possible to use every type of credibility check in this study because of time constraints. It is hoped that the research was carried out in a systematic and thorough way so that these checks add rigour (Barbour, 2001).

4.4.3.1 Respondent credibility checks

These checks were carried out by getting feedback on the findings from the participants. Ideally, this could have involved re-interviewing them (for which the researcher did not have time), or, at least, providing them with detailed results. However, for this study, a 1½ page written summary of the findings was sent to the participants after a non-response to a lengthy account of the findings.

The findings resonated with the participants in that they thought that they accurately reflected the subject matter. The research process and findings also had an effect on the participants and they acknowledged being affected by the interview (Section 3.5.1, and
Appendix 13) and some considered changing their practice. Some participants had made changes since the interviews (Section 3.5.2 and Appendix 15).

Although the comments given by the participants may give some validity to the findings, the process engaged in by the participants was very different from the immersion in the data by the researcher. Their comments cannot be compared to the researcher's fuller understanding of the data and the findings. The lack of disagreement may make one speculate whether, in some respects, the participants were trying to please the researcher.

4.4.3.2 Readers

Although there were only six readers, their concurrence with the findings provides a source of resonance.

While the two critical psychologist readers did not carry out any coding, frequent discussion with the researcher was a very useful exercise. Agreement with the data or findings implied that they found them coherent, while disagreements helped the researcher refine categories by lumping or splitting them, or re-interpret the findings. These readers thus gave the researcher an external perspective. It also meant that the researcher had to account for each step taken in the analysis. This is in the spirit of the principles of qualitative research.

4.4.3.3 Auditor

The analysis carried out by the auditor seemed to be at a very low level of coding and thus of limited value in establishing inter-rater agreement. Since there cannot be an 'objective' version of the findings, it was not surprising that the auditor's categories differed from the
researcher's. The auditor had also probably carried out a very different exercise from the researcher's. The researcher had gone over the data many times and had an overview that was not available to another rater.

4.4.3.4 Generalisability

No attempt was made at generalisability in this study. However, it is possible that the results would be judged by members of other psychology and psychotherapy departments as being an accurate representation which would resonate with them, and so provide the starting point for research that could be tailored to a different setting.

4.4.4 Summing up of trustworthiness criteria

Credibility checks were carried out, as far as was possible within the time constraints. Care was taken to comply with procedural trustworthiness and to be transparent about all stages of the data collection and analysis. However, the limitations of these methods should be acknowledged. Barbour (2001) suggests that these methods should be treated with caution if they are used too prescriptively. Some of these methods can be seen to be more like 'technical fixes' and do not necessarily confer rigour, unless they are relevant to the design of the study or enhance the analysis.

However, it is hoped that the transparency of the process undertaken by the researcher provides sufficient credibility and shows her to be plausible and trustworthy.
4.5 Limitations of the study

Various limitations have been alluded to throughout the previous section (Methodological issues) but the main ones will be summarised here.

Although there may be a positive aspect to the loss of focus in some of the interviews (see Section 4.4.1.2), a more serious consequence is that the resulting data may have been less consistent and, therefore, would be more difficult to replicate in future studies. The tension between asking precise questions and allowing participants to interpret the area of interest in their own way is one of the dilemmas of carrying out qualitative research.

Readers of the current study might have been able to see more clearly how the various themes emerged from the data by having longer quotes from the transcripts available to them. This, therefore, limits the study in that transparency is reduced. However, the researcher was restricted by the word limit, and also followed the convention of having short quotes that is used in scientific papers.

It would have been useful to have had some measure of inter-rater agreement in this study, at different levels of coding. However, this was not carried out and was outside the scope of this study. Barbour (2002) also affirms the usefulness of having some element of multiple coding. However, she allows that, as well as actual coding by a rater, this could also include discussion of coding with other involved in the research. Future studies may wish to address this question.
Finally, in the spirit of the transparency and relativism of qualitative research, it might have been better to write in the first person. The researcher decided to be consistent with the practice in scientific papers, which is to write in the third person.

4.6 Alternative explanations for the findings

The findings are the result of the researcher's grounded theory analysis of the raw data, carried out within certain time constraints. Another researcher would construe these data differently and would collect different data from their own interviews.

A re-analysis of the raw data might have allowed more exploration of therapists' conflicts and their ways of dealing with them. For example, therapists might have specific strategies for dealing with particular conflicts that were not revealed in the current analysis. Knowledge of therapists' decision-making in a more fine-grained way might then enable change to be tailored more precisely. For example, if therapists tend to drift with particular types of patients, e.g. patients with continual crises, they could be alerted to this phenomenon earlier in therapy so that they could become more focused.

4.7 Clinical implications of the findings

The main implications of the findings, as discussed in Section 4.3, were that therapy could stop sooner and take place in a more open culture. Such changes could be of benefit to the service and could possibly increase therapists' self-esteem. Fewer very long therapies might also reduce waiting times.
For a few of their patients, therapists may be likely to be experiencing conflicts because of the demands from patients, patients' families, colleagues, the setting in which they work, as well as intrapersonal conflicts. At the same time, the therapist is trying to do the best for their patient. This means that decisions being made may not be rational ones. The outcome may be that the therapist does not stop therapy as soon as they might. Even though the details may vary between therapists and departments, similar conflicts may be widespread.

The department and its therapists may need support to help them gain more control over the length of longer therapies — to prevent therapy ‘taking on a life of its own’ — by learning to make more rational decisions. It should be remembered that some patients may need a longer therapy and this can be cost-effective. For example, if the alternative to a longer therapy were hospitalisation, that would cost more. Thus, although some longer-term therapy is inevitable, the actual length is not, and it is possible that therapy might sometimes stop sooner.

The recommendations that follow are suggestions which may help therapists make better decisions about the length of therapy. However, it is important to remember that the current study has limitations which are outlined in Section 4.5. Bearing these in mind, the recommendations suggested are therefore of a tentative nature. The members of the department may be more likely to comply with the recommendations if they see their value, and if they are not too onerous to carry out. This could come about if the culture of the department changed to being more open.
4.7.1 Recommendations

1. Greater openness

i. Being open about doing longer therapies might be facilitated by helping therapists review and stop therapy earlier, especially CMHT psychologists who have more varying demands on them than tertiary service psychologists. In the past, the department had three named psychologists to whom therapists could go, to discuss and review longer therapies and make plans about stopping (usually by session 20). Reinstating this system might help curtail drifting. This reviewing function could be incorporated into supervision or line management, or it could be separate.

ii. Some decisions leading to therapy continuing seemed to concern patients who were not making progress or not sufficient progress, i.e. the partial reinforcement vicious circle (Figure 3-1) was operating. There might be a value in therapists noticing and acknowledging when this is happening. A more open culture might allow therapists to discuss this sooner, and so take action and set limits to the therapy. This could be discussed in the context of supervision, line management, talking to the named psychologist (Point i above) or having a caseload review with a colleague.

iii. There might be some benefit in instituting ‘information-sharing’ sessions (e.g. a regular half-day event in the department) or journal clubs in the department. This might help psychologists become more familiar with empirical evidence (such as about therapy for specific disorders), not just using one’s experience in deciding on treatment length.
2. **Training in long-term therapy**

The therapists in the department are predominantly cognitive therapists who are skilled in brief therapy but may have had less training in giving longer therapies. For example, a longer therapy typically involves having a long-term plan and is not the same as the continuous series of five sessions that were described by some participants. Training might include getting as much information as possible, looking for alternative explanations and hypotheses, so that other biases are likely to be minimised. This training could be carried out in the department's skills-sharing sessions, which occur for one morning every three months. However, there is a danger that this training could seem to be encouraging therapists to offer longer therapies, and this would best be guarded against.

3. **Setting realistic goals**

It might be useful to set realistic goals which aim for what a patient can achieve (in so far as that can be predicted), even if this is very little. It may not be realistic within the NHS for goals to aim for complete recovery: which is, perhaps, the opposite suggestion to Participant No. 10’s belief – 'it doesn’t seem sensible to cut out half the tumour'.

4. **Monitoring patients' progress**

More frequent monitoring of a patient's progress might be helpful when making decisions about continuing therapy or stopping. In the department in question, questionnaires on anxiety, depression and self-esteem, are routinely given at the beginning and end of therapy. It might be useful to give these more often. Observations may also be important (as advocated by Watts, 1980), and are something psychologists
are good at (Garb, 1994). They could be used to pick up small but significant changes that questionnaires cannot do. Estimating change might usefully be used to recognise when the patient has had ‘enough’ sessions, e.g. when the dose-effect curve, for a particular patient, is levelling off. Sharing this information with others might give therapists more confidence in their judgements, and might also be supportive. Using notes rather than relying on memory, when making a decision about the patient might also help prevent biases occurring.

5. Making ‘general rules’

In their feedback, Participant No. 9 mentioned that there was a lack of general rules in the department about extending therapy. This suggests that it might be helpful to formulate an overt departmental guideline that acknowledges that longer therapy is sometimes needed, and which also draws up practical steps to help members of the department keep the therapy ‘briefer’. The guideline might usefully contain the recommendations laid out above. With a change in the departmental culture to greater openness, the length of therapy might then be talked about, making it easier to ask for help in stopping (or continuing). Therapists’ self-esteem might also be enhanced.

6. Interacting differently with CMHT members and others

When psychologists have general guidelines to help them, and the support of their psychology colleagues, it may become easier to be firmer with others who put on pressure for therapy to continue (against the psychologist’s judgement).
7. Enhancing psychologists' self-esteem

Rather than making specific proposals here, it is hoped that the above recommendations might lead to enhanced self-esteem.

4.8 Future research

This study was exploratory and not intended to be an end in itself. The findings could be investigated further using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

4.8.1 Qualitative

As suggested in Section 4.5, a more detailed study, e.g. from a further round of interviews with the same or additional participants, could provide knowledge of the decisions made in relation to specific conflicts. This would facilitate better decision-making with respect to these conflicts.

The credibility of the findings of the current study could be improved by triangulation, i.e. comparing them with other data sources. Examples of this would be running focus groups with therapists who have offered longer therapies, or discussing the findings with other groups of therapists.

The study could be replicated in another psychology or psychotherapy department. This would enable the findings to be more relevant to other therapists.
A similar study could be carried out by interviewing patients who had had longer therapy, to see what they saw as contributing to their therapy being longer, and what they thought their needs were.

The findings could be taken further by asking another set of participants about the process of reviewing longer therapies and how this affects the goals of therapy.

4.8.2 Quantitative

The findings could be extended by using them as the basis for a questionnaire or survey, to find the reasons why therapists give longer therapies. The research could then be more generalisable by using more diverse samples.

Audits could be carried out on the effectiveness of the recommendations, by taking measures of the periods before and after instituting the recommendations. Measures of greater openness in the department could come from the degree to which therapists discuss longer therapies to the named psychologists, supervisor, line manager or in case load reviews; and those of making therapy brief could be measured by treatment length in the department’s routine data, and methods of monitoring such as questionnaire scores and observations. This research should be done as single case designs rather than group comparison designs so that change in individual patients can be measured.

4.9 Conclusions

The study answered the research question and the findings showed that, while longer therapies were appropriately given to a few patients, therapists sometimes had difficulties in
stopping therapy as soon as they might have. Recommendations were made to help therapists shorten therapy. Extending therapy occurred in the context of the therapists experiencing conflicting demands – from the patients and from the system. Therapists tended to keep these longer therapies secret, and this may have negatively affected their self-esteem. Recommendations were made on how to make the culture of the department more open. The findings could thus have a positive effect on the department, and might also be helpful to other, similar departments.

4.9.1 The experience of doing qualitative research

Being rather a novice, I was learning as I went along, and not surprisingly, discovered that the reality is different from reading about it, and that the whole process was even more time-consuming than I expected. It was interesting becoming immersed in the data, yet standing back and not letting my preconceptions colour the findings (a similar process to what one does in therapy). I was impressed, moved and humbled by the hard, dedicated work done by the participants, often seemingly against the odds. I found things I wasn’t expecting and, as a result, have resolved to modify my therapeutic practice. But I regret writing in the third person. That was a distancing experience, and seemed to go against the ethos of this kind of research.
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6 Appendices

6.1 Appendix 1 Semi-structured interview schedule

Participant No.__________ Years qualified: 0-5__ 5-10__ 10+__

Approx. no. patients seen per week________

Ever seen patients for 26 sessions or more? Y/N
  If Yes – in last 5 years? Y/N
  If Yes – approx. how many patients?________
  If Yes – what was the highest session number you offered?________

Introduction
I’d like to ask you about why you have offered a patient(s) 26 or more sessions of therapy. It may help you to think about a specific patient(s), although it is your decisions I am interested in.

Additional prompt questions
At what point in therapy did you decide to offer 26 or more sessions?
  • Before you started?
  • At the beginning?
  • During the course of therapy?

How did you decide on the final number of sessions?

What were your goals in therapy?

What was your reason(s) for offering (more) sessions?
  • Were they to do with the patient?
  • Were they to do with you?
  • Were they to do with the relationship between you and the patient?
  • Any other reason?

Has supervision or line management played any part in deciding on the number of sessions you offered?
  • In keeping you going?
  • In keeping you focussed?
  • In helping you to stop?

Closure
Is there anything else you want to tell me, or ask me, before we finish?
How have you felt telling me these things?
Is there anything you would view differently now? Thank you for your time.

1 In practice, the topics were not always covered in the order given on this schedule.
Dear Ms Kuchemann,

6th August 2001

RE: A01.027 - An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 or more sessions of therapy

We have received a letter dated 11th May 2001, from the Oxfordshire Mental Healthcare NHS Trust, who are providing indemnity for the above study. I can now confirm final approval and wish you every success with your study.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Lorraine Busby
AQREC Administrator
Applied & Qualitative Research Ethics Committee
Dear Christine

CLINICAL DIRECTORS APPROVAL FOR DISSERTATION

Thank you very much for your letter of 20 August. I was very interested in the study and am sure that the results will be of great relevance to the Trust. I remember David Westbrook presenting some results on outcome study at a Tuesday morning Professorial Unit Meeting around seven years ago which, I think, showed that people with personality difficulties did not benefit very much from standard CBT within the department. I may have remembered this incorrectly however. I mention this because I guess that it is this type of person who generally is given more than 26 sessions of treatment. As he is your supervisor, I am sure that you have already been through his work with him.

I hope the study goes well and I would be very interested to know the results in due course with best wishes.

Yours sincerely

Simon Hampson
Clinical Director
Adult Services

21 August 2001
Ref: JW/jrn

11th May 2001

Dr Christine Kuchemann
Principal Clinical Psychologist
Psychology Department
Warneford Hospital

Dear Dr Kuchemann

I am writing to confirm that Oxfordshire Mental Healthcare NHS Trust will indemnify you, for your Research project A01.54 'An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 or more sessions of therapy' as described in your application to Applied Quantitive Research Ethics Committee (AQREC). This commitment is dependent on the formal approval of the Applied Quantitive Research Ethics Committee and on the understanding that you have contract of employment with this Trust.

Yours sincerely

Julie Waldron
Chief Executive
6.5 Appendix 5 Preliminary announcement

Psychology Department
Warneford Hospital
Headington
Oxford OX3 7JX

My research dissertation for the Clinical Doctorate (Admission with Academic Credit) will be:

'An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 or more sessions of therapy.'

For this study, which has been approved by the Applied and Qualitative Research Ethics Committee, I am looking for participants from psychologists in this department who have seen at least one patient for 26 or more sessions. I would like to know who would be willing to be interviewed and audiotaped by me for about an hour on their reasons for giving this many sessions to one or more patients. The enclosed Participant Information Sheet will give you more information. You are welcome to talk to me if you would like to know more.

When I have had the names of volunteers I will randomly select a sample of about six whom I will approach and talk to about the study. All interviews will be anonymous and what is said will be confidential.

Please let me know, in the next two weeks, whether you would be willing to take part. You may contact me by writing to me at the above address or phoning me on (2)26436 or the secretary on (2)23968.

The study has been reviewed and approved by the Applied and Qualitative Research Committee (AQREC No. A01.027).

Christine Küchemann
Study title: ‘An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 sessions or more of therapy’.

AQREC No: A01.027
Name of researcher: Christine Küchemann

Invitation
You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read carefully the following information and discuss it with others if you wish. Please contact me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Consumers for Ethics in Research (CERES) publish a leaflet entitled Medical Research and You. This leaflet gives more information about medical research and looks at some questions you may want to ask. A copy may be obtained from CERES, PO Box 1365, London N16 0BW.

What is the purpose of this study?
Research has suggested that, while therapy duration is related to outcome, with increasing duration returns may diminish. Therapists sometimes see patients for lengthy periods of time, which may not always be the most efficient use of resources.

I want to find out more about the reasons why psychologists in our department sometimes offer patients 26 or more sessions of therapy. The study forms part of the department’s concern to find ways of improving our service. Although we know that most of us have given some patients a longer therapy we do not know the various reasons people have for doing this.

The interviews will take place over the next few months.

Why have I been chosen?
I have selected you from those psychologists who indicated they were willing to take part.

What would happen to me if I took part?
I would interview you for about an hour and ask you about your decisions to give some patients 26 or more sessions. With your permission, I would like to tape-record the interview.
Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you would have this information sheet to keep and you would be asked to sign a consent form, a copy of which you would be given. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

What are the possible advantages and disadvantages of taking part?
You may appreciate the opportunity to reflect upon your clinical practice. The findings may help us to work better with patients in the future. However, you would have to give up about an hour of your time.

Would my taking part in this study be kept confidential?
Information which is collected about you during the course of the research would be kept strictly confidential and secure. Your name would not be attached to any information. The only other information I am collecting is broad bands of years since qualifying (in such a way that you would not be the only one falling into a band, and thus would not be identifiable).

What will happen to the results of the research study?
A report of this study will be submitted as a dissertation for the Oxford/Open University Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (Admission with Academic Credit). You would not be identified in the report or in any publications of the study. However, with your permission, any words you may say during the interview may be used, anonymously, in the presentation of the research (with any identifying information removed). The study is funded by the Berkshire and Oxfordshire NMET Consortia.

Who has reviewed the study?
The study has been reviewed and approved by the local Applied and Qualitative Research Ethics Committee.

What happens next?
If you are willing to take part, I will contact you in about one week to answer any questions you may have and to arrange a time for you to take part.

Thanks for reading this. Your help with this project would be greatly appreciated.

Christine Küchemann
6.7 Appendix 7 Participant consent form

Version 2 (June 2001)

Psychology Department
Warnford Hospital
Headington
Oxford OX3 7JX

Tel. (01865) 226430

Participant Consent Form

Study title: ‘An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 sessions or more of therapy.’

AQREC No: A01.027
Name of Researcher: Christine Küchemann

Please initial boxes

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet dated July 2001 for the above study, have had the opportunity to ask questions, and have received enough information about the study, and satisfactory answers to all my questions. □

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason. □

3. I agree to the interview being audiotaped. □

4. I agree that any words I may say during the interview may be used, anonymously, in the presentation of the research. □

5. I agree to take part in the above study. □

Name of Participant ___________________________ Date ___________ Signature ___________________________

Name of Researcher ___________________________ Date ___________ Signature ___________________________
6.8 Appendix 8 Transcriber's confidentiality form

Version 1 (June 2001)

Transcriber Confidentiality & Security Agreement

Study Title: 'An exploratory study of factors which influence therapists into offering 26 or more sessions of therapy.'

AQREC No. A01.027

Name of Researcher: Christine Küchemann

Please initial boxes

1. I agree to keep the interview audiotapes and transcripts confidential

2. I agree to keep the audiotapes and transcripts secure (e.g. hard copies to be kept in locked storage cabinets and soft copies to be password protected)

Name of Transcriber (Block Capitals) **SUSAN HUTTON**

Date **13.10.2001** Signature **SUSAN HUTTON**

Address **59 CYRIL STREET WEST, TAUNTON, TA2 6JD**

Name of Researcher (Block Capitals) **CHRISTINE KÜCHEMANN**

Date **15-10-01** Signature **C. Küchemann**

Chair: Elizabeth Winnett Chief Executive: Julie Waldron
Oxfordshire Mental Healthcare NHS Trust, Warneford Hospital, Warneford Lane, Headington, Oxford OX3 7JX
6.9 Appendix 9 Transcript of Participant No. 6’s interview

So I’d like to ask you why you’ve offered one or more patients twenty-six or more sessions of therapy, and, it may help you to think about specific people, but it’s your decisions that I’m interested in.

Three of the people, the people who seem to have really engaged in cognitive therapy and be using it themselves, and seem to grasp the model, show some signs of progress, but then have setbacks during therapy really, a feeling that they’re not at a stage where it would be appropriate to discharge them. I think with those people I have also...they have been people with low self-esteem, as well as the presenting problems and these have tended to [inaudible], things have tended to shift, anxiety, depression.  

Shifting problems.

Shifting problems through treatment. And these people are having to work, done more work on assumptions and beliefs as well as the Axis I issues, if you like.

So at what stage did you decide to carry on?

I think...I think with all the people I had sort of, ten sessions in mind to start with, but then when the ten session sort of limit came up they were still with the shifting problems, and there still seemed quite a lot to work with, more you could do I really felt they could benefit , and I was hoping that they’d get better.

So it wasn’t about maintaining them, it was about continuing progress.  

Yes, continuing treatment really, yes, definitely. I think if they had been feeling better then I would have found it easier to discharge them into follow up, but they still had ongoing problems that they were struggling with that made it hard to finish sessions. I think with all those people I did sort of take it five sessions at a time, but just kept going. (laughs).

So at each of those points, five-session points, were you doing a review in your head, or a review with the patient, or with your supervisor, or...?
A review with the patient, and when I was discussing people in supervision, and the supervisor was aware of how long it was going on, and was the line manager. I don’t know if I was actually spelling out...

_The supervisor was your line manager?_

Yes.

_You don’t know whether you were spelling it out?_

Exactly how many sessions. (laughs) But the fact that, you know, they did, there was somebody else discussing it, these things, and had a rough idea, of sessions.

_So that sounds a bit as though you were embarrassed about the number of sessions, not wanting to be quite open about it._

I think when I go over twenty I start thinking, is this OK? What would other people think? I think there’s a mixture of feelings. I think my line manager thought there were exceptions where it was OK. I felt reasonably OK. I think it’s more difficult to admit to.

_So do you think that’s partly a function of being relatively newly qualified?_

That I worried about it?

_Yes, that you were worrying in this way, what do other people think and..._

I think it’s more this expectation that we can only offer very short-term treatment given the waiting list we have, and, [pause], breaking the rules in some way. I think it’s like I’m still struggling with those issues really. When you see somebody for thirty sessions, it does have a look of... It’s quite difficult.

_And so when did you...how did you come to decide you were doing five sessions and review, that you were going to finish?_
Mm, that's interesting. I think when the people concerned were moving towards recovery, and their scores on questionnaires were lower, so, sort of mildly depressed or mildly anxious rather than moderately, and questionnaire scores were, or the Beck scales were sort of approaching ten. And I think also, which, it was when they, they were also feeling more able to cope without the sessions, and... Because I think seeing people for that many sessions gives a danger of dependency. And think, I think with probably all these people, they feel quite anxious about ending the sessions and sort of working on things independently; I think it was at the stage where they were feeling a bit better and feeling ready to do that, I then found it easier to say then, this is the right time to go into follow-up.

So you're the one that made the decision.

Well, I think it sort of, you know, it was discussed, and I think it was at the stage where they, you know, were feeling a bit more comfortable with the idea. I'd been preparing them for the end of the sessions, but... And I probably was responding to their anxiety between the sessions. But also taking account of the symptoms they had presented with, how distressed they were [inaudible].

Any pressures on you to continue or to stop?

Not... Not really. I mean I guess just know that I didn't want it to, to keep going on and on, pressures of having a waiting list really, but...

Because some of the people have mentioned pressures coming from the team, or from the GP. Sometimes to go on seeing somebody.

Mm.

As well as to stop, of course, like line managers.

With all of these people actually getting clear messages from the team and GPs.

So what sort of problems do the patients have?
Shall I go through them all? (laughs)

Yes, yes.

One person presented initially with panic and social anxiety, but he also had very low self-esteem, and once we'd made some progress with the social anxiety he became very severely depressed. Another was, she presented initially with severe depression, but was also quite socially anxious. Another person was quite severely agoraphobic and depressed. And there were, there were, there were some self-esteem issues, but there were quite specific ones rather than general problems in certain areas, and sort of working with one belief. The other person, somebody with...

The fourth one?

The fourth one. Somebody with longstanding vomit phobia, which had led to, well actually she had anorexia as well, a continuation of problems and low mood and self-esteem.

Would you describe them as having personality disorders?

[long pause] It’s really difficult. I don’t think they’d meet diagnostic criteria for personality disorders D.S.M. IV. I think they all had longstanding self-esteem issues, and had problems like, ever since childhood they’d had problems with anxiety or depression. But I don’t think they necessarily fit in to those categories. And I think, I mean, only one of the people has a significant inter-personal problems. The other people were fairly good at making relationships and things like that actually, which probably meant they were then more able to make use of therapy, I guess.

Have you worked with personality disordered people?

Yes. (laughs)

And, have you done longer therapies with them? Are they the twenty session type people, not as much as twenty-six?
I guess the people who come to mind are people who’ve had really very significant interpersonal difficulties, and very severe problems who haven’t been able to sort of engage in and make use of therapy. The one that immediately comes to mind.... And there was somebody I saw recently who had personality issues who made very good use of ten sessions, and use of self-help material and I had wondered at the start, you know, is this somebody who’s going to use a lot of input to get to things, and she made very good use of it, and I hadn’t thought she would. So I think it’s really difficult to predict how it’s going to go.

Yes. You haven’t said much about the fourth person.

Have I not?

No.

No, I guess she’s a little bit different to the others. She didn’t actually engage fully in sort of cognitive therapy and there were social issues, that seemed to be more important, that seemed to be undermining what she was trying to do. I think I stayed involved with her for more than twenty-six sessions, because, she was making some progress. I’m not really sure what that was down to, whether it was the support and encouragement of actually engaging in cognitive therapy. And I think because she was very low weight it was very difficult to pull out, because of the risks of deteriorating, and she was very anxious about that as well, so that’s why we sort of continued, and she’s made steady progress.

And so she was anorexic, was she?

Yes. Yes. anorexic and vomit phobic.

So with her it was slightly different, in that you were...you were worried about her, you felt that you had to stay in touch with her and keep going with her, and that element of it might...?
Yes, it was a bit different in some ways, it was...yes, I was worried about her being, about her low weight. I guess a similarity would be between the four of them would be the client's anxiety about ending therapy, I guess. And she was really anxious about losing weight.

So how did you come to finish with her?

Well it got easier as she put on weight. And then, we had, we had regular reviews, and at the last review we considered the options, which were, either her taking bigger steps really and do more challenging, with behavioural experiments, or her being supported by a practice nurse, for sort of ongoing support, not from me. And she decided that she wanted ongoing support rather than to work more in a cognitive therapy-type way. That was easy, because she was very different from the beginning. So she decided, chose that.

Well, she decided, and you decided as well, but with the others ones it was a bit more you, than them... Or was it the relationship between you? Do you think there's something about people that hooks you in, or...?

Yes, I think...

Or even makes you collude with them...

I don't know, because, I think this is saying something about finding it difficult to discharge people who are anxious about being discharged, but on the other hand, you know, they did have...I discharged them at a point where they had sort of improved quite a bit. In other ways it might seem appropriate to because they are feeling less distressed and have reached a stage where from moderately depressed or moderately anxious, things were going well. So, it could go either way, I think. (laughs)

Well I suppose sometimes it might be easier to keep going with somebody because you like them, or keep going because you dislike them slightly but feel guilty or feel you ought to, or...

Mm.
Yes, I can, I can see that. And I guess if somebody does engage well with cognitive therapy, it’s easy to run with them. So you might say to yourself, well they’re more likely to get something out of it, because they’re engaged but I guess also it would be more of a pleasure to work with them and be their therapist and to continue.

Yes, I think I do prefer those sorts of people really. (both laugh)

I feel a bit, it’s a bit difficult to admit that I continue longer with people just because I like them, but I’m sure there must be something in that, if I’m honest.

So what part do you think might have been played by supervision or line management in deciding to carry on or to stop or whatever?

Well, not being challenged about it. (laughs)

So a sort of, negative way?

Yes. In the absence of somebody saying, you know, what about discharging this person, I think I’m more likely to carry on. And I guess, my supervisor, or particular supervisors would be more likely to say that person’s hasn’t changed, and that person’s not engaging and....

To say to stop?

Yes. They don’t seem to be getting anywhere, and asking why continue?

Did the supervisor say that about some people?

Not about three of them, but, the fourth person with vomit phobia and anorexia, I think in supervision we discussed does it need to be me supporting this person or can it be someone else and that influenced the discharge in the end. And also thinking about setting more
challenging behavioural experiments and things like that, sort of contributed to that decision-making process as well.

240 *It sounds very much as though you keep quite focused because you are reviewing quite frequently, and then you don't drift along into a longer therapy.*

No. I think that helps. But I guess it can still be a bit of denial about ending and things. Some people when you have a review, it really does feel like you are deciding whether to continue or not, with other people, I think there's a sort of assumption, you're going to continue but let's just check it out and think about it.

250 *What's the difference then, between those types of people?*

I think it would be really whether...whether they seem to be engaged in therapy and it makes sense to them. It might depend slightly on levels of distress, if they're very distressed, it might be difficult to contract an ending. But I have recently decided to end with somebody who is very, very distressed, her model was completely different, so we decided that there was not point in continuing at this stage. But that is quite difficult, because she was very severely depressed. It was only after about six or seven sessions.

255 *And maybe it's, maybe it's because they're not so much personality disorder patients, because I know that there are patients where I have no focus really, and I just drift on and on and on. Or they bring new things, and you can never, can't actually finish, kind of thing.*

That can be difficult too... Yes, I mean, the people I've talked about haven't really been like that.

260 *No, no.*

265 I think they, those sorts of people are difficult to work with, and I probably would run on for a few more sessions because of that but I probably wouldn't actually gone on to twenty-six sessions.

270 [*inaudible*].
[inaudible] for five or something.

Yes. And where I’ve waited for sixty sessions or ninety sessions, I still feel we haven’t started yet. (both laugh)

Mm.

But their problems are so awful that you can’t stop seeing them, or there’s something that keeps you going. But it sounds as though your patients weren’t like that.

[pause] Yes, I guess I might not come across people like that so much, but...

Do you think your case load has changed over the years?

Yes, I’m seeing more complex people. [pause]

Anything else you want to add? [pause] Because it seems as though we have covered everything more or less.

Mm. I think so, [inaudible].

So, how’s it been, talking to me?

Fine, yes.

OK.

I hadn’t really sort of thought about it much before, so, I’m sort of thinking on my feet.

That’s OK. Is there anything you would view differently now?
[pause] I'm not sure, but I think I'll think about the issue of whether I'm responding to the client's anxiety about ending, or whether it is reasonable though distressing. I think I might think about that a bit more when I'm coming to the end of therapy with people.

*OK, thank you.*
### 6.10 Appendix 10 List of categories, for each interview, from open coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of patient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures from the team to take the patient on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for taking on (and offering treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why carry on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why can’t stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (need sessions to gain the patient’s trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from line manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feelings (towards the patients)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I get out of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My resistance to long-term work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The place of supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of patient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the outset (goals and expectations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why they are longer therapies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drifting (carrying on for the wrong reasons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positives about going further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives – from patients (or the relationship, or feelings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship/feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different types of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of patient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for taking on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel at beginning it will be long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in deciding how patient will respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms of therapy (e.g. bouts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hard and fast rules – sessions no. varies from patient to patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hard and fast rules – depends on how I’m feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist’s goals/aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal may not be to go all the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient’s goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient responds well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang in there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop when getting nowhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification of long-term therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ influence into shorter therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others’ influence into keeping going</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision/discussion with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When patients don’t change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemmas – support/therapy; risking discharge/risking dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How I’ve changed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant No. 6**

| Discussion in supervision/line management |
| Review – how to decide |
| Mixed feelings (re continuing or ending). Indecision |
| Carry on |
| Hard to finish |
| Reasons for stopping |
| Type of patient |

**Participant No. 7**

| Trust |
| Feelings towards the patient |
| Ending properly (by extending) |
| Aims of therapy |
| Reasons for stopping |
| Reasons for extending |
| The decisions to offer more |
| Pressure from others |
| Supervision |
| Case management and scrutiny from others |
| The importance of contracting |
| The type of patient (who gets more) |
| Maintenance |

**Participant No. 8**

| Take load off someone else |
| Pressure on therapist to succeed/make it all right |
| Type of patient |
| Aims of therapy |
| Patient’s response to therapy |
| Expectations of patient/therapy |
| Patient not as expected |
| Expectations/views of self |
| Why extend |
| Extend for wrong reasons/can’t stop (but should) |
| Mixed feelings re carrying on/difficulties |
| Reasons for stopping |
| Focused or undisciplined |
| Therapy has to be justified. Sessions have to be worth it/get results |
| Inexperience lengthens therapy |
| Something between patient and therapist |
| Consequences of supervisor’s trust |
| Guilty secret |
| Reviews |
### Participant No. 9

- Pressures from outside
- Need support from a team
- Guilt
- Feelings re interview
- Contracts
- Goals at outset: work during therapy: outcome
- Patients’ problems
- Patient characteristics: positive
- Patient’s difficulty in using therapy: negative factors
- Patient’s use of therapy: positive factors
- Patient’s previous experience of therapy
- Therapist’s feelings towards patient
- Therapist factors
- Therapeutic relationship
- Supervision
- Long-term was long ago
- Decide to stop – maternity leave
- Want to stop
- Was recently qualified/Not aware of reality
- Process – ongoing experience
- Offering treatment versus other factors
- Awakening to reality/Disillusion/Held back? Can’t develop own potential
- Learning – for the future
- What a psychologist can/can’t offer

### Participant No. 10

- Work on my own – with a waiting list, therefore reluctant to take them on (struggle)
- No one else to see them in this set-up
- Know before I see them
- The changing types of referrals – chronic, long-term, etc
- If patients don’t attend – can’t become long-term therapy (chance element)
- Own responsibility to be available
- Carrying a burden for other professionals
- Reasons for continuing/offering more
- Unpredictable course of therapy
- Review
- Goals
- Sometimes have to stop/give up
- Monitoring/discussion with colleagues (no secrets)
- Feelings towards patients
- The relationship
- Factors leading to continuing
- Fit in with the system
- Own change

### Participant No. 11

- Type of patient
- What long-term means & how therapist fits into that
- Reasons for the special, idiosyncratic service she offers, which the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patients deserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, sharing the burden, and being open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings towards the patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What therapist gets out of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of the relationship with the patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My special skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The type of therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy in relation to other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative feelings towards patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for stopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations to what I offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-doubts re the therapy therapist offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guilt/secrets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure/when it doesn’t work out/mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professionals misunderstand the purpose of therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for going on/extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-overs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant No. 6 seems very cognitively focussed but the patient seems a slippery customer, e.g. by being up and down, and with shifting problems. Although they review every five sessions, they just keep going. Is it a focussed drifting? Is it putting the patient’s need before other considerations? Similarly, they review and discuss it with their supervisor, but they aren’t completely upfront about the number of sessions. Is this because they are embarrassed; or feel they are breaking rules? They seem to comply with the understanding about trying to keep to ten sessions but they don’t. Yet, they seem to have felt better when someone else knew about these longer therapies – as though transferring responsibility. A conclusion might be that the ‘secret’ is better for being shared, so as to share the responsibility. If someone else knows and doesn’t say stop, then maybe it’s not so bad to carry on.

Participant No. 6 The impression I have is of people really putting themselves out for their patients. There may be a satisfaction for oneself from that, but the patient’s well-being definitely comes first. Therapists are doing something against the odds. That, despite the pressures, therapists try to do a good job, not just a pragmatic job. And that they are really helping people when they do this (on the whole). This should be valued – people shouldn’t have to feel bad about this (and keep it a secret), as some seem to do.

Although Participant No. 3 gives the impression of knowing exactly what they’re doing e.g. making predictions and giving %, (and compared to many other psychologists) they actually bumble and stumble into situations that go against prediction or drift on, turn out to be more serious than expected, or can’t risk stopping because of fears of admission or suicide attempts.

Participant No. 3 There’s also the influence of the team upon them either in making joint decisions or in appeasing the team and thus taking a monitoring role. To keep the team happy they will do work that they really have little or no time for, e.g. monitoring a patient for a very long time (years). Conflicts with the team.

Participant No. 3 The tension/dilemma between feeling responsible, making amends and it being burdensome. Defending themselves against burdens.
**Participant No. 3** The impression of the great burden that these long-term patients place upon them and the sense of responsibility, especially on a bad day, and how they must be trying to defend themselves against being aware of this (on good days). The impression that it could become too much to bear.

A sense I get, that as they’re talking they’re getting more and more tangled up, overwhelmed saddened and demonstrating the burden – as if to justify what they do, that it’s OK really, or is it? That this work is so difficult that it would be impossible if they did not really empathise with the patient (and making it up to them). It is difficult to bear, and to listen to, they’re being heroic – and is immensely sad and burdensome to listen to. This will be specific to them, or at least, extreme, this compulsion for atonement. But do we all have it a bit? Is it being too omnipotent, in the sense of expecting too much of ourselves?

**Participant No. 9** I remember their extreme discomfort at being taped. At the end, after the tape recorder was switched off, they revealed some of their ‘real’ feelings about a patient as though this was really terrible, whereas I don’t think this is that uncommon. I remember how cheated I felt that the interesting stuff was coming out after the interview, and that I wouldn’t be able to use it, unless I could find shreds of evidence about it on the tape. I also remember their discomfort, and how uncomfortable that made me feel. As though I was putting them through something awful – because I was taping it – as though I was checking up on them, that they didn’t want this to be known (to whom?). How can I not lose this?

**Participant No. 10** You quickly become aware of the great burden this person takes on, yet they are making light of it. Denies it’s a burden and you wonder how that can be – if you really engage with difficult patients they’re a burden. NB They also mentions that they’re off to play a sport – so they do have a release mechanism, something to ease the burden.
### Appendix 12 Participants' feelings after the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 3 Lines 336–338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I've felt like one of my patients might have. Well, fine, I have felt fine about it. But what it does make me wonder is whether I need to spend a bit more time in thinking about how I select people I may take on for long-term treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 4 Line 489</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine. I think it’s nice to, to think about some of these people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 6 Line 299</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine, yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 9 Lines 536–539</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[pause] I think it’s... The questions that you’ve asked have been more difficult for me to think about, because it seems like a long time ago, even though it’s probably only, well it was about two years ago I stopped seeing these people, so it’s difficult to be clear. Although throughout the course I’ve remembered more and more details that have helped me to sort of, clarify my answers. I think if we were to do the interview again, and record it again, I could probably be clearer and more concise, but I’ve just kind of rambled on, sort of helped my thought processes that way. I feel certain that I will be identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 10 Lines 491–493</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well, I mean obviously it’s...it’s very helpful to be forced to reflect upon what you’re doing. I think it’s very... I think one feels that one is protecting one’s position rather than looking for faults in it, and justifying it. But other than that...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No. 11 Lines 626–627</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mm, interesting. Concerned at times that I’m not giving you what you want, but... And I’ve been talking about things that are of interest to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.13 Appendix 13 Effect of the interview on the participants

Is there anything you’d see differently now?

No. 3 It’s made me think whether I need to spend a bit more time in thinking about how I select people I may take on for long-term treatment. ... I think one’s feelings do come into it. ... I need to very carefully monitor, not necessarily the times when I may offer a lot of effort really, but the times when I don’t, by which I mean the people with whom I may not click in quite the same way, who may still have vast needs. ... to be a bit more overt in what makes me make those decisions.

No. 4 What’s occurring to me from talking to you is about, there is something about supervision, and it’s tied to the service thing I think, and that when you’re kind of lower down in a sense, more newly qualified ... I have supervision about the quality of the work but not really those nitty-gritty things about the, what the service can cope with. [‘case management supervision’] ... sometimes it seemed quite legitimate to see people for a longer period of time, but actually I think that quite often you do just drift ... and you need those conversations, that kind of management checking in, maybe in a supervision-type way.

No. 5 Since the original interview we have got into practice the meeting to review the thing ... it makes you stay aware all the time ... You become more focussed on, what can I do or can’t do.

No. 6 I’ll think about the issue of whether I’m responding to the client’s anxiety about ending, or whether it is reasonable though distressing. I think I might think about that a bit more when I’m coming to the end of therapy with people.

No. 7 I have to re-emphasise the importance of contracting. The person I’m seeing for the longest term, I have the loosest contract with. Then you drift.

No. 8 The third one – the guilty secret one – I would see it much more of a mistake, but I did even before we talked about it. And I feel more positive about the other two actually.

No. 9 I’ve already said that I’m, as part of a learning process, I’m now much clearer about setting sessions limits, contracting in, checking out that people can use therapy. I guess before, I wasn’t so clear about that when I first started working, I wasn’t so clear about that.

No. 10 I might count the number of sessions. ... I think I’ve got a rough ... I know. I know when I’m seeing someone for the 12th time or the 6th time. ... but I haven’t been writing down an actual number for patients for a long time. And I’m trying very hard to be a good person and get it started again.

No. 11 I’ll go away thinking about guilt, because that’s the question I couldn’t answer. Something I’m blind to there.
Appendix 14 Researcher’s memo to post-interview information

I remember their extreme discomfort at being taped. At the end, after the tape recorder was switched off, they revealed some of their ‘real’ thoughts/feelings about one/more? patients (can’t remember) as though this was really terrible, whereas they were not uncommon (according to my, and others’ reported occasional experiences/feelings towards patients). I remember how cheated I felt that the interesting stuff was coming out after the interview, and that I wouldn’t be able to use it, unless I could find shreds of evidence on the tape. I also remember their discomfort, and how uncomfortable that made me feel. As though I was putting them through something awful – because I was taping it – as though I was checking up on them, that they didn’t want this to be known (to whom?). How can I not lose this?
6.15 Appendix 15 Participants' feedback

No. 3
This looks absolutely fine.

No. 4
This seems a fair summary. I don’t think that I personally raised issues in all the categories but they seem reasonable. I can’t see that you’ve left anything out.

No. 5
'Taking the patient on'. ✓✓
'Starting therapy'. Work on assumption that short is good – and should assume from beginning that things can be sorted – or there is no purpose at all during first sessions.
'Stopping therapy – external factors make it easier to stop’. So what is the significance of this – psychologists just can’t make decisions I wonder?
Second section – ‘that therapy should be brief’ – if possible – but a recognition that some individuals will require longer. I guess it is about recognising one’s limitations.
'Trying to be a good psychologist – change’. Yes, maintenance does not seem to be an option.
'Burdened’. Can also be set up to be the one who can always cope with long-term patients, therefore be unfairly burdened.

No. 6
I think this summary of the results sums up the key areas for me.

No. 7
‘Offering more’. This is where drift occurs.
Other difficulties in CMHTs include keeping people on because others are burdened, or you feel (arrogantly) that there’s no one else to see them.
Also working to time limits often not supported by team colleagues – being ‘precious’ etc.

No. 8
I think it looks good – excellent. Categories do seem to describe what we discussed. They make sense. I don’t think you’ve left anything important out and I think I have said most of what I wanted to say. However, a few months down the line – and with more experience, I think I would think differently about things now and do things slightly differently.

As I have gained more experience, particularly with complex cases, I tend to be better at dealing with things like: crises at every session. I am also perhaps less likely to think – if I could just have longer with her/him, things would be better – I think in a way this is related to an increase in confidence. Maybe I thought before – it is my inexperience that is slowing progress – perhaps if I had more sessions, worked harder I could make up for my inexperience. This is very much off the top of my head but these are some of the things that I think have changed.

Also, but maybe it’s negative, I have perhaps become a bit ‘harder’ – tending perhaps to think more quickly – if there is very little sign of progress perhaps we should stop – maybe this is good but maybe it isn’t.

I think basically an increase in my own confidence has led me to be less likely to ‘waste’ a lot of time.
However, I still think that some patients would benefit from more sessions – largely because their story may be so long and so important to formulation etc. AND because of building up a trusting therapeutic relationship.

### No. 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Taking the patient on’. There are some general rules, but not when it comes to extending. It’s not always clear, no consensus amongst dept.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Starting therapy’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Offering more’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stopping therapy’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Trying to be a psychologist’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Burdened’</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Psychologists’ sense of responsibility’. When patients have had previous difficult therapy or a raw deal in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Psychologist denigrated by others’. This is not my experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Painful awakening – shame and guilt’. Not my experience, more like sad, despondent, impatient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No. 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Taking the patient on – no hard and fast rules’ but flexible criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Offering more sessions’ – seek advice more often from a colleague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stopping therapy’ – seek advice from a colleague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Managing conflict’ – recognition that therapy should be briefer rather than brief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Painful awakening’ – do not feel shame or guilt.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No. 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Taking the patient on – no hard and fast rules’ but flexible criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Offering more sessions’ – seek advice more often from a colleague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Stopping therapy’ – seek advice from a colleague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Managing conflict’ – recognition that therapy should be briefer rather than brief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Painful awakening’ – do not feel shame or guilt.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maybe the positive aspects need more emphasis.

My comments do seem a bit at variance with what you have put forward – but maybe I’m an ‘outlier’ in your sample.

Important area for me is one involving shared learning with my complex, long-term cases, in which we both can benefit – I understand more and learn and think about how to ‘do it better’ and (hopefully) they ‘improve’ at least to some extent. Also it’s constantly interesting – never dull – always new and therefore a challenge that I like (not a conflict).

NB Don’t remember at all what I said before, so can’t be at all sure my reactions here are consistent with the information you already have.

‘Offering more – not making progress’. This is surely another question: if no progress – I go on if I have a sense that I could/they could; if there is progress then I want to judge whether it is stable/maintainable; has made a ‘significant’ difference, and will continue with that continued therapy.

Stopping therapy’. This sounds as if one never reached an agreed, satisfactory, stopping point. I don’t much experience the conflict here.

‘Painful awakening – shame and guilt’. No I don’t (may be I should!!). Personally I feel that I have improved/developed as a therapist over the years and therefore feel better now than previously about what I can offer my patients (though fully aware still that I can and do make mistakes).

As far as I am concerned (and I may be atypical) the emphasis on conflicts is too great and self-esteem doesn’t come into it.
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It may help you to think about a specific person, although it’s your decisions I’m interested in.

OK. Well there are two routes by which I end up seeing people for longer. One is, I offer them at the outset more than twenty-six sessions, or twenty-six-plus sessions. Or, during the course of treatment I end up in a well-planned, or a not-so-well-planned way, seeing them for longer than twenty-six sessions.

So what happens, what makes you decide at the outset?

At the outset, it would be an assessment of complexity, level of disability, what role cognitive therapy might have in helping them with that, versus medication or any other kind of form of input, that the team may for example provide. And in rare cases I would say, I would at the outset offer a maximum of thirty sessions. And I’m currently doing that in a case series I’m doing with multiply traumatised ex-military personnel and emergency services personnel. But I’m monitoring their progress in treatment in a single case series. So, an example, I recently offered a woman who has multiple childhood trauma, not CSA, but a whole range of childhood trauma, and has at least three Axis I disorders. But is at the other hand also coping. I’ve offered her a maximum of thirty sessions, but we in fact didn’t do that, we decided to do something else. But I did offer her a maximum of thirty sessions.

You gave her less?

I didn’t...I mean in fact she only had three sessions in all; we decided that she wasn’t ready to do the cognitive work, and a CPN is seeing her to stabilise her a bit and to...

And then what?
And at that point we may then review psychological input, but that would also include reviewing the contract, which may not then be thirty sessions, but it doesn't include any emotional stabilisation.

What about the non-case series, the non-traumatised people?

Oh the ones...oh they're not always traumatised, but yes, at the moment it probably would be, because of the kind of people I see.

Yes.

Well there's...in history there are two routes by which I get to that point. I mean I haven't... I've assessed them, and two people I'm thinking of in particular, one I offered twenty sessions to in, she's also seen by other members of the team, so I was just offering some specific CBT for her problems, and another patient where I offered fifteen sessions to, who is also seen by other members of the team in time. And in both cases I ended up seeing them significantly, for significantly more sessions, and often over long periods of time, but not necessarily very frequently. In one instance the reason that emerged really was because key workers disappeared, either because they moved on or because the patient didn't get on with her identified key worker being an RMO, and the contact with the team was felt to be incredibly important, because high suicidal risk... These are all, both, multiple admission patients, both chronic high suicide risk, and somebody needed to monitor him, for whom he was likely to show up, and who he was likely not to persuade that he was all right when he wasn't. And because of the relationship I established with him, and there is a degree of dependency...

So, you may see them for, sort of more concentrated block of therapy...

Yes.
But then you change to monitoring.

No, I change...well monitoring, support, a bit of problem-solving here, a bit of tinkering with a, a thought or, interpretation of an event, his appraisal, there. But it's much more low-key and I may at good times only see him every six weeks, and in bad times I end up seeing him twice a week. And that really is, I've become really, I'm doing more generic teamwork; the team has a belief I think, rightly or wrongly, that up to a point any good team member takes some of its fair share of the team mess. And for political reasons it is very usual for me to carry on doing some of that, but it has to be very limited, given my role within the team. Now having said that, I think that's probably not the main reason why I'm carrying on seeing him, but the main reason is that he has become very attached to me, and that attachment in some sense is useful for keeping him alive. Because he does come and see me, he doesn't just disappear from me. And good times, which can last for four, five, six months, when he isn't...he's doing as well as he ever does, which isn't very well, but...and we're kind of beginning to talk about maybe ending, handing him over to one of our support workers and can then start an ending process, because of his attachment, and, somewhere along that ending process, be it for a period of two, three or four months, he ends up really ill again, and very high suicidal risk, at which, at that point nobody thinks he can be handed over. And so we go round and round and round. So I think there are two reasons for why I am still seeing him. The other person I've been seeing for longer, who has also had multiple admissions is somebody who has done phenomenally well, given her limitations of cognitive therapy, in the twenty sessions, that we did work together. And, it was felt by the whole team that she could go further than that and how unexpectedly well she'd done in relation to a particular part of her difficulties. And that withdrawal at that point from therapy with me may threaten the progress she's made. She's basically managed to go to university, in all of this being a period of, well in total of about seven years, a 30-year history of psychiatric disorder, very severe psychiatric disorder. So I've got her to go to university.

So, I've heard you mention her.
And it was felt at the time that if I pulled out, that that might...that she needed some input to carry her at doing that. So, I suppose partly it feels that CBT is actually very important to her, and that nobody else could fulfil that role in the team. But again there is an element of concern about dependency and feeling that she can trust them. Which in the past, not in my team but in the past she's had very poor therapeutic relationships, so to have a, a good one is very difficult to end. So again I think there are two reasons, one is probably a better reason than the other. But it would be confidently predicted by all involved that ending would rock the boat very severely, no matter how well we've planned it, and clearly we, given the concerns in these two patients that they might end up in another admission or another suicide attempt. So, those were two examples of the kind of multidisciplinary team decision-making, though it is partly, I'm holding something for the team. And I suppose the other unplanned one was, me stumbling into, basically stumbling into an area that I just had very little idea about, by which I mean ... I'm not very articulate. When I assessed this man, my explosives expert, I assessed him as having a severe PTSD and offered him twenty sessions of treatment but very severe PTSD, very chronic PTSD. But at the time I had little understanding of the complexity of working with people who had been subjected to multiple trauma. So I think in that context I set an expectation for him and myself of a seventy per cent chance of treatability, but this isn’t actually all that difficult to treat on the whole, and lots of people get better and so forth. I was treating him like a single event trauma. And partly that was because he was pulling the wool over my eyes, he didn’t tell me how bad it was at the time. But, so I got myself into a corner where I realised after, in the process of twenty sessions, that this is an entirely different ballgame, and it is an entirely different ballgame, I think that’s been replicated in the case series I’m doing now, but now I know what I’m doing, if you see what I mean. But I had set the expectation I was going to get this man, hopefully better.

In twenty.
In twenty, which of course was no way on earth I could do that, because it took at least thirty sessions for this man to tell me what was wrong with him, because of the trust problems to show this particular population. And because I wasn’t looking for it, if you see what I mean, because I assumed that there was trust, and he was so distrusting that he wouldn’t ever have given the inkling that he wasn’t trusting. Does that make sense? So that was...so I got myself... So one of the reasons that I ended up in long-term treatment is because I, I made, promised him, I didn’t promise him but I gave him an impression of treatability, and then we got all these obstacles. And given that it’s also an area of my interest and expertise, I became very curious about what was going on here, and did subsequently do quite a lot of work in relation to that, and I think I’ve learnt great deal about multiple trauma in the course of that. Now another...another factor in determining that in the end we were going to do longer-term therapy was that, there was something about him, a characteristic about him that I...it’s not just being reflected by me, but anybody who ever has worked with him, there’s his GP, the bloke overseas, the psychologist, the head of the [......] Trauma Service overseas, saying there’s something very curious about him that makes you think this man could do really well. He has a lot of strengths, which are very, which are apparent. So I think there’s a mixture both of thinking he can do something, but also I think, I was getting very disheartened in the kind of patient-bashing kind of way of working, by which I mean seeing a lot of people really fast, putting them back together again quickly, to some level of functioning, and then discharging them, without ever feeling that you’ve done a really thorough job. And I don’t mind doing that, and I think it’s realistic for them to be given the services, the level of services we can provide and so forth. I was just getting very disenchanted with that kind of way of working, and feeling quite burnt out by that. And I think in that context, I really wanted to find out how far can I go in somebody where I know, I think I’m now learning what I’m doing, I’m interested, and I think he has the resources to do it. I really would like to get at least one person once in a while really better. So that was another reason, I think it was actually personally a very powerful reason for doing that with him; and it’s not in the other cases. [pause] And that’s [inaudible] really. There may have been something as well as therapeutic niceties and the only way I could finally get his
trust was when I stop talking about very tight limits of treatment, I think that whatever progress I might have theoretically made in twenty or thirty sessions, I couldn’t have made with him, if this was twenty or thirty sessions, because he would have thought he was just, I was just part of the Establishment, and to screw him in the way that everybody else had ever done. And that belief system, although maladaptive now I think reflects real experience, rather than a paranoid state.

*Was it also something to do with his horrendous experiences?*

Oh, I think I felt immensely, and still do, feel immensely, immensely saddened by his, overwhelmed in some sense by somebody who can have that much traumatic exposure, and who is in some ways actually still doing quite well, and intact. I mean it’s still a miracle to me why he’s still walking. But there is something, yes, about having that level of CSA and adult traumatic experiences that is just never ending. And working with him, that was the most difficult thing to do; not, each individual trauma is not something that we have never heard about, is so horrific in itself that you can’t stand it, it’s just the relentless nature of it, just one after the other after the other after the other, that at times really really, somebody’s got to do something for this man, he deserves better than this. But having, having done all that work, I recognise that I can’t stand, given that I am interested in multiple adult trauma, I can’t spend eighty sessions with every multiply traumatised adult, is just completely ridiculous. So out of that work I have done a lot of thinking, and clear planning, of how I can make treatment shorter, but it’s still not very short, I’m offering now thirty sessions, but how I can make treatment shorter. So I think, I’ve tried to use it as almost a kind of form of CPD for me as a test for doing something that might actually be very useful, I’m not sure. And that was I think my way of justifying doing something that I know is not with...within the spirit of what we should be doing. [pause] And it’s very interesting. [pause]

*So you’ve, you’ve mentioned something to do with the patient that’s, like attachment,*
Carrying on, and feeling that he deserves something because of someone’s multiple traumas...

Mhm.

...you’ve mentioned things to do with you, like it’s interesting and you want to learn more, and that the experience for you and you’ve been overwhelmed as well.

Well I think in the one case, I think I do have an underlying kind of sense of, it’s not...it’s not my responsibility, because I don’t always...it doesn’t always give feelings that ... I think in relation to very hard luck cases, and all of the three I’ve just talked about are very hard luck cases, they’ve had a really raw deal in one way or another, either from the mental health services or from other organisations, but they have had a really raw deal, I have some sense, a perceived sense of collective responsibility, that we ought to get in that, we ought to do the best we can to get, to make amends. And I think, I think that’s not necessarily terribly helpful, that sense of responsibility. Because it makes it more likely that I take...that it’s difficult for me to, and... And it also could potentially be quite a big burden. So, on the whole, most of the time I don’t perceive it as such, but there are bad days, and like recently when I had to threaten one of my patients with a Section, because he was getting so ... feeling overwhelmed and burdensome, it took, it took a good day to kind of, not feel shaken about having had that experience in kind of threatening with Sections, which is something I don’t generally do. [pause]

And, something about the relationship between you?

Well I have to be able to... I mean I think there is...I think in order to be able to do that, I have to be able to empathise with the patient, and I know we empathise with patients, but I mean real empathy; I have to have some sense of where this person is coming from.
And... But more importantly I think in all three, I have a sense of strength from them, from the patient, that I have to perceive a sense that there's something intact I can use. Because there are people who have been, have had terrible histories in whatever form, and I haven't had that kind of sense of, 'Let me help you get out of there,' and I think the difference is that I haven't at that point, rightly or wrongly, perceived that the person had some kind of oomph left that I could use. But how good I'm judging that, I don't know whether you would call it ego strength or...but, skills, a residual kind of strength I think is a really important variable on the whole, I don't know. [pause]

Yes, there are some people who seem to want to do something; there are people who are humbling.

Yes. Yes. It's a good word, without doubt people who are humbling. [pause] But I'm also damn sure that there are some people who may be equally humbling if only we could relate to them in some way, but that we don't click with them, whatever that might mean, in the same way, and therefore they get a much more standard service. And I feel that's probably inevitable; I think we need to watch out for it, that it's kept to a minimum. [pause]

And, then you've also mentioned that some, some of the decision-making or pressure or call it what you will, is coming from the team, so it's coming from elsewhere.

Yes, in two cases clearly, the pressure is coming from the team, because the patient is being looked after with minimalish input from me. You know, there are no CPNs at the moment running about, no psychiatrists who keep threatening to section them or keep having to review the drugs again, keeping them relatively stable. I'm ... the team's very keen on that, I don't want to rock the boat if I can help it. Although some members of the team have more, a different view on what my role should be, and whether I should be doing this or not. But there is also general pressure that is on every team member, that we need to hold some of the really difficult cases, and do, do what we can in maybe an
unspecific way. Now for me, and if I provide non-specific support it will undoubtedly always have a bit of a CBT flavour to it. And currently there is a significant dispute within the team which is going to be discussed in the next review day, because it appears that, the medics in the team do not see their role very much like that any more, that there isn’t, they don’t hold difficult patients for the team. But then their absolute role is to prescribe drugs. And that’s, that’s a perceived role that we think the medics have, because that’s how they appear to be at, and this is going to lead to a fairly significant debate and seems to also be tipping the balance in the team so that everybody else has a lot more, because we now have three medics, a lot more of those cases that need to be shared out, which makes it harder for me to get rid of the ones that I’ve got if you see what I mean. And will make the... It’s a different role, depending on what role a particular team member adopts, and how important that team member is, and that is clearly an important function. If the team members don’t do something, then there is a fallback on any, on the rest of the team members. And I think in some sense if there had still been A[…] B[…] [inaudible]...

Well, he was a great holder.

Exactly, I mean he was particularly unusual, but I probably would not be holding, at least one of my patients, probably many of them, because he would be doing that. And he would be doing it very well. So I think some of that comes from the defined roles that people see they have within the team. Now whether they’re agreed by the team is a different matter, and I think that this, what’s currently happening with the roles the medics appear to be adopting that is not an agreed team policy, and will be addressed however painfully that might be. [pause]

I think know what you’re talking about.

Sorry, that’s, that’s clearly a probalem that I think...that’s a problem that all of the members of the team face, including the psychologists. We’re much more protected from
it because of the waiting lists and the kind of role that we generally have. So the vast
majority of my team colleagues who are not psychologists would have at least fifty per
cent of patients on their caseload of that ilk. And their role may be different, it may be
more appropriate to their role, but it is not entirely appropriate to them.

Now what about supervision or line management, has that played any part in helping you
decide on sessions?

Line management probably not greatly. Except that it was helpful to me to have Joan’s
permission to do the work that I was doing with my explosives expert. And I think she
was fairly aware of the complexities of that. It was helpful; I don’t necessarily think I
would have not done it if she had said, ‘Don’t do that,’ but...

Might have done it nevertheless.

I might have done it nevertheless. I mean if she had said, ‘You don’t, and I refuse to let
you,’ then, I probably wouldn’t have, but, there’s more or less approval, and I think the
approval has helped me turn that experience into something more constructive in relation
to the research I’m currently doing. And so line management I don’t think has a major
role, but it does make you...being supported is always better than feeling challenged.

Supervision I think has had a key role in two of those patients, in terms of looking at what
I can do, and how far I can take it, and with my explosives expert specifically I’ve, on two
occasions, reviewed his case, and decided with my supervisor where I should go and how
much treatment I should offer reasonably, to make sure that it wasn’t just being pulled by
my need to rescue. And I think there are good technical reasons why I should have
carried on, but it doesn’t necessarily say that there isn’t a need to rescue, which is a bad
reason. But just because it’s a bad reason doesn’t necessarily mean there’s a good reason.

And so supervision has been terribly helpful, but with one caveat, that being supervised
by Z[......], is incredibly, it’s an incredible privilege. Z[......] is a very good supervisor,
and I’ve learnt a great deal from her, but I think Z[......] isn’t working within the NHS,
so when I'm supervising, I might always have one eye on service delivery as a whole, and how does that treatment of this case fit into the whole of the service in which this treatment is taking place? I think Z[......] is much more inclined to just look at, the kind of intricacies of doing CBT with this person.

Yes.

Which leads, doesn’t lead her to ask me questions about, how long have you see them for? How long are you going to carry on seeing them for? Those kinds of questions which might, another supervisor might do, they might not, but might do. And she just wouldn’t do.

_And so, in keeping you going, or keeping you focused, or helping you stop?

Oh, in terms of... Not in keeping me going, I think it’s, it’s helped incredibly in keeping me very focused. Because one of the threats of doing longer-term work is clearly to lose focus completely, and I think I’ve been there. Not necessarily very very long-term treatment, but I have been there. And I think that on the whole the long-term cases I’ve seen have had, because of supervision, a very clear focus. That might have been minute steps I was trying to take; an example would be trying to get somebody ready for re-living. That might in an average patient of single event trauma only take half an hour, and somebody with very complex difficulty, that might actually involve lots of stabilisation and lots of education and lots of kind of discussion about the fears and, and the cognitions around the fears, which might actually take you ten sessions just to get them there. But at least I knew what the ten sessions consisted of, and the goal was still the same, so I think I, I remained actually incredibly focused, and I think I would have, there would have been a significant threat of losing that focus if I hadn’t, had regular supervision. And subsequently, I think subsequent supervision is also very important. Anything else?
329  *Is there anything else?*
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331  No.
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333  *So how have you felt telling me these things?*

334

335  I've felt like one of my patients might have. Well, fine, I have felt fine about it. But what it does make me wonder is whether I need to spend a bit more time in thinking about how I select people I may take on for long-term treatment. There sometimes is no choice, I mean it's not me selecting but it's me being asked to do that; vanity. But inasmuch as I am exercising choice...

339  Well even there I suppose, when you think about it, if it's appropriate.

341

342  Yes, well I'm actually... Yes, but, I mean clearly the others two I haven't seen for 86 sessions. But I'm just wondering about...my own variables at making decisions which are not necessarily to do with straightforward up and down treatment decisions or demands of a situation outside of my own feelings about something. I think one's feelings do come into it. And just talking to you about it makes me aware that I need to very carefully monitor, not necessarily the times when I may offer a lot of effort really, but the times when I don't, by which I mean the people with whom I may not click in quite the same way, who may still have vast needs, and to make...and just to see whether or not, just to, to be a bit more cautious about what I'm doing. I'm not saying I should be offering them lots of treatment, but to be a bit more overt in what makes me make those decisions. It has to be said that I, I think, yes, I'm about to get rid of one of the patients who is probably going to go to the H[… ] Clinic in B[… ], and that will be a route for me to stop seeing him. And I'm about to discharge the explosives expert. So... And I have no inclinations to, at this point, to offer somebody else longer-term, very long-term treatment, although because of my study, I will be offering people thirty sessions. [pause] And it's not something I do annually.
Only as much as annual?

As much as annually. I think people I've seen for more than thirty sessions or so are probably in total...six. And that's in 14 years. I mean spreads evenly through 14 years I think. So I think, I don't think I would want to go down that route very often.

Is there anything else you'd see differently now?

No. I'm sure we'll be thinking about it at some stage, but right now I think it's fine.

Well, shall we stop there?

OK.

Thank you very much.
I'd like to ask you why you've offered a patient, or more than one patient, twenty-six or more sessions of therapy, and it might help you to think about a specific person, but it's the decisions about giving that number of sessions that I'm interested in.

So, how I reached them?

Why were they given that many?

And I think that that is...there are different decisions, different reasons for all of, for each of them, as much... So... One person I suppose was about the fact that we seemed to have engaged, and she seemed to have been making some use of cognitive therapy, but she had a lot of day-to-day problems that arose, and quite severe depressions that came extremely quickly. She was diagnosed with a slightly, not quite bipolar affective disorder, but a kind of lesser version of that, so more, more major recurring mood swings.

And so that our overall goal, was more about trying to look at beliefs of hers, and to explore and change some of her extremely negative beliefs, was upset on a day-to-day basis by difficulties, such as her depression which was caused by, and which was precipitated at that moment by, a lot of physical problems for example, or not getting any benefit, or a neighbour's child dying, committing suicide. There are a number of kind of day-to-day just events which upset her mood and the course of therapy. So she was quite well engaged with us, and actually it was quite successful [inaudible] that we met.

At what stage did you decide to carry on?

Well I think we just kept reviewing every, about eight sessions. We had originally I think with her, I think that we'd, it's difficult to remember but I think that we'd originally planned to have five sessions of mood management and thought records sometimes, and that seemed to make sense, and so actually from this original five we ended up having, I'm sure it was more than thirty. And so that was one of the reasons that our work was kind of always going sideways, because of these crises.
How did you...

... fire-fighting.

What made you stop, with her, what made you stop?

[pause] I think we had agreed to get to a certain point, and we did a historical review, and things were actually going much better, but I wonder if I was also reducing my sessions in that team, and so, it was maybe easier to think about meeting (?) her. But I know that I continued working in that team, so, for quite a long time after that, so I’m not...I don’t...I don’t think that was a major thing; I think it was that we had agreed to do a certain amount of work and to look at bits and pieces and that sort of thing. And actually what was really helpful for her was doing a historical review, and getting another way of looking at her past experiences, which she’d developed all these beliefs on, and actually she decided that from then it was really more a question of her trying to practise these things and keep them all going, there wasn’t necessarily anything new for us to do.

So partly it came from her?

I think so, yes. Yes.

Yes.

And then there’s another person who we, again with all people I think I’ve had we’ve reviewed continually, but the fact that this first, this other person was someone who I thought was engaging with the model, and I kept thinking that she was making changes, and she was extremely, extremely pissed off, and depressed, and distressed, and depressed. And, and I just kept thinking that it would help, (laughs) and it could help, and that we were making progress, but actually, we weren’t. (laughs) And, we got to
thirty sessions, just we, I decided on discussion with Y[......] that I really had to end, that
she wasn’t going to be able to benefit from it, and she’d had a fair go, it wasn’t making
any difference.

[inaudible].

And so that was quite different from the other woman. Sorry, was there...

But why at that particular point, was there some particular reason at that particular
point?

Because she’d had so many sessions, but...

Twenty-five must be the same as thirty, or twenty, twenty.

I think at twenty things were looking a bit better, so, I think, I think I was lulled into
thinking, well just a few more. And then, because of the situation which I’d got myself
into really, we had to have a very planned end, and that meant stating something that was
reasonable, which wasn’t just two sessions from then. So that’s how it ended up with
there being thirty, was that it was kind of another five sessions or something at that point,
and really making myself think about where we were going and what progress there had
been. But that was a really tough one, I mean I was...it was really tough to stop with her
actually. And...

Why was that?

I don’t know.

What was it...
She got... I don't know. I think she got under my skin somehow, (laughs) and... And I think it was, it was something about the fact that, I felt like she should have been able to make more progress with it than we had, which might not make sense, but... So in a sense I guess I was thinking maybe I'd done it wrong, that if I could just get her to understand things better, or if I could put things differently, and...we might, we might get somewhere. There was also, I think at probably session twenty, I think she'd talked about a lot more than she had before, and was really questioning a lot of things in her life, like her relationship and her situation, and...which were things actually I think were really maintaining her problem, and I think that was a huge amount of work.

So you felt hopeful at that point?

Yes, I think at that point I did, and then I think she, she decided, although maybe not explicitly, that she, she wasn't going to be able to make changes to those things, she couldn't even emerge for example, and things slid back. [inaudible] much more clearly than I think it was, but her having made, her being constantly unable to do things that we'd agreed that would be helpful perhaps to. And finally coming to the conclusion that not going anywhere. So something about chronicity, or chronicity, severity, distress, keeps you going. Maybe from the outset you can kind of expect not to be able to deal with in ten sessions. You want to, but I think those two people make...were kind of quite different decisions, in terms of how I...you know, at what point we got to, and the reasoning was quite different as to why we got to thirty sessions. Though someone else who I'm sure she went to thirty sessions, and made very little progress, but some of the difficulty with... Did we have thirty sessions actually? I can't remember now if we only had twenty. It'll be someone that you will remember my talking about someone who, whose dog ate her homework, do you remember? And I just didn't trust what she was saying, just didn't really believe her. And also at the time, because she was saying things like, 'The dog ate my homework,' she may well have done, if there was a dog.

Well if she was X[......J, she might have done.
(laughs) Even without a dog. (laughs) The rabbit ate my homework. (laughs)

Or the [......] destroyed her Filofax.

Really?

And then, the dates didn't matter any more to X[......]. (joint laughter)

And she cancelled an inordinate number of sessions, which is maybe why I've got it into
my mind that she had thirty sessions, because I think I might have started to count the
sessions that she didn't attend, which doesn't really fit with what you're talking about.

Mm.

And I can't remember exactly how many she had, we had, but she had a lot. But as I say,
I can't actually remember whether there was twenty or thirty. It was easily thirty, if we'd
agreed to count the ones that she didn't attend. That was one way of dealing with her.

So what was different with her?

That I felt that we needed a contract about what a therapy was...what therapy involved,
and what was necessary for that, and part of what was necessary for that was attending.

(laughs) Which seemed quite reasonable at the time.

So, you're saying that sometimes you know from before you see them, right at the
beginning, that ten isn't going to be enough...?

Well I feel like it's not going to be enough. I think I always start out telling people
there's going to be ten sessions, but, yes, yes sometimes we, I think I perhaps started out
with both people, because of how distressed they are or how long their problems have
gone on for, I mean there’s not much evidence for that. Actually it feels like a lot to have
to do.

And with others, you don’t think that at the beginning, but then, it still carries on?

Yes. And that’s about it having been helpful, and not wanting to end too soon, in a sense.
That people have been able to make use of some bits of work, and it would seem, it seems
reasonable to try to extend beyond working on their here and now and negative automatic
thoughts to working on making bigger, not necessarily bigger, making other changes to
their beliefs and assumptions and behaviour. And I think that’s when it’s been more
sessions as when I’m trying to look at, maybe trying to get people to look at making quite
huge changes in their life really, which require quite a considerably different way of
acting and behaving. That’s when I offer them a bit more. And ten sessions to get
someone from where they start in ten sessions to the point of changing their whole belief
system that they’ve had for forty, fifty years, with huge amounts of trauma and abuse in
between, just doesn’t seem reasonable. [pause] But again that doesn’t apply to everyone,
there are very different people. There are people for whom their history is suggestive
that... [pause] that chronicity but, you know, that there’s a lot in their past, where there
are others for who it’s the level of distress when you first meet them. And as I said to you
the other day, I haven’t kind of thought it through, and I haven’t discussed it with other
people, and so suggestible that when someone else says something, I think, oh yes, that’s
what it is. But I haven’t thought about it. Haven’t thought through ideas. (laughs)

That’s quite all right. Sometimes those things are the most interesting.

(laughs) But it’s very much person-specific. I mean I think it’s really hard to say, ‘Well
these are the rules, and this is why I do this,’ because there are plenty of people for whom
my expectation of how many sessions they’re going to need is completely inaccurate, and
that was in fact what started me on the whole Research, I don’t know if you remember
this, was that it was someone that I was seeing in the Central service, who had a terrible
past history of abuse and had had to give up her children, all children had been taken
away from her, or, at different times, and gone through hideous, hideous legal things in
relation to her children. And was very depressed when I first met her. And within ten
sessions she had made an enormous change, which looked like it...and was maintained in
follow-up. And there was nothing that I could have said about her at first meeting her
that would have made me think that she would be able to make those changes, huge
changes, in such a short space of time. And that’s what got me started on the whole
Research, was thinking about, well what makes things better for people, as opposed to
what makes things worse? I mean it’s easier to just look at things like chronicity and
levels of past history of abuse and whatever, and to assume that things will be worse, but
actually, why do things, then get better so quickly? And that’s, that’s what started the
whole thing, which of course I can’t follow up. But that was what, that was fascinating,
the fact that she did get better so quickly, and it was so well, seemed to be so well
maintained. So as I say, it’s completely person-specific, and what you think at the
beginning isn’t necessarily what then, then happens. And with her I think it was
something about that psychological mindedness, she was fantastically psychologically
minded, although not particularly intelligent, which actually was probably to her
advantage. And had... Yes, the psychological mindedness I think was the main thing
with her. But also I think was able quite easily to access much better, a better belief
system, self-belief system, and it was much more readily available than I think I had
thought at first instance. And I think if I, if I go back, if I go back, the woman with whom
I had thirty sessions and at that point decided to have to, you know, well not have thirty
sessions, planned to end at thirty, she in fact was not psychologically minded, and I kept
thinking that she could be (laughs), but I think she had an enormously medical model of
treatment and was probably quite compliant in some things, and so would do some things
and question them, but then seemed to understand them and believe them, but then
actually would come back the next week and say, ‘It didn’t work,’ or say something that
would lead me to think that she just expected it to work by osmosis or to work in the way
that a pill would work. She was also having a huge number of changes in medication
throughout the time that I knew her, and a lot of side-effects of the medication were resulting in her gaining weight quite fast actually, and so she was becoming extremely disabled by her weight gain as well. So that was constantly offsetting any work that we could do, because she was getting these two different messages all the time, one about medication being a way forward, or the way forward, because they were constantly changing it, but also not a very helpful way forward because otherwise it would have worked, and me saying other things. And that then being hampered by, on a very basic level, her physical inability to do things that you would want someone to do with severe depression.

It's the woman who was then seen over in the other department?

Yes, it is, it is. I forgot that she went to the other department. Did she complete treatment there?

She did complete it; she made some minimal changes, which were not expected to hold up at follow-up.

Apparently she's now doing very well with a psychiatrist, with C[...] D[...] in fact.

Yes, she was seeing him in fact. It didn't seem at all helpful and she...

Well, apparently, well, when I last checked, which wasn't that long ago – yes, I'd forgotten that she'd done that – she had said he's wonderful apparently, and he's someone who encourages dependency I think.

Yes.

So, which [inaudible]. (laughs) Not that that didn't go around [inaudible], you know.

And, he... Yes, so that's, that's...and I think that's interesting. So there is those, and she
did complete treatment, so you know, there's something, there's something about encouraging hope in a therapist I think. Although I don't think that's why she got referred to the other dept. But you just...but there was something quite intact about her that you felt that she should be able to move forward and get through that, but you know, I'm completely repeating myself, and was different from the first person I was talking about, in terms of her being able to make progress, and really benefiting from using a more structured approach; in all of her crises still I could be much more structured than for example her meetings with the CPN, which are actually very unhelpful. So it seemed reasonable that I offer her support at various points along this time, because she was doing things, she was doing a degree and stuff, she was a mature student, went back to do a degree, and that seemed reasonable that I see her through that, and help her with her study skills and all that kind of thing, rather than passing her off to a CPN, although I did try that and it was unsuccessful and she kind of relapsed. So when I started to see her again I then helped her through it (laughs).

That's not part of the thirty you were talking about before?

Yes, it is, yes.

Right. So that's interesting. So, then come back, and then it might be more supportive.

Well she didn't leave the whole system, and what we'd agreed was that, because of the nature of my sessions, and that we're more problem-focused and we were trying to look at her beliefs, she was about to go through this very stressful period of time of doing her exams, but it probably didn't make best use of her or my time to meet with me. So that we agreed that she would meet with the CPN during that time, and...but actually, I think they just didn't gel, or the CPN I think was not structured enough or didn't...just didn't get her to use any of the things that she had learnt with me in terms of questioning her thinking and all the helpful behavioural things that had worked before. And so she, she relapsed, and at that point they asked me to get back involved, and so that I then, I then
271 just saw her through to the end of that, or she had to re-sit it or something, I can’t
272 remember. I think, I think in fact what she decided was that she wouldn’t take her exams
273 when she was supposed to, and that she would take them a few months later. So having,
274 her having decided to do that when she was meeting with the CPN, and I started to meet
275 with her again, and then just held onto her, so we... So we were constantly thinking, I
276 mean at least thirty or so sessions, which may well be many more than thirty in fact
277 (laughs), were over quite a long period of time, I mean it was over...no, it must have been
278 a lot more than thirty. It was over two or three years I think. I’d have to check the notes
279 to see exactly how many times I saw her.
280
281 Not seeing her every week, certainly not, not in the later phases?
282
283 No, and it would change; there were times when I would see her weekly, and there were
284 times when I would see her monthly. Or, there was a time when I didn’t see her at all
285 over the summer, because she had her daughter in, and it was just easier not to, so... So
286 that was three or four months I didn’t see her. So...
287
288 So, sometimes there’s something about the patient, some things coming from the patient
289 that makes you carry on or extend the therapy.
290
291 Mhm. Yes.
292
293 Sometimes...sometimes the system asks you to get involved again.
294
295 Yes. Well... Yes, that is true, although with her it wasn’t, but yes, that is true, it made
296 more sense for me to do that work, I hadn’t originally planned to do, so yes. Yes.
297
298 And, sometimes it’s you, or...
299
300 Yes.
...this person should be able to do it.

Yes, if only I could find...

[inaudible].

...that particular way of putting it. Yes.

Something about the relationship between you with some people, that makes it carry on?

Well always. (laughs) But I think that’s also to do with the hope, that if I didn’t have a relationship with the individual, then I might not be as hopeful at all.

There’s also guilt sometimes, carry on though guilt or some...

[pause] Yes, and...and the person...I don’t know what to call her, the one who went to the other dept.

W[...]: yes.

Yes. I think that was, that was hope and guilt together really, they’re sort of oscillating. (laughs) Which was very powerful. It was extremely powerful actually. And that’s what I mean about getting under my skin I think. It was definitely, it was definitely both, and it was both at different times. But guilt, but just guilt, I’m not sure. There’s someone else, but again I don’t know how many sessions we had, but it was certainly more than the ten, I’m not sure that it would have been more than twenty-six, who may well have been more of a guilt type of person, and I (laughs) with him, I decided to refer him into the Central service, and to see if someone else would do a better job. So I think that would be my, my personal, usual route with someone that I didn’t have that hope with, personally,
would be to try to get someone else to check it out, and that might be to do with the relationship as well. The person I’m thinking about is someone who, how I just couldn’t really ever fathom what was going on, exactly what was going on with him. And again, he seemed to give me some ideas that he was making use of the sessions, but then ultimately just didn’t seem to do that, and with him I think because I just didn’t have a clue what was going on, it was much easier to say, ‘I think that we should end, but I’d like, you know, how about seeing someone else?’ to see whether that would be helpful to continue.

Anything about why you chose that particular point at which to make that decision?

Well I think that will have been a session limit thing, much easier to say, ‘Well, we’ve had fifteen sessions,’ or whatever, ‘and I really can’t offer you any more in this service.’ Much easier. And it is terribly unfair, that one person should have that, although, is it unfair? It is, if you, in a black and white way it’s very unfair, but I think it’s also, it was fairer to him to not continue with me. And I guess that’s something you’re always weighing up, is about, well the whole thing about whether they can go further with what you’re doing with them, in that relationship, at that moment in time.

Mm.

If they want to get better. You can’t make the people go any further than (laughs) they want to… But with the first person, or the person we’re talking about mainly, she definitely had an idea how she wanted things to be, and as I say, given everything about her, it was quite unreasonable that that would happen within ten sessions.

And what about supervision, did that play a role at all in, either encouraging you to carry on, or to stopping you, focusing you?
Yes, certainly, both. I think that... Well I think it’s much easier to drift with people if
you don’t tell people what you’re doing (laughs), or if you haven’t that supervision, you
know, for a while. But it’s also possible to use supervision with other people where you
seem to have made this progress, how about trying to go a bit further? And with these
individuals, I mean, they are quite a while ago, because I’ve had, because I’ve recently
had more short-term placements in a sense. (laughs) So it’s hard to...of course I’m
currently in The Second Team, I was looking at how many times I’d seen people, and I
haven’t quite got twenty-six but I’m close to twenty-six.

And that’s been less than a year.

Yes. Yes. [inaudible] twenty-six [inaudible]? Yes. It’s much easier to go on with people
if you’re, if you’re not having detailed discussions with someone else. Well I think it’s
also easier to go on with people if you’re having supervision with someone who’s not
directly involved with the service, with your particular bit of the service. So I’m having
supervision with U[…] who in a sense doesn’t mind whether I see someone for six
sessions or two hundred (laughs), you know, it wouldn’t really be her position to question
that. What Y[…] and I and whoever was working in The First Team agreed at one
point was that we would have a… Oh my goodness, I’ve completely forgotten about
someone else, sorry. We did have a review of who we’re seeing and how many sessions
we’d had with them, as a kind of peer pressure thing really, to get us to really question
how many sessions we’re having. Because our waiting list was so huge, as I’m sure it
still is. And that was really interesting, because it really did make you focus on exactly
what you were doing, and why you were having so many sessions, and, and with M that
was certainly crucial in my actually ending when I did, that, I could quite possibly have
drifted on and on and on and getting nowhere, and actually being, quite unhelpful. And I
think with her it was actually really unhelpful to have gone beyond the ten sessions, but
that’s [inaudible] really unhelpful thing to have done.
And of course she had a different therapy where it was definite that it was going to stop, and did.

Yes. Yes. Yes.

So what's the one you've just remembered?

Someone with an eating disorder, who I saw for ages and ages and ages. And I was worried about it before fifteen sessions I think. And, but that was actually encouraged in a sense by supervision, so that's what I mean about supervision being helpful both ways, because it was the first time that she had engaged with anyone to any extent, and it seemed to be helping her in keeping her out of hospital. And so that was, that was supported by the service.

Was that a team or a Central one?

It was a team person. All the ones I'm remembering are team people, but I also, you know, for the first few years only worked in a team.

[inaudible].

Mm.

What about [inaudible] must have been.

Mm. It was, that's right, it was at the very very beginning, that's right. And then, and then Y[......] dropped his ward sessions, so I had three ward sessions and seven team sessions, and so, yes, so that's why I stopped the Central work. So, and that was probably about a year into it. Because I basically... In fact there is another, there is a Central person who I saw, but I can't remember how many sessions I saw her for. And I
struggled with her. And probably drifted on because I was a bit scared of her. (laughs)

When I was newly qualified and didn’t have the confidence to say I don’t think this is
going to go anywhere. But, I think it was only about fifteen sessions actually; just felt
like two hundred. And I’ve since heard about her from E[...] F[...].

And so she’s doing the rounds still?

No, I think she had about six years out, but she’s come back in, yes.

So being newly qualified can also lead to more sessions?

Depending on the person, I think it may have done. But there are so many, now, as I say,
there are so many environmental factors that make it difficult for me to see people for
longer than two weeks – well, right now, a week. (laughs) But things like that changed
all the time, so, that’s not very helpful to you.

It is.

But it does keep, if you know that you’re going to be leaving, then, it does make you
much more focused on what you’re going to do and much more much clearer about how
many sessions you can have, and what you’re going to do in the time, what’s reasonable
in that time, and... But what happens to those people, I don’t know. You know, if you
then end your contact with them, like if I had had not seen that first, the main person I’ve
been talking about for as long as I did, then, and got her to that point, what would have
happened to her? And I’m pretty sure that she would have just come back in to the
service. She would have done anyway, in fact I know now that she has, she has come
back into the service again, because she’s had a hysterectomy that’s gone wrong, and so...

Some people have bad luck.
Well precisely. And she’s had an enormous amount of bad luck. And that, one of the
things that I, one of the reasons that I had more sessions, I’m saying ups and downs, one
was her health, and she’d had problems, and had had an operation but hadn’t had a
hysterectomy, but clearly has a lot of physical problems. She also broke her foot, and
things like that. You know, there are things like that got in the way really. (laughs)
Which is always the case. And there’s someone now here I’m seeing at the moment, and
if I wasn’t leaving I think it would...it could drift on. There again I’m not sure that it
would be helpful to do so, I think that’s something I would certainly take to supervision,
if, just to think about but she’s saying, that it’s, it’s...our sessions have been really
helpful, much more so than the CPN sessions, that she likes the structure, and that she’s
been able to talk to me in a way that she hasn’t been able to talk to other people, because
she felt like she was burdening other people. Whereas, she...she said to me, ‘But I can
tell you anything and you’re not going to take it, you’re not going to get upset.’ (laughs)
Which she was clearly valuing. Although what she said, what she...what she, she also
said was, ‘I can tell you anything, you wouldn’t care. No I don’t mean that.’ (laughs)
So... But she’s a very vulnerable and very damaged person.

So, an obvious factor in giving more sessions is, you’re available to give more sessions.

But I think, and I think that being available is kind of what we were talking about, and
does it mean physically available, does it mean emotionally available, does it mean the
service is available? I think, I think all of those things are critical. Or is the patient
available? (laughs)

Yes.

To give someone else a go.

Is there anything else you want to tell me before we finish?
I’m sure I could witter on for ages, but I think I’m repeating myself now. And I’m sure there’ll be something as I leave the room and I’ll think, ‘No, that’s what it’s all about.’

Bound to be.

Mm. Mm. And I think the main, the main thing is that there aren’t any hard and fast rules; there don’t seem to me to be any hard and fast rules.

How’s it felt, talking to me?

Fine. I think it’s nice to, to think about some of these people.

Anything you would see differently now?

[Pause] I think what’s occurring to me from talking to you is about, there is something about supervision, and it’s tied to the service I think, and that when you’re kind of lower down in a sense (laughs), more newly qualified, and I see it as being my responsibility in The Second Team for how many sessions V[…] has with clients, but I don’t... But no one’s doing that with me really. V[…] and I, I mean I do that with me mainly, and then have supervision about the quality of the work, of whether I could do something differently, but not really those fundamental nitty-gritty things about the, what the service can cope with. So I think that that, yes, that’s quite interesting, and that would be useful to think about. But other people at...that level...

Yes, I sometimes think of that as management supervision...

Yes.

Case management supervision.
Yes. Which I haven’t been having.

Supervision is just for clinical stuff that you have with U[...].

Yes.

And case management is what I think of as bringing to the...my line manager type supervisor.

Yes, it is.

Which is what I’ve used X[...] as; I’ve never had supervision from her, I go to have case management.

Yes. And I haven’t been having that recently. And in a sense it hasn’t been that essential in The Second Team, because it’s been a short-lived thing and The Third Team was a short-lived thing. But I, I wonder whether, and I’ve been looking at the waiting list and thinking about it, and wondering whether The Second Team has suffered as a result of that, in terms of how many people I’ve been able to see in my time there, how many people we’ve got on the waiting list, how many people have left it, sort of thing.

Yes, actually that is another factor isn’t it, where you are in terms of responsibility, and the number of sessions, because you’re looking at the service as a whole, not just at this patient, which, someone low down might only be thinking this patient...

Mm. Yes. And with Y[......], and one of the reasons that we agreed to have that open discussion of how many people...not...who the people were that we were seeing and how many sessions we were having with them, was because, I’ve got...we’ve got...I personally felt, and I might have said this, to Y[......], who might not remember, that we had agreed that he and I would have a kind of peer ‘Twerps’ thing, and I would do that, but I became
increasingly aware that Y[......] wasn’t doing that, although we had agreed that that’s what would happen, so I stopped doing it, and...(laughs) and just let it drift. And I think he let it drift as well. I mean this is going back some time, so I can’t talk about how it is now. But, and I think that that is a big factor, that sometimes it seemed quite legitimate to see people for a longer period of time, but actually I think that quite often you do just drift, and that’s [inaudible]. And so that you need those conversations, you need that kind of line management checking in a, and maybe in a supervision type way, rather than a managerial way, I think, it just felt too one-sided, well if he’s not doing it, why should I? (laughs) And I think, and that was helpful. 

Actually it’s something for our meeting next week.

Yes, possibly. Because I think the peer, our peer supervision groups could also offer that, I think that could work, in that environment, in that setting. And when it’s one-to-one and it’s clinical supervision, it’s...
So, I'd like to ask you why you've offered patients twenty-six or more sessions of therapy, and it may help you to think about specific people, and it's your decisions that I'm interested in.

Right. The reasons I've offered patients more therapy is that I felt that less than that has not helped them with the goals that they've come to me to work on. Often it's a case of, they've started a process, and we're aware of the fact that it really is very much starting. The other very relevant factor with my...

Very much starting...?

Starting a process of change, and, it's right at the beginning, twenty-six sessions for the patients I see is really right at the beginning; for many it's a question of even getting them to acknowledge that they have problems that they want to work on and change.

Right at the beginning of change; not that you decide right at the beginning of therapy, or both?

Quite often I do have a view already that this person is not going to be able to go off into the wild blue yonder with less than twenty-six sessions, but I try to make it such that I'm aware of that question all the time, and it's a question of, that they haven't managed to make the changes within that time, and therefore we need to continue making a longer relationship. The very important thing is that it's often, ten sessions could be just trying to make a relationship, before we even start to address what they want to change, because they come often so poorly motivated. Often they're brought by relatives, and it's a question then of actually getting on their side. And if I was seeing them for ten sessions or twenty sessions, they could rightly say, 'Well, you persuaded me that I need to come and see you, and I've actually got to the point of trusting you, and now you're telling me to go off and do it on my own.'
Well one thing that puzzles me about that is, you seem to be accepting their goals rather than maybe your goals, or joint goals. And the other thing, from the previous interview, there was a slight contradiction, because you said, you can tell in the first six sessions whether people are going to be able to change or not; but here you’re... And you also said in that one that you often need a lot longer before people trust you.

Right. The six session things refers to the research for the treatment of bulimia, and it’s really straightforward treatment of bulimia nervosa using the MN approach, and it refers to the fact, just using his approach, his straight approach.

*How many sessions does he offer then?*

He offers, usually, well the standard approach is sixteen sessions, but if the change has...if things haven’t started to change with six sessions, you can predict that it won’t occur within the sixteen sessions. So I was very specifically referring to that very straightforward approach to bulimia.

*Mm.*

OK, so what was the other bit? Let’s think. [pause] The truth is, because of the nature of the patients we see, who are tertiary referrals, I do often have a good idea right from the beginning that they will not respond to short-term treatment, so you could say, I am prejudiced to look, to offer them more.

*It’s an assumption.*

Yes, it is, before I start treating them. Because they will have had treatment with other people, or they will be very unwell, and particularly the very unwell ones often are in denial, and therefore, people who are in denial about their problems, I mean they’ll acknowledge that there are some things that go along with it, but they will deny they have
anorexia, which is mainly the problem, it's really a case of trying to make a relationship with them, and that can take a long time. And in terms of what we used to do in psychology was offer ten sessions; I could easily spend ten sessions just trying to hang in there with them before we’ve even started to make changes. Sometimes it’s then motivating them, those very unwell ones, to have in-patient treatment, or day patient treatment. But they don’t begin to make a connection.

The other thing was goals, that...their goals.

Ah, that’s right, goals, their goals versus joint goals or my goals.

Are their goals realistic?

No, but particularly... Not...no, not necessarily. But, their goals... They often want to be without the symptoms of anorexia without, without eating more for instance, so therefore, the goal of being without the symptoms is realistic; it’s the means in which you achieve that, and often it, we just have to accept their goals and the terms that they put them to start with, so we at least, it feels as if I’m on their side, and then we can start and look at how we can achieve those goals. It’s very, it’s not...I never work with my, just my goals. Clearly... Clearly they have to be joint, clearly... If someone for instance comes with bulimia, and it’s quite common they will say, ‘My goal is to lose weight,’ then I will say, ‘Well actually I don’t feel that’s something I can work on at present. That is up to you; I don’t see how you can even look at weight loss or what the normal weight is until you eat properly, so you then see what your natural weight is, and then that’s your decision, whether you want to lose weight or eat less. But I’m not about offering a therapy to help people lose weight. But I can help you discover what your normal weight would be with normal eating, and then you can make a decision about that afterwards. I can discuss that with you afterwards.’ So I will always try and connect with their goals, and their goals, the way in which they think they might achieve them might contradict the way I think about it, but I would have to, we would look at that, gradually as it were, according to
when they were ready to do that. Because if they come and they...the worst thing that
happens with anorexies is that, other people have told them they need to change, and their
sense is that anorexia has been a solution to, to many of their difficulties, so if you go
straight in and say, 'Right, the first thing we need to do is sort out and take this anorexia
away from you,' then, you undermine any relationship right from the beginning. So I try
and establish what things they do not like about their anorexia, at the same time
acknowledging that they adopted it for a good reason. Does that make more sense?

Mm. So, it sounds as though most of the time you know right at the beginning if there's
going to be a longer therapy.

Yes. That, realistically speaking, now with the group of patients I work with, I would
know that.

And before?

But before, it would be more reasonable to say that, if I had a mixed group of patients, I
would then, in terms of the length and severity of their difficulties, I would assess that as,
to what was happening, say, within the first ten sessions, or six sessions; we often think in
terms of six sessions, review. Clearly if you can treat people in less sessions, it's, it's
more helpful to them, although actually I don’t find that as a satisfying way to work; I
prefer to be involved with longer term relationships with people. And in terms of, we
work with CBT, in terms of, the shorter interventions are based at working at a thought
level, and if people can use that and change their behaviour, then, I would help them do
that. And I would judge whether that was bringing about sufficient change within six
sessions, twelve sessions, eighteen sessions maybe. But if, if we were coming up against
a brick wall, and they were... Quite often you get that sense, people say, 'Well I know, I
can write it down, I can write it on thought records, or I can give you reasons for this
happening, but it’s not affecting how I feel, and I’ve always felt like this from the very
beginning'; it’s that kind of, referring to sort of, core beliefs I think that makes you sense,
this is not going to be something we’re going to shift in, without getting involved with
longer-term work.

So when do you decide to do, one, thoughts, and when you do decide to move on to core
beliefs?

Well, there could be the correct answer, and the answer actually occurs...

No, your real...your real answer.

I...I mean I actually think, you develop quite an instinct, don’t you, for, for the way people
present. You know, if they are...if they take to thought records, and they use them and
you get the sense that this...that there’s an aha experience for them, it’s actually making a
difference, you can actually, I reckon you can assess that pretty early on. OK, give
them...if you give them five or six sessions to get into it, but then if they’re then starting
to use that and come back to you and say, ‘Actually this affected how I felt about the
things, I feel, this feels differently,’ even if it’s a little bit, you can just get that sense that
it’s very different to people who say, ‘Well I can do that and fill out your forms forever,
but actually this makes no difference to how I feel. I still believe that I’m a bad person.
OK, I can see logically that being able to do this that and the other...’ And I think...I
mean it’s almost a, just, you listen to what they say, and it... I rarely find it difficult to
make that distinction. And it’s that kind of... And especially if they’re bright or
whatever, they will often fill you perfect forms, or get into perfectionism with the form,
but actually they report no change in their actual behaviour, or how they actually feel
about it, or... You know, they can fill you, fill you up great forms and say, ‘Well...

So what?

...I suppose that’s meant to make the difference.’ Yes. Yes, exactly, so what? And I
personally can understand that. (laughs) Because I can do it too, and still think, well
actually I still think...still struggle with these same issues that I had when I was eighteen years old. In the rational I know I can deal with it day to day, but actually, still I’m worrying about it. So, I suppose it…it’s instinct, clinical experience, you know, just giving them that kind of...just experimenting I suppose if you want to put it in those terms. You’re offering them something, they try it out, and you see how they manage. Now I would acknowledge, there is some tendency to assume that beforehand. I would wonder the extent to which one might, speaking personally, might just have less of a go at doing things that are, you know, in a more surface way if you like, or a, a thought level for instance, because you...

*Because you find it more boring, or unconvincing?*

Maybe. Or you...or just experience tells you that surely this would be better if we go into it at an assumption core belief level, or, you know, we take...

*And that also assumes it’s going to be longer.*

Oh which...which will, by definition assumes that it’s... I would say it seems it’s going to be longer. Because I don’t think you can stir people up.

*Are you someone who goes along with what some of the other people say, what’s the point of cutting out half the tumour, or, you need to cut out the whole tumour?*

I... With the patients I work with now, no I...not necessarily, because, that isn’t my... I don’t think it necessarily means cutting out half the tumour. My instinct feels..

*And that’s what it means, what you’re doing is cutting out the whole tumour...*

Tumour. No I know.
Just half isn’t going far enough.

I know it sounds as if I’m saying it doesn’t go far enough, but if it achieves change, and they manage to function day to day, then I, I can see the logic of doing that. So no, I don’t by definition believe you have to go for the whole thing. And I actually think you can stir things up and leave people in a worse position, and clearly if you can only work for so, for a slightly bit longer, but not for a really long-term relationship, you certainly can leave them feeling worse about themselves. Whereas if you can give them a few tools which, if you want to in turn...

So when do you decide which?

[pause] Back to what I...within early sessions, I would say. When I say early, I’m talking about within twenty sessions.

Mm.

But, then whether they have forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty or whatever, that becomes...that probably varies with patient to patient; probably varies on how I’m feeling; probably varies how systematic I’m being. But fits with my general experience that the patients I see do need much, they need...they need long-term relationships within which to develop any sort of...everything. I mean I think the relationship is fundamental to the therapy. [pause] Which is not to say it’s not important in a short-term thing, but it’s not so central in that way. Clearly you have to have a good relationship, but if you’re...and they’re getting on and doing things and they feel...

So what makes you decide when to stop?

To stop therapy altogether?
Mm.

Well that's very tricky.

Mm.

Very tricky indeed. Sometimes it's a case of stopping when we have... we have been working... I suppose, if there's a sense of absolutely no, of getting nowhere, and by that I mean producing no change in their behaviour...

Would that be after, say, ten to twenty, or would that be after fifty to sixty?

After fifty to sixty, much more likely. Because of this business of knowing there's a high level of ambivalence, we tend to hang in there much longer. But I'm not saying that's always the right thing. If they really want... if they seem to want to come, that seems a, a good indication, although you could argue it's not necessarily. So if they want to come, and they still want to... and they're prepared to work, and they seem to be making progress, however little, then I will see them. My biggest issue is, those people who want to come, but seem to show not a jot of change. And I have real problems there knowing what to do with them. I've had quite a few issues, particularly a patient recently who, the parents have just written to me, you know, and they're absolutely furious, and I've thought, you know, I'm thinking, well she's got... she's not psychologically minded, she hasn't been able to bring about change; she's actually physically OK, and basically she's a chronic patient, and actually I think it's a waste of my time to keep seeing her.

And how many did she have?

Oh she'd had various stints, because she's had in-patient treatment, but overall she would have... we're probably looking at more than... a hundred sessions remain - overall, in bits. In actual fact, when I first met her, they didn't want to have anything to do with us, and
now they do think, you know, great, I'm the saviour, but the truth is, I'm not a saviour. What needs to be done is the changes within the family, and we've tried to work with the family, and it was partly working with the family therapists that gave me almost courage to say, 'Look we've done...we said it within the family work, and we said it within...' and I gave them courage to say in with individual work. And to offer a final admission, which we did, she got her weight much better, and then saying, 'Well follow-up would be best, probably done with OP the dietician to review your diet.' Not... Because when she comes, she hasn't got nothing to say anyway; I mean it's the most awful experience possible, and I do feel then cross that you've wasted your time. But she wants... I'm not sure she wants to come; I think it's her mother wants her to come, and that's the complication you have with lots of these patients, because the parents are so often very involved. But it's interesting, because I'm just finishing with a patient who I've seen for 117 sessions, and she happens to be moving...she was a student here and she happens to be moving to F, and she's done really very well, and, she's...she can't bear leaving, and I'm just thinking, well... I think I would have found it really difficult to end with her if she wasn't going to F, even though intellectually I know this is probably the right time for her to move on. But she comes from having worked in private therapy and having been messed around in private therapy. [pause] And I got quite muddled about the extent to which she had actually finished working, or needed to be on her own, or... Her mother had died, and therefore she was clearly, she had made this clear attachment to me, and, I mean she cries. These are our ending sessions, we've got two more, one month's time and another month's time, and, it's just struck me that, if she wasn't actually leaving... That enabled me to finish almost, and thank...thank goodness in many ways, because if she wasn't, I think I'd go so cruel and dreadful. I'm not sure I could have faced actually finishing with her. And that's when you then get into this whole business of, are we here for long-term support? [pause] And, I do think there's a place for long-term support, but who should be best doing it? But in truth, if someone's become very attached to you and wants long-term support, they want you to support them; they don't want someone else to. But then is that a good thing, you know? And there's that whole debate on, on that. Because what we've tried to do with a group, a chronic group, or a group of patients with
enduring problems is to swap some of the people who are attached to individuals,
particularly to me, to a group, and it's worked for some, they're prepared to do it, but
others, they don't want that, they want to come and see an individual.

Mm.

And they...you may say, 'Well you're not making any progress,' and they say, 'But I'm
really really trying, I want to make progress, and I don't want to be told that I'm just
a...stuck living with anorexia,' even though they clearly are. And I really struggle with
those. Because intellectually I...

So by coming to see you, it's means they're in therapy, so that means that they're
changing, or possibly can do eventually.

Yes. Yes.

But if they're not seeing you any more, they...

How can they possibly change?

[inaudible] yes.

Well how am I... If I can't do it with you, how am I meant to do it without you? You
know, and you're really sending me to...

Condemning me to stay as I am.

Exactly, condemning me to stay as I am. And you say, well, quite often we get into this
inght thing was, you've got to go off and do these things to show you're motivated, and they
say, 'Well I can't do it seeing you, so how do you expect me to suddenly find the
resources to do it on my own? This is a nonsense.’ And we had this with time out from
the day programme, you know, they’re not making sufficient progress, they have to take
time out, and then, the parents and them will say, ‘But I don’t want...I can’t do it; I’ll be
worse if I’m not coming.’ You see you do get into that sense, having made a decision
that, that you will see them long-term, are you saying you’ll see them in long-term
therapy that brings about change, or are you acknowledging that you’ll just see them long
term and hang on in there until they feel like changing, or they’re ready to change? And...

And what about the waiting list?

And what about the waiting list?

The people that haven’t been seen.

Seen at all. Yes, it’s really, really tricky.

Mm.

But then if some of these patients then get very ill, and then they, they enter a cycle of
hospital, and then if they’re in hospital you have to pick them up immediately, because, it
doesn’t make sense to have someone in twenty-four-hour care and then discharge them to
nothing, so you’re forced to sort of pick them up from there. So if you can avoid that
cycle, you have more control over it. But it does mean people on the waiting list,
although our waiting-lists are probably better than most of the, most of the CMHTs’.
And we will always pick up people who are urgent. [pause] But yes. It’s a lot of luck, a
lot of luck and what happens to be...who happens... You know, who happens to be
around at the same time almost, you know.

Yes. And I was just thinking....
And which therapist they're seeing.

But, maybe you're more likely to let them wrap you round their little, wind you round their little fingers than some other therapists.

No, I... Well, yes, I mean that's one way of putting it. Or, another way of putting it is that I'm much more prepared to tolerate the dependency some of these patients show. I can tolerate, it doesn't get me so wound up, and by allowing them to have long-term relationships, and doing work with me, then that keeps them at an even keel; whereas other patients, other people discharge their patients, they go off, and, and I'm not saying they all do, but they might then go into free fall and we have to start the whole thing again. And I, and I...I am more able to tolerate those kind of patients, definitely.

And you say you found it more, find it more satisfying to see long-term people than short-term people.

I don't see anybody short term. But, as compared to short... Yes, because I, I enjoy...I like the long-term relationships, and I...well because I recognise that this patient group... I mean I'd like to do a bit of short-term work as well, it is a balance.

What do you call long and short?

I'm talking about short, I'm talking about less than twenty, type of thing.

So over twenty is long term?

[pause]

Medium term.
Mm, medium term isn’t it. I mean often I’d see my patient for, a hundred sessions.

Well, 227 is long term.

Well that was my...that was the one I pointed out whom I have seen longer than anybody else. Now it’s interesting, because, thinking of S1, who I’ve seen continuously for those sessions, over a long time, I’ve just been re-referred another patient who I saw about the same...I saw before S1, and I realise that this is the third instance of treatment she’s had with me, but the difference with her is that in between, she’s been discharged, and she goes off and does her own thing, and I was trying to think what made the difference between finishing with her, the fact that I actually finished with her and then she has come back, but... And S1 who I never finished with. And it seemed to be, partly the difference between the two was that, A had a lot more resources out in the community, she had much more of a sense of, that she came to see me to do specific work, and if she wasn’t ready to go further, it was quite easy for us to agree that she’d got as far as she could get, and she could...she would now go away. And I made it clear that she could always come back to me. And in many ways, that’s...that’s quite ideal, if people can do that.

Yes.

But she had sufficient resources to support herself. She’s very involved with the Church. She got...she got...she finished her degree, which was the first hurdle, so she went off, did that. Then she came back. And she was still low in weight. Then she came back a bit later, and then said she wanted to do some more work and increase her weight. So she came back and we did, we went as far as she could go. But it seemed to be quite clear for both of us at the beginning that she would reach a certain weight and then, that would be it. And the reason she’s come back this time is because, unfortunately her mother has died, which precipitated a crisis, and... And she eats the same so her weight’s remained the same, which, she’s apparently anorexic still, but just at top end of the range, but she
eats...her timings are ridiculous. I mean she eats her lunch at six o’clock in the evening,
and her dinner at 3.30 in the morning and things. So she’s come back to deal with that
specifically, to try and help her let go of that pattern. So therefore, again I had this sense
that we – and each time it’s about twenty sessions – will have that very specific goal, and
so we can assess how well we’ve done with that. And somehow if we haven’t managed
it, we’ll assess that we’ve given it a good go. And it’s very striking that it feels quite
straightforward and clear and... And she’s always kept in contact with me, but... So, she
hasn’t become so dependent in some way. So I don’t quite know how, how that’s worked
out. But I’ve known her longer than I’ve known S1. She had a good family, family, yes,
and that has, that’s also been... Where S1 never had any, any kind of backup whatsoever.

[pause] Similarly...

But with S1, just to summarise it very quickly...

Mm, yes.

You gave her that many sessions over a very long time, because it actually, you reckoned
it saved a lot of money and time by keeping her alive.

Definitely.

Keeping her out of hospital.

Definitely. And you can actually look at the extent to which she went...

Keeping her supported at times as well as change type stuff.

Yes. Yes. Yes.

And that it was cost-effective in the long run.
I would argue that definitely with her. And similarly with patient J, who in fact I took over from, someone we were referring to earlier.

Oh yes, yes yes yes.

And, the thing is with J, she's now doing her Ph.D. at University, I mean that's amazing compared to what she was doing, but she requires enormous input. And she, she rings me at home, she looked me up in the phone book. But to be fair, she never rings for more than five minutes. And I've made it clear to her that... And you know, so she's someone who...she seeks that kind of reassurance, but she is easy to reassure. And we've tried endlessly to try and set her on her way, on her own; she can't manage it, and she then becomes very acutely ill, and the last time she was in hospital for one year. So, me seeing her once a week and taking...phoning her, and, she'll come and see other people, members of the team, she...it's definitely cost-effective. And we keep a good relationship with her, we tolerate it, whereas it's freaked everybody out in the past, and you know, she's... We have had little crises. It was her fortieth birthday and she wanted me to go to her birthday party, and that was...I explained to her I wouldn't do that. She wants me to go to her graduation when she gets her Ph.D., and I've told her I will do that; if she graduates for her Ph.D., I will... Because that, that feels like that will be possible to do, whereas the birthday...

Less personal.

Exactly, less personal. And so I was able to be clear that...that I could do that, and that was OK, but I wouldn't come to the party, that wasn't OK. Although it was quite difficult for her to see that, because she sort of sees us... She has got a mother and a sister, but her mother's part of the whole issue, because her mother has been terribly disturbed throughout her life. But she...she would drive other people mad. You either love J or you hate her, but if you can...she's...she's a scream. She's the one who set up
bed in my office overnight when we left. Of course, that would happen. But... But it’s...
For instance, it’s interesting, because that basket of red flowers there, they came from J at
Christmas. Now that, in all the time I’ve known her, that’s the first time J’s actually, we
managed to get to the point where she could think sufficiently about someone else in
order to actually give them a present. Which, you know, most of the others would do
without thinking, but J is so self-centred. So I thought.... And she bought a box of
chocolates for the rest of the staff. And that was real progress, because she could...she
says, ‘I know it must take a lot of effort dealing with me et cetera.’ Well, she’s never
been able to notice that before. And she is doing this Ph.D., and she luckily has got this
crazy supervisor who sounds quite as crazy as J. So if we just keep her weight up
sufficiently. But she’ll always need you to be there, literally. But, that’s OK. I think that
is OK. So is that support or continuing therapy? Well, I suppose it’s support, but it has
enabled her to continue to make changes. I mean I would say her being able to think, it
would be nice to give a present, was a tremendous change, as compared to how she used
to be. [pause] And how would we have known that from the beginning? Well what...the
person who saw her before did try and end therapy with her, and we’ve learnt it from her,
with J, that actually experimenting with a kind of sense that, you can’t go on seeing
someone like this, let’s try and reduce the relationship, and then you see what happens.
And I think, well I’ve concluded that she can’t do without that kind of... And she needs it
from one or two people. What we’ve managed to do over the years is get more...we’ve
got her to live in a group home for instance, which has a better backup system, but she
still needs a named, one or two people who are her family.

Mm.

You know, and you can say, we shouldn’t work like that, it doesn’t help you, whatever,
but for J it means that she is functioning miles better, and is not in an in-patient, in
hospital for another, you know, year or so. So, you can justify it on that basis.
So are there ever pressures from other systems? You say families to keep people going, you go on seeing people, or to take people on that may be....

Families in the CMHTs will always prefer you to keep them. Community mental health teams definitely don’t want them to come back. There’s very much a pressure to keep our, all our patients. And when we try and... For instance when we’ve tried to look more generally at the idea of, some of these patients have just as severe long-term needs as, say, people with schizophrenia, there’s great resistance to see them in that way. And there’s always the sense that, you’re the experts, you know them, you keep them. Which is why they wouldn’t object, they wouldn’t object to us keeping them long-term, because they just, they see it as, that’s what we should do. Families definitely like you to say it, you know.

Is that a difficulty for you sometimes?

Yes... It is, in that they also want us to take urgent cases immediately. Yes. And to try and get them to look at these two things alongside one another, they’re not interested, because everybody’s under such pressure all the time.

Yes, of course.

You’re expected to....

And GPs, do they put pressure on?

They vary. They vary. We’ve got some very good relationships with some GPs. And because we don’t have a medic in our team, some of these long-term patients are maintain...the medical side is maintained by the GP, and they like that, they like to have the back-up. But some just like to hand them over, and expect you to do miracles,
Of course.

But others are pretty good, and we have got particular ones who we know are pretty good, and just like coming out and have a chat and then that makes them feel they can contain their patient. So that feels then like working well. [pause] I think they feel then, if they can have access just to check something out with you, or if you stop seeing that person, you re-see them, that, that... Maybe that's part of the thing with A, that her GP was, has always been involved and is OK about being involved. You know, I offered her..., the GP was the mainstay support.

Yes, that they could take over that role.

Yes. Yes.

You could share it.

Yes. Yes.

So are there pressures to stop seeing people?

The wait list is the obvious one, definitely.

Mm.

And we have recently looked at, people who do outpatient work, look at our percentage of face-to-face contacts et cetera, because of the wait lists, and, I mean my face-to-face contact time is about sixty per cent.

God!
I mean it... And...

*That is terrible.*

So, I think it's...it's sixty per cent of the time I'm meant to work, I think effectively it means I work more. Q's is about fifty, but P interestingly keeps much more to, I think hers is about thirty-eight. And the irony is that as far as I can understand, it should be the more senior people who're having less face-to-face contact. But then I like seeing patients. So, you know, it's a kind of...

*But, what also seems to happen in your team, that there are other people to take the slack if you like, to take the short-term people, so maybe have greater throughputs, which allows you to have them for longer then.*

Well...

*Is there a balance there do you think?*

[pause] I see. [responding to surroundings] [pause] No, theoretically we're all meant to take the same.

*But in practice?*

In practice I give the simpler cases to the less... Q...I...I do all the, the referrals, and I keep... All urgent referrals Q and I do. The most urgent ones I do simply because I've got the referral so therefore I can do it urgently more easily. So yes, the less experienced people definitely get the more simple cases. And assessments, you know, I...we do a lot of the assessments. And that's part of the face-to-face contacts, you know, it's a large number, of doing the assessments, and we always do the assessments within... Urgent
ones we’ll do within a week, and less urgent we’ll do, definitely within two to three
weeks, which, that’s the way we kind of, work it. [pause] Because you have to respond
to the urgent...the urgent patients are really urgent, might even die on you. Mostly they
are urgent actually, and that’s the thing that’s possibly different to some of the CMHTs.

Yes, and urgent in the death kind of sense.

Yes. Yes, there are some you overreact to, but for the most part they are really urgent.

What can we do to keep them alive?

It’s more a case of, going in there and saying, ‘Actually, these are the tests you need to
do; this is not...this is serious.’ Or, ‘Take this person to the general hospital.’
It’s...it’s...they want decisive action, because people are still terribly unsure.

You mean people like GPs or the team?

Definitely. Definitely. And it’s the students, this is why we have such a bad term this
term, if the new students who pitch up, and... This student I’ve just...she...you know, she
was BMI of ten, which is ridiculous. And the university had taken her, GH is her GP so
she had, immediately referred her to us and said, you know, ‘She does not see this as a
problem,’ and it turned out they were identical twins, they’ve never had periods, they’ve
always been low in weight, and over the years the mum and dad have said, ‘Well, people
have just said, given them the Pill to make them have periods,’ rather than, you know,
saying, ‘This is frank anorexia.’ So although the daughter was terribly resistant to what
we had to say, what I had...we, no, there was GH as well, and then IJ’s taking them on,

taken over, because GH’s on maternity leave, the parents were relieved. And when...the
father, I spoke to the father the other day, because we’ve...she’s...we’ve asked her not to
return to college, he was saying, ‘But round here the GPs said, why have we come?’ And
it turned out they hadn’t got our fax letters. But the point was still weighing this girl with
this low weight, with no history of periods or anything, they were more or less saying,
well...

What's the problem?

What’s the problem? And their parents were saying, ‘We feel now that after having got
recognition that there is a problem, in E, we now feel we’re back home again, and we’re
concerned we won’t get the treatment we need.’ Well I have rung up everybody and
faxed them fifty times now, so hopefully they will do something. But quite often they
need someone to say, ‘Actually, this is not good news, this is really bad news.’ I think
there’s a lot of...people like you to be decisive, like you to have a definite view. I never
cease to be amazed by, I don’t know whether this is completely off the subject, by the
extent to which individuals call you to give an expert opinion, and you have to say
something I think is pretty ordinary, and they’re so relieved that you’ve sort of made the
judgement here, or said this is not possible. Often it’s in relation to what’s feasible in
terms of long-term treatments, and it’s actually quite often saying, ‘There is no point in
kidding yourself, by holding this person in hospital you’re suddenly going to change their
life around.’ Or treating them against their will.

Hospital meaning a physical hospital?

Often it arises from physical hospital, but then they want to transfer to long-term
psychiatric input, specialist units, when they’ve had so many admissions already, they’ve
made it quite clear they’re not going to do anything more. And actually, I’ve had recently
two much older people, a sixty-eight-year-old and an eighty-year-old, and I just was, you
know, come on, get them to what...what’s physically viable, put as much support in as
possible. But to sort of, against their will, fight them, in hospital, when it’s driving every
single nurse bonkers, don’t do it, it’s not worth it. And they say, ‘Right, now you’ve said
that, they’ll act on it.’ But they won’t take that risk themselves, not surprisingly. So it’s
with the elderly, with the elderly, it was KL, what’s his name?
KL, yes. And I thought, well, surely this is pretty obvious. But actually they wanted... I think it’s been seen to be doing things correctly in that way, they want you to give the expert opinion, ‘No you do not have to keep sending the nurses in the general hospital completely bonkers by keeping this woman here’. (laughs) She was great actually. Of course I came in, chatted to her, and just had a great chat with her for an hour and a half about her life, and her going, ‘These nurses, they’re trying to make me do this, that and the other,’ and... Well it’s mad. [pause]

So, are there things, are there things that keep you sort of focused, like, or keep you going, or, help you stop? You’ve mentioned helping you stop. Like, supervision or line management?

I’ve never found line management affects what I’m doing. (laughs) But, Q would disagree with you totally. It’s interesting because, we were discussing this business of, you know, appraisals, and she puts such a store on appraisals and how, what a fundamental change it’s made to her whole career development and life et cetera, and I just thought, well, well maybe...

No effect whatsoever.

Well, I found it quite extraordinary.

Very rarely happens anyway.

Well, but... Yes, that’s how it struck me. Because she was saying, ‘We must get O to appraise this before he, you know, he moves on.’ Well I said, ‘Well fine, but, I don’t know what you expect to happen out of that.’ I mean... Supervision. I think I said
before, we have peer supervision, Q and I, and I do think that that will influence how I
think about something. And because we, we...because she’s so obsessively keeps to the
rules, and I much more spontaneously do whatever I think’s right, I think the kind of, the
partnership does work very well, so definitely I would say that was an influence. So
therefore I would say, I am influenced by people whose judgements I would value; I’ve
known over time that they...

So that might influence you into keeping things shorter, or...?

It would, yes.

Focusing.

It would, but it would mostly be people that...I think...it probably only... [pause] Q
particularly comes in with that experience, because I know she works...because she works
with the same group of patients, although...and I know she comes from a different place,
so I would hear and think about that. I’ve had some meetings with, N’s in my supervision
group, and we meet, and she’s said some things that again, some more senior experienced
person has, you know, made you stop and think, definitely. But mostly they say it’s fine
what you’re doing. (laughs)

Do they sometimes say, ‘Keep going’?

Yes, they do. I never forget the experience when I took G, who still writes to me... In
fact, that’s a good example, because I originally took her to my supervision group when Y
was in it. (laughs) Personalised, this is meant to be. But, I was assuming Y would
immediately say, ‘God! you can’t go on seeing this person, this is ridiculous.’ And...he
didn’t. He said, ‘No, clearly you need to go on seeing this person, because you’re...she’s
made a very strong relationship with you, and you can’t just dump her.’ Well I was
completely stunned. And interestingly, recently I brought it back as a problem to N,
because she still writes to me, emails me, and she was totally clear that, 'Don’t be
ridiculous, you’ve got to...’ Because what happened was, she...she left E, went back to
home in G, without a proper ending, so we always had a sense that we would try and have
an ending, but she became completely phobic about travelling, so therefore never got to
have this proper ending, so therefore continued the relationship by writing or phoning.
And it’s gone on for years, and it is ridiculous. But N was completely clear, ‘Right, OK,
you acknowledge what’s happened, you write your final goodbye letter, and it ends,
there’s no question of allowing this to...’ And I thought, oh, that’s interesting. And
actually I found that quite helpful, because it almost gave me permission to be...

And did you then do it?

No, but I have been much stricter about making it clear that she must engage with her
new therapist.

Oh, right.

And she has to think about... Whereas before, I just kind of replied, or picked it up. And
what had happened was, she actually ran away from home and pitched up in E. Luckily I
never saw her, she didn’t tell her parents where...where she was or anything, it was awful,
and I thought, no, this is crazy, I’ve got to stop this. But then discussing it with N who
then said, ‘This is crazy, you’ve got to stop this,’ actually helped me, definitely, so I was
definitely influenced by what she had to say. But you could argue, I was influenced
because I was already feeling that, and I just needed someone else to definitely say....
So... Yes, so it’s colleagues whose opinions I will value. I would definitely...

Not...not less experienced people?

[pause] No, I wouldn’t say definitely not, but I don’t tend to...I don’t tend to be exposed
to.
I mean, we've got a third-year in our peer supervision group.

Yes, but our supervision group doesn't work at all.

And she can be really really useful.

Yes. That, I do not have any problem with that idea at all, it just doesn't happen generally. So I don't have any, any problem with that. I mean that's, N is the only one I ever meet with in our supervision group. M for a while, but... [pause] No, so I, you know, I'm... I'm actually happy to hear what anybody has to say in that way.

Mm.

Hopefully let it...I will try and think about it and let it influence. And clearly the newly-qualified people are much more up-to-date on some of the research et cetera, or... In general terms, not in eating disorders. I do carry prejudices and things about. Like we, we have a regular meeting with MN's team, and I suppose I'm continuously disappointed about what they have to offer, because they don't have enough experience of the patient group. It's quite a rarefied experience.

Because they see the easy side of eating disorders?

Mm, well, it's certainly more straightforward.

Mm. Yes, I don't think they're the real world.

I don't think they are too. And it, you know, people continuously say, 'Oh MN he's expert in anorexics,' but he doesn't know enough about it, he really doesn't. And actually
I think he’s quite sensitive to criticism and stuff, so he won’t put forward his ideas, and this is quite extraordinary in the group.......

...Other influences. What else might I be thinking of? [pause]

*Supervision, line management, colleagues, other professionals. In the team. Like in different kinds of teams, CPNs can put pressure on, but you don’t have that sort of set-up.*

No. [pause] Oh, I think one of the issues in our team is that, if people can’t take the pressure, then we just...I just take it off, and I take it off more than anybody else, because L...because they just...they can’t...and we just acknowledge that different people can bear different amounts. And that is an ongoing issue. And sometimes, it’s just a case of recognising it. What I think they should be more place for is to actually stop, have sufficient time to actually enable them to do it more. I do think that, that, that...a difficulty of all this is that you end up, you do things because it’s faster to do it, but actually then that keeps it...

Not changing.

Not changing. I think that keeps too much of the expertise in...on experience, in one place. And I talk with P about it, for instance, and she...she was saying, ‘Well, don’t you think I’d be capable of doing that?’ or... Or, ‘You’re right, I’m probably not capable of doing it, but couldn’t I come out and do that with you and then that would enable me to take it on?’ And that is true, but of course that takes more time. But I do think that’s what needs to happen more. Which is why we’ve tried to instigate, we had a meeting, which was why we tried to instigate, the four of us who see outpatients regularly, meeting more and reviewing every... What we decided was that we would review every ten sessions I think whether they should go on to the next ten sessions, you know, to actually do it in quite a conscious way.
And open way.

And open way, yes. Yes. Yes. So hopefully then that will, we’ll influence each other more, because a big discussion we had beforehand was that it would be totally pointless, if people felt defensive or they felt like from the beginning they were going to take no notice.

So, what we haven’t sort of talked about is, to what extent other people know what it is you’re doing, and that you’re seeing some of these people for such a long time, do you keep it... I mean is it just by default, is it not known, or do you actively keep it a secret, or is it...

Oh no.

...or is it open and known, or...?

No, I think it’s pretty known. There’s no need to... nobody would question, nobody would actively question, I think that’s the point, probably a matter of power as much as anything.

Do you feel guilty about it ever?

[pause] No, because I actually feel... I don’t feel I see people for just... for the wrong reasons. I really do feel that I need, they need to be seen. I think about it, and sometimes I wonder, but I actually don’t ever feel guilty about it. Because also I know I see plenty of others too. If I only had a few long-term patients and that prevented me seeing urgent cases or doing things et cetera, but maybe that’s part of the reason I then go into overkill and see all the additional people, is, you could argue, I don’t know, is, to make up for... I don’t know. I don’t feel guilty about it. I make other people feel guilty, and I can see they don’t like that, and that’s unfair.
That they should be seeing more long-term people?

They should be just seeing more people. (laughs) Doing more work. It’s funny, because Q and I were laughing. We’re the two part-time people; she goes home, she does lots of work at home; the difference is, I stay at work. And everybody else is full-time, and I’m in there in the evening, I say, ‘I’m the bloody part-time worker, why is there not another soul in this building?’

P’s part-time isn’t she?

Yes, she’s...she’s five sessions, but she’s...she does whole days, she does two whole days. P doesn’t stay beyond five o’clock for the most part, ever. People don’t. They cut off our lines at six o’clock, we have to go through switchboard. It’s because of what it used to be. Stop patients using the phone. [pause] So, anything else?

Anything that you see differently now, from how you saw it before, as a result of talking?

[pause] I think that, it’s interesting, since we did our origl interview, we have put into practice this...you know, the meeting to review the thing, and we really have... And...and I think, particularly it’s given more junior members of the team the possibility of having more joint discussion about how long a time we see people or not. [pause] I think it just makes you stay aware all the time. And very much, I was very much aware of it as I say with this S2, who, you know, the one who’s moving to F, and that enabled me to...

S2?

Mm, she’s called S2. [pause] And, I think S1, who is the one whose parents got cross et cetera, and I said, ‘I’m not going to continue this thing.’ I mean I’ve...these things are all happening and, you know, you just become more focused on, what can I do or can’t I do.
And in actual fact we're changing all the time ourselves, aren't we?

I think so, yes, definitely. Well, definitely. Definitely. Well I am.

Because what I have been aware of in this interview, that, whereas in the first one we did talk more about when you were in the central service.

Yes.

And being much more focused on eating disorders this time.

Yes.

But it's also that, the way you view things has changed, and I'm sure I would say the same about myself, I'm changing all the time, how I do my work, and within the system and so on.

Mm. So is this going to make it very complicated, the research you're doing? (laughs)

Yes, ruined, ruined it completely.

(laughter)

Oh dear!

Shall I stop it there?

Yes.
[End of Interview]
So I’d like to ask you why you’ve offered one or more patients twenty-six or more sessions of therapy, and, it may help you to think about specific people, but it’s your decisions that I’m interested in.

Three of the people, the people who seem to have really engaged in cognitive therapy and be using it themselves, and seem to grasp the model, show some signs of progress, but then have setbacks during therapy really, a feeling that they’re not at a stage where it would be appropriate to discharge them. I think with those people I have also...they have been people with low self-esteem, as well as the presenting problems and these have tended to [inaudible], things have tended to shift, anxiety, depression.

Shifting problems.

Shifting problems through treatment. And these people are having to work, done more work on assumptions and beliefs as well as the Axis I issues, if you like.

So at what stage did you decide to carry on?

I think...I think with all the people I had sort of, ten sessions in mind to start with, but then when the ten session sort of limit came up they were still with the shifting problems, and there still seemed quite a lot to work with, more you could do I really felt they could benefit, and I was hoping that they’d get better.

So it wasn’t about maintaining them, it was about continuing progress.

Yes, continuing treatment really, yes, definitely. I think if they had been feeling better then I would have found it easier to discharge them into follow up, but they still had ongoing problems that they were struggling with that made it hard to finish sessions. I think with all those people I did sort of take it five sessions at a time, but just kept going. (laughs).
So at each of those points, five-session points, were you doing a review in your head, or a review with the patient, or with your supervisor, or...?

A review with the patient, and when I was discussing people in supervision, and the supervisor was aware of how long it was going on, and was the line manager. I don’t know if I was actually spelling out...

The supervisor was your line manager?

Yes.

You don’t know whether you were spelling it out?

Exactly how many sessions. (laughs) But the fact that, you know, they did, there was somebody else discussing it, these things, and had a rough idea, of sessions.

So that sounds a bit as though you were embarrassed about the number of sessions, not wanting to be quite open about it.

I think when I go over twenty I start thinking, is this OK? What would other people think? I think there’s a mixture of feelings. I think my line manager thought there were exceptions where it was OK. I felt reasonably OK. I think it’s more difficult to admit to.

So do you think that’s partly a function of being relatively newly qualified?

That I worried about it?

Yes, that you were worrying in this way, what do other people think and...
I think it's more this expectation that we can only offer very short-term treatment given
the waiting list we have, and, [pause], breaking the rules in some way. I think it's like
I'm still struggling with those issues really. When you see somebody for thirty sessions,
it does have a look of... It's quite difficult.

And so when did you...how did you come to decide you were doing five sessions and
review, that you were going to finish?

[Pause] Mm, that's interesting. I think when the people concerned were moving towards
recovery, and their scores on questionnaires were lower, so, sort of mildly depressed or
mildly anxious rather than moderately, and questionnaire scores were, or the Beck scales
were sort of approaching ten. And I think also, which, it was when they, they were also
feeling more able to cope without the sessions, and... Because I think seeing people for
that many sessions gives a danger of dependency. And think, I think with probably all
these people, they feel quite anxious about ending the sessions and sort of working on
things independently; I think it was at the stage where they were feeling a bit better and
feeling ready to do that, I then found it easier to say then, this is the right time to go into
follow-up.

So you're the one that made the decision.

Well, I think it sort of, you know, it was discussed, and I think it was at the stage where
they, you know, were feeling a bit more comfortable with the idea. I'd been preparing
them for the end of the sessions, but... And I probably was responding to their anxiety
between the sessions. But also taking account of the symptoms the symptoms they had
presented with, how distressed they were [inaudible].

Any pressures on you to continue or to stop?
Not... Not really. I mean I guess just know that I didn’t want it to, to keep going on and on, pressures of having a waiting list really, but...

Because some of the people have mentioned pressures coming from the team, or from the GP. Sometimes to go on seeing somebody.

Mm.

As well as to stop, of course, like line managers.

With all of these people actually getting clear messages from the team and GPs.

So what sort of problems do the patients have?

Shall I go through them all? (laughs)

Yes, yes.

One person presented initially with panic and social anxiety, but he also had very low self-esteem, and once we’d made some progress with the social anxiety he became very severely depressed. Another was, she presented initially with severe depression, but was also quite socially anxious. Another person was quite severely agoraphobic and depressed. And there were, there were, there were some self-esteem issues, but there were quite specific ones rather than general problems in certain areas, and sort of working with one belief. The other person, somebody with...

The fourth one?
The fourth one. Somebody with longstanding vomit phobia, which had led to, well
actually she had anorexia as well, a continuation of problems and low mood and self-
esteem.

Would you describe them as having personality disorders?

[long pause] It's really difficult. I don't think they'd meet diagnostic criteria for
personality disorders D.S.M. IV. I think they all had longstanding self-esteem issues, and
had problems like, ever since childhood they'd had problems with anxiety or depression.
But I don't think they necessarily fit in to those categories. And I think, I mean, only one
of the people has a significant inter-personal problems. The other people were fairly
good at making relationships and things like that actually, which probably meant they
were then more able to make use of therapy, I guess.

Have you worked with personality disordered people?

Yes. (laughs)

And, have you done longer therapies with them? Are they the twenty session type people,
not as much as twenty-six?

I guess the people who come to mind are people who've had really very significant
interpersonal difficulties, and very severe problems who haven't been able to sort of
engage in and make use of therapy. The one that immediately comes to mind.... And
there was somebody I saw recently who had personality issues who made very good use
of ten sessions, and use of self-help material and I had wondered at the start, you know,
is this somebody who's going to use a lot of input to get to things, and she made very
good use of it, and I hadn't thought she would. So I think it's really difficult to predict
how it's going to go.
Yes. You haven't said much about the fourth person.

Have I not?

No.

No, I guess she's a little bit different to the others. She didn't actually engage fully in sort of cognitive therapy and there were social issues, that seemed to be more important, that seemed to be undermining what she was trying to do. I think I stayed involved with her for more than twenty-six sessions, because, she was making some progress. I'm not really sure what that was down to, whether it was the support and encouragement of actually engaging in cognitive therapy. And I think because she was very low weight it was very difficult to pull out, because of the risks of deteriorating, and she was very anxious about that as well, so that's why we sort of continued, and she's made steady progress.

And so she was anorexic, was she?

Yes. Yes. anorexic and vomit phobic.

So with her it was slightly different, in that you were...you were worried about her, you felt that you had to stay in touch with her and keep going with her, and that element of it might...?

Yes, it was a bit different in some ways, it was...yes, I was worried about her being, about her low weight. I guess a similarity would be between the four of them would be the client's anxiety about ending therapy, I guess. And she was really anxious about losing weight.

So how did you come to finish with her?
Well it got easier as she put on weight. And then, we had, we had regular reviews, and at the last review we considered the options, which were, either her taking bigger steps really and do more challenging, with behavioural experiments, or her being supported by a practice nurse, for sort of ongoing support, not from me. And she decided that she wanted ongoing support rather than to work more in a cognitive therapy-type way. That was easy, because she was very different from the beginning. So she decided, chose that.

Well, she decided, and you decided as well, but with the others ones it was a bit more you, than them... Or was it the relationship between you? Do you think there’s something about people that hooks you in, or...

Yes, I think...

Or even makes you collude with them...

I don’t know, because, I think this is saying something about finding it difficult to discharge people who are anxious about being discharged, but on the other hand, you know, they did have...I discharged them at a point where they had sort of improved quite a bit. In other ways it might seem appropriate to because they are feeling less distressed and have reached a stage where from moderately depressed or moderately anxious, things were going well. So, it could go either way, I think. (laughs)

Well I suppose sometimes it might be easier to keep going with somebody because you like them, or keep going because you dislike them slightly but feel guilty or feel you ought to, or...

Mm.

...something like that.
Yes, I can, I can see that. And I guess if somebody does engage well with cognitive therapy, it's easy to run with them. So you might say to yourself, well they're more likely to get something out of it, because they're engaged but I guess also it would be more of a pleasure to work with them and be their therapist and to continue.

Yes, I think I do prefer those sorts of people really. (both laugh)

I feel a bit, it's a bit difficult to admit that I continue longer with people just because I like them, but I'm sure there must be something in that, if I'm honest.

So what part do you think might have been played by supervision or line management in deciding to carry on or to stop or whatever?

Well, not being challenged about it. (laughs)

So a sort of, negative way?

Yes. In the absence of somebody saying, you know, what about discharging this person, I think I'm more likely to carry on. And I guess, my supervisor, or particular supervisors would be more likely to say that person's hasn't changed, and that person's not engaging and....

To say to stop?

Yes. They don't seem to be getting anywhere, and asking why continue?

Did the supervisor say that about some people?
Not about three of them, but, the fourth person with vomit phobia and anorexia, I think in supervision we discussed does it need to be me supporting this person or can it be someone else and that influenced the discharge in the end. And also thinking about setting more challenging behavioural experiments and things like that, sort of contributed to that decision-making process as well.

It sounds very much as though you keep quite focused because you are reviewing quite frequently, and then you don't drift along into a longer therapy.

No. I think that helps. But I guess it can still be a bit of denial about ending and things. Some people when you have a review, it really does feel like you are deciding whether to continue or not, with other people, I think there's a sort of assumption,'you're going to continue but let's just check it out and think about it.

What's the difference then, between those types of people?

I think it would be really whether...whether they seem to be engaged in therapy and it makes sense to them. It might depend slightly on levels of distress, if they're very distressed, it might be difficult to contract an ending. But I have recently decided to end with somebody who is very, very distressed, her model was completely different, so we decided that there was not point in continuing at this stage. But that is quite difficult, because she was very severely depressed. It was only after about six or seven sessions.

And maybe it's, maybe it's because they're not so much personality disorder patients, because I know that there are patients where I have no focus really, and I just drift on and on and on. Or they bring new things, and you can never, can't actually finish, kind of thing.

That can be difficult too... Yes, I mean, the people I've talked about haven't really been like that.
No, no.

I think they, those sorts of people are difficult to work with, and I probably would run on for a few more sessions because of that but I probably wouldn’t actually gone on to twenty-six sessions.

[inaudible].

[inaudible] for five or something.

Yes. And where I’ve waited for sixty sessions or ninety sessions, I still feel we haven’t started yet. (both laugh)

Mm.

But their problems are so awful that you can’t stop seeing them, or there’s something that keeps you going. But it sounds as though your patients weren’t like that.

[pause] Yes, I guess I might not come across people like that so much, but...

Do you think your case load has changed over the years?

Yes, I’m seeing more complex people. [pause]

Anything else you want to add? [pause] Because it seems as though we have covered everything more or less.

Mm. I think so, [inaudible].
So, how's it been, talking to me?

Fine, yes.

OK.

I hadn't really sort of thought about it much before, so, I'm sort of thinking on my feet.

That's OK. Is there anything you would view differently now?

[pause] I'm not sure, but I think I'll think about the issue of whether I'm responding to the client's anxiety about ending, or whether it is reasonable though distressing. I think I might think about that a bit more when I'm coming to the end of therapy with people.

OK, thank you.
OK, so what I want to know is really about the sort of decisions that you made when you offered twenty-six or more sessions.

Mhm.

So, and what point in therapy did you decide to offer that many?

I have a sense it's sometimes dictated by...it's probably quite early, rather ironically.

At the beginning, or near the beginning?

Probably after five or six sessions. I would say that's kind of implicit rather than explicit.

To yourself?

Yes. (laughs) Well the kind of people that I've taken on have either been people who have been hospitalised, and therefore who have kind of had some sort of severity kind of cachet kind of... And... Or, I think the most recent person I think I offered about fourteen sessions, and during about three sessions before the time up, he made a real big change in his, his work, and I took him to supervision, and actually the group felt that it was quite wrong then to not offer him further therapy.

Was that a hospitalised...?

He wasn't, he was somebody who had come here with quite complex – well not complex, but I mean with quite an enduring personality problem I would say, and a depressive disorder. And I treated him largely because he'd...he'd been offered treatment but he caused a lot of trouble, there was somebody who had already come with quite a label having made complaints to the Trust, about the waiting list, and about his treatment with a psychologist. Not necessarily substantiated, but, on the waiting list level, but I don't
think the psychologists were nasty to him. But, so, yes, so he looked like he was going to be severe and enduring and difficult to treat, and actually, and I then gave him a bit of treatment. But he seemed to be able to make use of that and that seemed to work.

So you, at the outset you decided to give a bit.

Yes. And he used it, so we gave him more.

So that's your second group of people?

Mm. The hospitalised people, I think almost that they, I think that sometimes they drift in because, you treat them when they're in crisis; I think sometimes contracting goes out the window. I mean that's the reality of it, sometimes for me that happens. You sometimes go through, you've been...you're at twelve sessions and you suddenly think, gosh I'm not sure that my formulation on their history is very good, because somehow you've started treating them on activity scheduling or something, and somebody's not in a fit state, and then suddenly you think, gosh, I need to go back to the drawing board. So that can drift. And the reason why I tend to see some of those people for longer is, I often tend to be the only clinician working with them, so, I quite often would become their key worker. I think there are more pressures then.

It doesn't sound like a good system.

I don't think it's a bad system, but it depends what your aim is really, if your aim is to be a therapist, or whether you're aiming to keep the team happy, or be a key worker, or minimise the number of contacts this person needs with the team. And sometimes it can be quite unwieldy, if you've been a therapist and somebody else has been the key worker, and actually somebody's functioning reasonably OK, ish, and can manage with one worker, I think that's better. Well thinking about two particular in-patients, and one that
I'm seeing now and one that I worked with before, and they really did have kind of complex problems.

But you didn't see them, you're not counting this as while they were in-patients; this was when they were...?

This was when they were discharged.

...discharged.

Yes. Mm. So I'd pick them up when they were.... I've lost track of the questioning.

There are two groups, the hospitalised ones and the complex enduring, difficult...

Yes.

...often with a reputation tag.

Yes, and I wouldn't want to say that all my, all my in-patients that I ever pick up get seen for twenty years, they don't, but there are some people where complexity and key working that's two separate kind of issues really.

Do you ever decide right at the beginning when you first take them on?

For long-term?

Mm.
I'm trying to think of a time when I have. I suppose I've not really...I don't know if I overtly would have made that decision. I think sometimes there has a sort of sense of, the likelihood that it would be difficult to offer brief treatment with some people, that sort of, somebody that I saw last year who, although I offered brief treatment as a sort of, a taster or as an experiment to see whether or not they could make use of it, and if it would be of any help to them, I had a very clear idea in my mind that it would be unlikely that that would be the minimum. So the contract with the patient was brief, but actually in my head, and this is somebody who had been, who was a late adolescent and was I think nineteen, and had already been held under a section for two years, and had received a sort of tentative borderline personality disorder diagnosis, although people were reluctant to use it because of her age. And she'd had two years of psychodynamic psychotherapy in the in-patient unit, that she'd been in a private in-patient unit. So although I'd said yes, I'll see her for four to six sessions to see how we get on, I kind of had that sort of sense that it may be difficult to limit it to that, and that she would...she actually found that quite difficult, to trust me, for that brief amount of time.

So what happened?

She actually dropped out of the treatment in a kind of, almost a flight into health, because she dropped out of my treatment, the psychiatrist's treatment, the GP's treatment, the social worker's treatment, and is now allegedly, apparently - well not allegedly, I do know that she's gone to college, and has, you know, made a success of her life, which is very good.

Mm. So you, you rarely actually decide at the outset, rarely if ever...

Yes.

...I don't think I do, but you might decide fairly early on?
Yes. Decide's probably putting it a bit strong, but have an inkling. Yes.

*So what happens to make you think that give more...?*

I was thinking about this, as you were summarising me. There are various kind of criteria, and one I think is the one we talked about, which is somebody looking like they're making use of it in a way that makes it seem worth pursuing, and with the person I'm thinking about, actually this was somebody who complained bitterly about the waiting list, complained bitterly about the NHS, have lots of feelings that the Health Service didn't care about them, and then seemed to be, had quite paranoid and fixed beliefs about themself and the world, and actually seemed to be showing some signs of shift, which, (laughs) which meant that he could make some progress with cognitive therapy. But also meant, and this sounds awful, but, that he could actually leave OK.

And I had a sort of, a very strong sense with this chap that when we withdrew therapy, that that would be, if we weren't careful this would just re-evoke all the old beliefs about, nobody cares and they just give me things and take them away, and they're just taking the mick out of me kind of thing. So something about him needing to, me needing to ensure that he had a good solid ending that made him feel somehow kind of cared about, and ready for the ending. So deciding with him, I mean it was partly, I was trying to stick very firmly to boundaries, I thought it was very clear that he needed that, but actually there was a side to it, there was one bit about him needing more and needing more, but lacking in benefit from more, and another one about sort of facilitating a good ending that didn't feel like an abandonment, didn't feel too much like abandonment.

*So did he know quite a long way ahead then that it was going to end?*

Yes. I mean we were...he is somebody I was very careful about contracting with, because he's somebody who needed to know where he stood from the outset.
So did you extend him, like some people have reviews and then offer another five, and
review and so on?

I only extended it once; I think I asked him... I can’t remember how many sessions I
offered him, but it was something like... Maybe, I might have extended twice. I think I
probably offered six and then reviewed, and then another eight or something, and then
around the next review we were coming up towards an ending, and he made a change,
and I offered him I think another ten, or twelve, I’m just trying to think. We finished, we
were bang on your 26.

Definitely twenty-six?

Definitely twenty-six. No, it was around about... But, so I only, I did extend him twice
probably, I can’t remember. Yes, twice.

Do you do that with other people?

Mostly. My...I mean, not often swayed to extend, but if I’ve almost got a parallel system,
there are the ones that I stick to very firm, and these are the ones you’re interested in
really, well they are the ones you’re interested in. There are a lot of whom I kind of make
the decision are sort of, fairly straightforward, and therefore I offer them around the kind
of eight, ten, twelve sessions mark, probably, and review every four or five sessions. And
then the ones who almost have a kind of, a much more open-ended contract, and there
aren’t very many that I have like that. But, I mean there’s one at the moment where by
virtue of complexity it is... I mean this guy’s, this guy I talked to you about before, he’s
got PTSD and chronic depression and a history of childhood abuse, who, you know, I
mean one could carry on working with him forever, but at the moment our aim is just to
kind of tone him to some sort of level of functioning that’s manageable really. But I’ve
been seeing him for over twenty-six sessions since last year, so, weekly for a year, and
for longer than one-hour sessions. It’s confession time. (laughs) No, I mean I think
there's a good clinical basis for that, this chap kind of can't cope with doing any talking about any trauma or painful things, and then leave. I mean he really does need kind of, a good twenty minutes to get into it and twenty minutes to patch up again before he walks out.

Gosh, I haven't talked about the length of the session time. That's an interesting...

So in terms of client hours, this chap, you know, exceeds people, even though he's only been seen for a year, so technically he's probably had something like the late twenties of sessions, with holidays plus phone calls, but actually in reality in terms of patient hours, a lot more.

[pause] He's only made one phone call but...

Is phone calls something you do?

No, not really. I mean, this person called me in crisis last week because it was sort of hot off the press really. No, I don't routinely.Occasionally, if there's a good reason. I mean usually it would be if I'm doing something where, or I'm sort of busy with clients so that I can't see somebody for a week where I normally would have done. And I think we really need to assess. So it's really a kind of the second best, if I can't manage to see them, but that's very rare. Or if I think somebody's in real crisis and they need some help. But I don't often instigate that, it's usually times when you're ...

[pause]

So what...what makes you decide when to stop?

That's more difficult really.
And I mean with these longer ones mainly.

Yes. [pause] It’s very difficult. (laughs) I think...I’m just trying to think, I was racking my brains with the people that I finished with after a long, long time. And there’s two particular reasons. I think sometimes it’s sort of, a sense that somebody’s got to a point where they can function without therapy. But that’s a very idiosyncratic sort of point isn’t it? There’s something about, I suppose a concern that you...and it’s intuitive I guess, about thinking that you’re beginning no longer to offer them something that would help them change; it’s more about... I think...I’m thinking about dependency and actually giving somebody a message that they can move on, rather than they need to stay with me forever. [pause] Yes. I’m not terribly clear about that one. And I think those are the main things, I’m still thinking. When you feel like you’ve kind of, met your treatment goals. I mean, it’s difficult with that, because you can always find more treatment goals, but... I’m just mindful of clients I’ve seen who’ve been seen forever and ever by people, and they come back and you say, ‘Why do you get seen forever and ever?’ and they say, ‘I don’t know, the person made me come back, and that sort of made me feel like I’m a really terrible patient and I must have done something really, really wrong for them to see me for twenty years every six weeks.’ But so, a sort of something about giving people the message that they’re competent and they can work without a therapist, a sort of clean bill of health kind of thing. So that’s about, I mean that’s an aim rather than why I make the decision.

Yes, what are your aims and goals in therapy?

[pause] Well it’s just the classical cognitive therapy answer is, well, to help people function in the way that they identify as being a goal for them that would be realistic. So I suppose that’s the answer, I don’t... [pause] I don’t know, they vary. I mean I think with, with one client that I saw, it was to keep her safe, because when I first saw her she was doing quite unsafe things, in a lot of chaos and getting involved in dangerous things. So it was about keeping her, I think for her it was keeping her alive, or, protecting her
from being raped. That was my aim, I think. And the chap that I finished work with recently, he'd had quite sort of a lot of anti-social personality traits, it was really to kind of get him to a position of acknowledging his role in his relationships, and the fact that there is a lack of relationships really, and that was quite a challenge, because, to get on board with somebody enough for them, he was quite prickly and found it quite difficult, and felt very angry with the system for letting him down, rejecting him, whatever. So that was an aim really, to get on side, I think that was to get alongside him really, and to develop a relationship where we could be a bit more open and honest about his role. And to that extent we succeeded really. I mean his goal was to earn £100,000 a year, and get a girlfriend, which is a difficult one for him, and we failed. (laughs) But I think we reviewed that goal, and, I don't think his goal was that important at the end really. He was sort of setting goals that were impossible to meet when we first started, but his goal at the end was to move out the family home, which was...

A first step.

A good first step, yes.

[pause]

I'm interested in the way that complainers get more.

Mm.

I mean you're not...when I interviewed Joan last year, that was a big category she had.

Mm. Yes.

Is it just that man, one person?
Oh I haven’t got any more complainers, I don’t think. No.

So when you offer more sessions, do you think it might be something about you...

Or about them.

About them, about your relationship?

I’m sure it’s all of those, you know, me, them, us. I’d like to think it was based on some sort of clinical need as much as some sort of, kind of, which on my part. And... And it’s interesting, because I was just thinking about, I mean the opposite is people who I haven’t offered, and hadn’t agreed to treat.

Yes.

And I suppose I’m mindful, I’ve had some interesting outcomes with that, where, I was just... It almost kind of guides me into thinking, why do I or don’t I offer treatment? And I can tell you, can I tell you about a woman that I didn’t treat, and she was somebody who had been seen for twenty years every six weeks, and just kind of always had an expectation that she would be seen by the Health Service for her many anxiety, depression type problems. And I didn’t offer her treatment on the basis that I felt... So she wouldn’t...I thought she wouldn’t change. I thought she was dependent on therapy in a way that was, through infantilising and...not infan...what’s the right word for kind of, sort of deskilling, and disabling somehow. Because it wasn’t enabling. So you were kind of a bit like the expert, and she would trot along and you’d kind of reassure her for a bit, and then she’d go off again. And also she was quite, she would set treatment goals and then kind of solve them the following week, and then made...

So you did see her?
I saw her very briefly, I saw her for about eight sessions, and she... But when I discharged her, and said that I felt that there was nothing more I could offer her, she was furious, and...and sort of went off and said, 'Well, there’s no point in seeing health professionals, we might as well just go it alone and do it ourselves.' And in a sense...

That's what happened.

That was exactly what we wanted. And although I'm sure, it was kind of like a nasty outcome in the sense that she felt very angry with me, and very let down by me, it almost galvanised her. I mean in the time that I was with the team that I worked with, she didn’t come back. And it may have galvanised her into action. So, I suppose, for my own thinking, as we're talking I'm thinking about how...

So, so you seem to be saying that for you, therapy or the interaction is about change, not about maintenance.

Yes.

So even the ones that get a lot more, it's about change.

Yes. And I don’t think I’ve got...I’m...unless...I haven’t necessarily got very high aspirations about how much change, but I suppose, some change, mm. Mm. And I wouldn’t carry on...although I talked about key working, I don’t think I would carry on seeing somebody as their key worker unless I thought that it needed a psychologist to be doing this work, or a therapist, you know, a psychological therapist, cognitive therapist. I wouldn’t take somebody on for maintenance long-term, if I thought that somebody else within the team could be doing that.

So to come back to maybe your own reasons, factors from yourself, do you think that liking a patient, or feeling guilty, things like that, come into it?
Definitely. (laughs) Yes. Oh I've just thought of another person I saw for a long time. She's just been re-referred. (laughs) I suggested perhaps she doesn't need therapy. Yes. It's not often...I suppose, there's gradations of like. It's not often that I see somebody I don't like, and I often see not liking somebody as being a bit of a challenge, because, I usually think that if I don't like somebody, it means I've not got a good formulation of their problems. Because at least if I, if I understand it, I sort of think understanding somebody means that you don't feel as irritated by them, or if you understand what drives their behaviour. It's not always possible, there are some people who I don't like a lot.

Do you ever offer them more therapy, more sessions?

[pause] I'm just trying to think of the people I didn't like. No, probably not. It's just, I'm sort of squirming a bit and thinking, well is it that... Because I suppose my formulation of that is that if I haven't got a good formulation I don't like them, and, or, if I'm not working well with them I don't like them, because... Perhaps that's very simplistic. That if I can't...sort of, if I can't empathise with them, then I find that frustrating. But I don't know whether... Maybe that I just don't offer people I don't like... Do you know what I mean, I'm just trying to think whether it's just about liking or not liking, whether there's a reason behind that. And that may sound like squirming. And I remember fondly the people I've worked with for a long time. I don't know whether liking them...possibly. I mean there is something about guilt. I mean the chap that complained, I was very mindful of having really understood what was behind his complaining I think, and you know, and he'd...for somebody who was quite so angry and stroppy, had actually shown quite a lot of vulnerability and talked a lot about painful things, and cried and done things like that in sessions, which were, were quite touching I suppose, and I...well I did like him; he was a stroppy person, but I quite like stroppy people. But, but I didn't want to...that was about not wanting to recreate stuff from the past. But I did like him. I just don't know when...
So how does guilt come into it?

[pause] I just think I'm heavily defended, or I just kind of pretend that there's a clinical reason for this, and try and deny that I have any personal reaction that are absolute balderdash really.

Because I can see that guilt might make you give more than you feel you should.

Yes. I mean I think guilt...

But also liking someone would make you give more...

Yes.

Or engagement?

Yes, I think it's engagement.

Not liking sometimes goes with a patient not being engaged.

That's, that's kind of what I was trying to articulate, that I suppose if I don't like somebody, it's...it feels like the wrong word; if I feel like we're not on board with each other, then it's hard to work.

Although I've offered more in order to get them engaged.

Absolutely, yes.

[pause]
And then had to give it up as a bad job.

Yes.

After a million sessions.

Oh really?

Yes.

Yes. I’m just kind of muddled about whether engagement ...

And the trust issue, which somebody else brought up, that you need a lot of sessions for some people in order for them to start trusting.

Yes. I don’t...I don’t fall for that comment. I don’t buy that one... I do it a bit. And then I sort of said about that patient, the young girl where I knew that offering forty-six sessions was tricky, and in fact very quickly she challenged that and said, ‘What’s the point?’ And before I knew it, I’d offered her much more long-term, thinking... I’m just remembering this. I wasn’t lying earlier. (laughs) I’m just recalling that, that she did take me on about a short contract, and could only really settle into therapy for, she was on, I think I offered her something like twenty at the beginning, with a, you know, very clear knowledge that it would be forty, because of... But in fact she didn’t use, so she doesn’t quite count for your.

No. And she dropped out.

She dropped out, yes. So you were asking about trust, that would come into it to some extent. But I’d be more inclined to offer ten. That’s a lie isn’t it, because I just offered twenty. But I wouldn’t just offer somebody oodles of therapy just because of an issue of
trust; there would have to be other reasons, you know, very good clinical need, either, you know, in terms of, if there was a kind of classic... in terms of the patient or the service needing it if somebody's been coming in and out of hospital. So there's a sort of argument that actually by seeing them, you might reduce demands on a service in other areas.

Right, so that's another...

Yes. I just suddenly thought of that one.

Yes

I have done that actually, where I suppose change is change-ish as the aim really, then change-change, with more of a maintenance aspect to it. Or I was thinking about people where, there's one woman who you've probably heard about in the team, who works...who I worked with, to see whether she could make use of treatment in a brief contact, concluded that she couldn't, but also concluded that it wasn't a sensible idea to pull out either, because we felt that she...we knew that she didn't do endings well, and that therefore (laughs) we had to do this huge long kind of time-managed ending, having just begun with a sort of brief contact in mind. And that, I mean that was basically that she didn't do endings well, and that she assaulted members of staff, often in a displacement way, she didn't assault the member of staff who left; she assaulted somebody else, and was quite difficult to manage. And, she also, you know, had lots of drug and alcohol problems, and, and ended up in places like the hospital, prison, she was often finding herself into sort of custodial care, and it didn't seem like a good time to pull out. And so, that was a kind of maintenance-ish.

How long did you see her?
Nine, ten months. No, you know... I'm just thinking, I was thinking twenty-six sessions is about a year, but it isn't necessarily. I could have seen her for twenty-six sessions.

Yes, between six months and a year.

Mm. I've kind of meandered, I can't remember what we were talking about.

So, there are service needs sometimes.

Mm.

And, another thing that somebody has brought up is crises, working towards the ending and then they have them. Or rather, there's that, or there's the bringing a new crisis every week so that you can't stick to your agenda.

Mm.

And that just keeps it going for far longer.

You're right, there is an element of that. I can't recall that being a... My perception is that that's not been a major issue for a lot of the clients I've worked longer with.

Or, pressure from, from other professionals, like GPs or health visitors, or OT or nurses or doctors or psychiatrists, whatever.

Well you, just... It's interesting that, it flashes back, to various people, and I'm just thinking about somebody where that was true, that, that the referral came from Social Services' children and families team, to see somebody who had lots of problems, lots of sort of social problems, and had a history of abuse, and lots of flashbacks, and lots of
interpersonal relationship problems, where I felt that actually it wasn’t very fruitful to pursue therapy particularly not about this person’s problems.

It wasn’t?

It wasn’t, no. In fact, you know, we saw quite significant increase in her distress whenever we touched upon those issues. And in a way a lot of the supportive work that she needed was pretty well, very, I mean, really impressively well covered by other professionals within the Social Services network, in the family centre. But there was a real resistance from people outside of the Health Service, from the Social Services Department not to pull out, you know, pull back on the therapy. Although actually the goals that she had identified weren’t workable really. So there is a kind of outside agency thing sometimes. Although, I think what I did with that actually was to try and manage it in a number of ways, one by having joint meetings with the Social...I mean it was a team, a community job, you know, community team job. And I went and visited the family centre with, with family centre workers, the social worker involved, and the patient, and the patient’s husband and the child, and talked with all of them about managing her distress, and on a monthly basis. And that kept her ticking over for quite a few months, and actually I think was much more helpful, and it made them, they felt helped and supported, and supervised and whatever. And I maintained some contacts. That was kind of a way round it really.

Rather than seeing her individually?

I saw her individually as well, at times, but not...I saw her for a contract of about, I don’t know, twelve, fourteen sessions; it wasn’t a long-term. But that’s kind of how I resisted it really. But why... I mean I think I had very clear reasons; clinically I felt that it wasn’t...it wasn’t actually...I thought it was damaging to carry on working with her actually. Because she kept wanting to talk about – well she didn’t really want to talk about the abuse, but then kind of, felt like everybody wanted her to be there, and
somebody had to say no, this isn’t the moment really. And then she got pregnant again.

Then that was kind of...and nasty, psychotic… So there was all sorts of... In fact there were lots abuse already continuing, so there was like, there was a lot of protection things that needed to be sorted out before doing any explorative work really.

What about supervision then, has that influenced you at all in making decisions about stopping or carrying on?

Much more so latterly as I’ve got older and wiser really; I’m not sure about the wiser, but as I’ve got older I think, or more qualified, you don’t get more qualified, but more experienced since qualification, I think I, I value other people’s opinion about stopping and starting more than I did when I first started out. Often sort of, some supervisor, well-meaning supervisor, saying, ‘I don’t think you should carry on working with this person’ felt quite punitive, and I felt quite misunderstood, and hated the session rule and really resisted them with passion. And I came to the department when there was a very rigid ten sessions, and if you were really lucky you got twenty, kind of attitude, although there was a bit of furtive seeing people for a lot longer than that probably, definitely. But now, you know, supervision, I often would... I mean in some ways be quite comforted, because there’s somebody I’m seeing at the moment who’s, you know, very sadly I don’t think going to change really, and I’ve worked pretty hard, and in fact he’s, he doesn’t count as long-term, but he is long-term, because he was seen by somebody who left this team and passed him on to me, after having seen him for about twenty sessions, and I’ve seen him for another about twelve. And you know, talking to my supervisor about that person and that person saying, ‘Oh hang on, you know, at some point you’re going to have to conclude, you have to bale out because you’re, you know, it isn’t going to work, this isn’t helping. It isn’t changing anything,’ I found that really comforting. So... I would quite often... I’m sure I use supervision much more to help me end with somebody, as opposed to...so I’ll ask for supervision when I’m stuck, where I may not ask for supervision when I’m offering somebody a contract, or thinking about extending their treatment.
Well that's interesting.

I'm sure it is. (laughs)

So, do you find that supervision helps you focus more?

Mm. Definitely.

[pause]

And what about line management?

Well I have a funny situation at the moment, because, as the sector psychologist, I don't have very much line management, because Y.'s very busy, and X.'s gone, she's not gone, she's not line manager any more. And in a sense, I suppose it's a different situation, because, I don't think that the management that I get from the head of department is asking me how long I'm seeing people. Essentially the interest is, how long's my waiting list, and how well am I managing my waiting list, rather than, how am I managing individual clients. I mean, I have a supervisor that I talk that through with. But very much in only who I bring. So actually I'm not very scrutinised.

So, a sort of case management with, in the context of the waiting list, doesn't mean you've done it?

No. Apart from in my head.

With yourself.

Mm.
Does that help?

Mm. Definitely. I do a lot of it in my car. (laughs) But yes, between...I do a lot of... I don’t have a lot of time to think in the sessions, you know, at work, but I do do a lot of thinking about where I’m going with people, and supervising from...because it’s three-quarters of an hour from home to here, and I do a lot of preparation in the car, which sounds ridiculous but that’s often what I do. And I do quite often sit down and work out my case load and think about where the people are at and their files think about contracts to try and keep tabs on everything. I’m sure I could do more.

[pause]

The only other thing I wanted to mention was that somebody said that they got the impression that they were influenced by an early case they had early in their career.

Mm.

In seeing long-term cases in a certain way, or giving them permission to see some long-term cases, and that then, that influence carried on for later cases. And I dare say it could work either way; if you were always very encouraged to stop early, you might always go on doing that. Or if you got the message, it’s OK, sometimes you would continue sometimes to extend.

So you’re thinking about kind of models that I must have got from the beginning?

Does that ring a bell with you? Because only one person mentioned that I think.

I mean I suppose...I don’t know whether it does or it doesn’t. When I first started out, I worked in a CMHT where I did have a couple of longer-term clients; I’m not convinced that seeing them for a longer time made an awful lot of difference to the quality of their
treatment at that stage. But I was in some sense lucky enough to have permission from
my manager to do that, who did have quite a close line on what I was doing. And I
worked on identifying, worked somewhere else where we worked with people longer. ...
So I wouldn’t say, of my case load, I wouldn’t say that the majority were long-time work;
I would try and keep that to a manageable level, I think.

Oh I think everybody does that.

Mhm. But I think I’ll be less...I think I’ll be more clear about what the goals were, and
what the reasons for seeing somebody for longer were. I think, I hope. I mean I think
those... When I saw people at the beginning, I think guilt and not knowing what the hell
to do with people was much more prominent, and... And also not having, not having that
sort of sense about how clients actually.... Many clients, although they have lots of
problems, do function, and as you have this idea of a focus to start with, I certainly have
this idea that somehow it’s an integral part of people’s lives. And I think, well that’s sort
arrogant, I mean people function incredibly competently and we aren’t part of their lives
at all. So I don’t feel quite as sort of, concerned that people fall apart without me.

Anything else you want to add?

[pause] I can’t think of anything. No. It’s been quite interesting, it’s been a bit...a bit
challenging. Not in a bad way, but I mean it’s just sort of, we don’t often sort of think...
I’m not sure what I conclude, so it will be interesting to see...

Yes, is there anything you would see differently now?

[pause] I think it just re-emphasises, and I have to re-emphasise, which is kind of
important to the, importance of contracting. And I can think of somebody, the person I’m
seeing for the longest term, I have the loosest contract with, and, that may be why then
it’s very difficult to kind of rein it in and get the contract on the table, and the plan for
ending, because it feels like, you know, you're imposing an ending on somebody who's not otherwise had that built into the therapy. And it just re-emphasises yet again that actually picking people up from the ward, you have to be mindful of the, the housekeeping, the setting up therapy, which I often kind of let slip when I think somebody's not ready to cope with that. But then it kind of drifts, and you almost sometimes think, well I don't have a full history here, and I should have. I kind of get into first aid before I get into, you know, formulating properly. And it's just a pitfall, I need to take it away and think about that.

OK, anything else?

No, I think that'll do.
why you offered some patients twenty-six or more sessions, it's your decisions I'm particularly interested in.

Right. I think, in the case of the one we talked about before...

The OCD one.

...the OCD lady, it was largely due to the severity of her problem, and the fact that there were a lot of very difficult systemic issues coming in that made it very difficult. And also that, at one stage there was a thought that she may have to go into hospital, and that was going to be extremely difficult because apparently OCD treatment here, they don't actually really do OCD, and it would have to mean going to the special Unit, which would cause even more trouble in the family. So a lot of it was aimed at keeping her out of hospital, and keeping her with her child. There were also a lot of other people involved who seemed to...

The child was quite young was it?

Yes, one, or less than one when we started, yes. And there had been some issues, which actually proved to be wrong, about health visitors, not the health visitor that I was involved with, but another health visitor, saying that the baby was very raw from being washed again and again; in fact, I went to a meeting and we found that that was erroneous. And I think the other decision was, my supervisor was very supportive about it, and, there was some feeling as far as I can remember that, when I actually started with her, it was a sort of slight mistake that I got her, because...

[inaudible].

...the assessment hadn't, the assessor hadn't really realised quite how bad things were, or whether they...
And that was your supervisor that did that?

Yes. And in fact probably things had in fact worsened considerably between assessment and seeing her.

In what sense would you say that you were, you shouldn't have had her?

Because I wasn't experienced enough. But in fact, I think in the end, without being arrogant or anything, I think it was OK in the end, but partly because my supervisor was so supportive, and his speciality is OCD.

Oh. So...yes.

Mm.

At what point then did you realise that it was going to be a more long term case?

I think I started to realise right at the beginning, and we discussed it throughout. And one of the points was when we realised that she wouldn't come actually to the team base where I work, because the OCD prevented her from going out of the house, and the first time she came there were a lot of sort of DNAs. And eventually she did come, and then there were more DNAs, and it ended up that we decided that I should go and see her at her house, which I did. And [pause] continuing to discuss it with my supervisor. And one of the things that happened, she had an enormous kind of pressure of speech, so it was almost impossible to say anything for about three or four sessions. And it was very difficult to make agendas and so on, and my supervisor was very helpful about that. And eventually we did a thing that, I think after about the tenth session we had a trainee, and we decided in order to sort of ascertain whether, whether it was worth us keep doing this, and the use of time and so on, to have a concentrated five day thing, and we had one goal,
which was actually, it was to make her baby's bottles without all the rituals. Which I did
with the help of the trainee. And then that did work, and so then we extended the
sessions further after that.

Right, so that was like a review...

Mm.

... to see if she could use it.

Yes. Yes.

And you had several reviews, didn't you?

We had several reviews throughout, probably after the first session, after the fifth session,
after the tenth session. [pause] Then it sort of rolled on a bit I think for another, another
ten sessions. I think in a way, the last sixteen sessions probably, or the last ten sessions,
[pause] I don't think there was much of a review with my supervisor of exactly how many
sessions, because it became... I don't know, it was... The whole thing seemed to take on
a life of its own in a way, so... In fact it was her really in a way that ended the sessions,
because she didn't...she managed to start to go out and everything, and was a lot better,
and...and she didn't turn up for quite a lot of appointments, and I discussed with her on
the telephone why it all was. And we've agreed not to meet for the time being, but to
have a further review in three months' time. You see when I'm talking, I'm thinking
about how difficult it is to remember it all, and how, I think with all of the ones that I've
had that are long, it hasn't been all that formal, the extending of the sessions.

Formal meaning, agreed with a supervisor?
Yes. It hasn’t felt very very formal about, I don’t know, [inaudible] ten sessions, and I felt I’ve had a lot of freedom about it, which might be good, might not be good. And I think that might be to do with, in a way with being inexperienced and sort of being allowed to have a bit more of a free rein maybe.

But what’s made you decide to carry on?

[pause]

So you weren’t being told to stop?

No. Well one of the things was the fact that she was making progress. [pause]

And you, I think you said she was very motivated as well.

She was extremely motivated, and she, yes, she did make excellent progress, and she did everything we planned and so on. But a lot of the time the sessions were, the reason the sessions were so much longer is because there were so many crises, which perhaps were due to my inexperience, I wasn’t able to compartmentalise the crises.

So crises about something that wasn’t OCD?

That wasn’t OCD. Although the crises always affected the OCD.

Yes.

Yes, because there was a lot going on in the family. So, there was that. And also I just felt very motivated myself, because the implications of the problem were so enormous. And I think also, subconsciously I was influenced by the health visitor, who rang me an awful lot about it, and, I remember feeling at the time and talking to my supervisor about
it that everyone was ringing me up all the time and putting pressure on me, the dad, the
mum, the health visitor, the court, the solicitor.

Golly, you didn’t mention those last time.

Oh, right. (laughs)

I wasn’t aware of those.

Yes, the court, because there were some difficulties over whether her husband was
allowed to see the child, and he made some sort of allegations that, that the OCD was,
was why they split up and why he beat her up, and so on, so on, so... There was a lot of
sort of outside pressure.

Mm, mm.

[pause] Especially from the health visitor, who I sort of got into a relationship with, and...
You know, she made a relationship with me that we were both sort of in it together and I
had to sort of help her. And I had a lot of help from my supervisor about that, because
that was all quite difficult, all the people phoning and... And the family tended to phone
and say, ‘She’s made absolutely no progress at all,’ and, me and the patient knew that she
had. So there was all kinds of things going on that made it go longer. Although I do
think it was good that it went on longer actually in the end. I don’t think it was a mistake,
but it was...thinking about it the way I’m talking about, I think it was fairly sort of
undisciplined in some ways, how it went on, but maybe it had to be.

So she decided when to end it, but presumably, it sounds as though you agreed that that
was the right time.
Yes, yes. Because there was a lot going on in the family at the moment. And the fact as I said before, I’ve just found out that her sister, which I never knew during the treatment, and, her sister had, was, is part of, is a patient of the specialised team at the moment, dealing with issues of child sexual abuse. Which I should imagine is having a major impact on the family and is possibly why she wants to stop for the moment, as well. [pause] And that...yes, the mother was very ambivalent, and trying to scupper treatment some of the time, so there was a lot of stuff about, talking about how to deal with her mother, and what it all meant and so on.

So were you tempted to stop earlier?

[pause] [quietly] I don’t think I was. [pause] I suppose I felt a bit like it, yes. It felt...it felt hopeless at some stages, especially about what was going on in the family, it was such a sort of close intense family, and they kept on trying to do treatments themselves, you know, like, telling her that there wasn’t any soap in the all shops in the county, and... And it was also difficult to meet with them, and I sort of felt it was important to meet with them. I was less tempted to stop with her than I have been with other people. I expect, you know, that in hindsight there was probably a lot going on between her and I as well, sort of thing.

So there was something between you that enabled you to carry on...

Yes.

...that encouraged you to carry on.

Yes. I mean she was very... [pause] Bringing, bringing me in by saying, ‘Oh,’ you know, ‘I love it when you come,’ and all this sort of thing, So... (laughs) There were quite a lot of things going on like that...
How did that make you feel?

[pause] Half wanting...well half wanting to be very very careful about it, and we spent a lot of time discussing dependency and so on. And half thinking, oh good, you know, at least somebody’s, she thinks somebody’s being nice to her. Because she had so much negative input from all over the place. It’s really odd talking about it, because now, the second time of talking about it, I feel that it was all quite a, a sort of, I’m very aware of how confused the whole thing was, and how it was difficult to keep the thread of the OCD treatment through all this, it was like sort of, carving a path through a jungle, you know.

And also what I remember was, you said at the every end of our last interview, was that you’d felt a bit guilty, and that made you carry on, the sort of mixed feelings that one has between wanting to carrying to on and wanting to stop.

Yes.

You feel guilty because you want to stop, so you don’t.

Carry on more. Yes, yes. Yes, I did feel guilty, and I felt sort of like, deskilled, I felt, well maybe I’m not really up to this anyway, and maybe I’ve actually, it was somebody else, they wouldn’t have, you know, they would have got a lot further by now, and so maybe I should carry on longer, and sort of make up for my lack of skills. Or somebody else could have done this in ten sessions, so I’ll sort of make it more, and hopefully that will make me like a very skilled, you know, sort of person. (laughs) Yes. So that was something, yes.
Right. Do you think that's changed at all since, since you've qualified, or since before you qualified even, that feeling, or is that still there, the same now as earlier?

I think it's worse. Yes. As you sort of learn more and more, you become more, I do, become more and more aware of how little you do actually know.

So do you think that might influence you into doing longer therapies?

In the future? [pause] No.

Or even with the people that you're seeing now?

I think it does influence me to have more sessions, yes. But I also think it...it makes me concentrate far more on how many sessions, more in the very...

What do you call a long term therapy?

I would call it about thirty sessions I think.

And you said you had some others...

Yes.

...that you've remembered now.

Yes. I have got a guy who was, had post traumatic stress disorder, and, following the death of his son right outside his house, his only son. And it was compounded by, it brought up something that had happened I think a couple of years before, where he found his apprentice, who was also a young boy, hanging in his workshop. And, he also had
some sort of, what I feel almost, had an obsessive quality. There were lots and lots of
habits to do with staying close to his son, which were becoming like, like obsessive
compulsive stuff. And I think the reason, and actually it’s interesting talking about more,
but I think one of the other reasons is because again of other people, there was so much
outside stuff again.

Putting pressure on you?

Mhm. And there was a CPN who had particularly said, he must have T, you know,
and...and who kept on saying to me, ‘You’ll be absolutely ideal.’ She was leaving. And
that sort of thing. So there was that kind of feeling of, oh I must, you know, be... You
know, she, she really wanted me to do this, and now she’s left, and...

So what did that make you feel?

Yes, under pressure to make it all right for him that his son had died. Because she
couldn’t, and you know, she... So sort of, under sort of a kind of pressure from her in a
way, even though she wasn’t there, you know, don’t let me down, you know, keep him
alive. He was very suicidal as well.

So to keep him alive?

Yes. And keep his marriage going. So that was...

And that’s a big responsibility.

Mm. Yes.

And to pull the rabbit out of a hat, sort of thing.
Yes. Yes.

Do you think that made you see him for more?

Yes. Yes I do think that had an influence on me. But I also think that it was extremely complicated by the just massive grief. Because also, his son had...be a bit difficult this one, because you could quite easily identify him, but, his son had, on the day his son had died, his wife had just come out of hospital with a colostomy operation, just that very second, and then his son was killed outside the house. And, his wife virtually immediately went into A Hospital, and had, I think for about six months, so, another CPN in the team was seeing the wife. But he had had no time to, to grieve, but there were a lot of issues about weakness, and I'm weak, and that was why I've, you know, I'm still grieving after a year, or, so on. So there was, we spent a lot of time not just working on the PTSD but working on things about, your wife has actually spent six months in A Hospital, which might have [inaudible] things along a bit, and... So it’s just lots of different issues really to deal with besides the PTSD. And that’s really, to put it simplistically, that’s why it was long.

Was there... So there were outside pressures making it long, and, were there sort of inside ones from, but coming from him?

[pause] Yes, there were a bit, yes, because... He would say things like, ‘Oh it’s coming up to my son’s birthday,’ and I might have been about to say, ‘I think, we’ll, just contract for another five sessions now,’ and then end it when things are going well. And it would make me think, oh dear, better not say that today. So that would sort of, add on another one. Or, ‘It’s my son’s...’ something or other, you know.

Sort of emotional blackmail.

Yes.
So were you reviewing with him as you went along?

Yes, I reviewed a lot with him. Because he actually very much wanted a structure to everything, and so I was influenced by him. So we reviewed a lot. So, and I mean the whole thing about him in a way was more controlled than the other person. I felt more, you know, that we were sticking to an agenda and a plan much much more.

And you say, in this instance, that supervision wasn’t such a factor. You were given more of a free rein...

Yes.

...or line management.

Yes, more of a free rein, yes.

Did you...

I think with all three of them I sort of, was given a free rein in a way, and I wonder...

[pause] I think I’m very lucky with my supervisor, because I think he’s quite sort of trusting, and perhaps thinks that you won’t do something completely unnecessary. But in a way that puts some pressure on in a way, because you know that they’re trusting you.

And then you’ve got to show that you’re trustworthy.

Be worthy of the trust, yes. Oh dear, I mustn’t take advantage and that sort of, you know. But in fact, funnily enough I’m...all three of the ones that are long, since I met with you, I’ve ended it with them.
Do you think because, something to do with the interview?

I don’t know, or whether it was to do with that waiting list meeting. I mean part of it was, you know, it was planned anyway, but... But I’m very aware that I’ve been stricter than I might have been about it, yes.

That’s interesting.

Mm. Actually I haven’t quite ended yet with him, but there’s only another couple of sessions I think. It is quite interesting.

So how many has he had so far?

He’s had about thirty.

And then the third one?

The third one was very different, because I think those ones are really quite complex and there were so many other issues and so on. But the third one I think was actually a sort of, sort of error really in a way. But those ones I don’t think I would think, God! you know, that was so stupid, that you took so long. Although there are, you know, bits where I think but... But this one I think, I think was. And I think really that, she, she had a personality disorder really. And that I just kept, kept on going and going and going, thinking, surely something is going to make a difference to your mood, and... And, in many ways the whole thing was one of the most unsatisfactory sort of things I’ve done in a way. But... She was ex-anorexic as well. So... And actually when I see her, this is interesting, when I see her in the waiting room, I think, oh God!

Heart sink.
Mm. [pause] So, in fact what I’ve ended up with, I’ve...I’ve ended up finishing it with her, which actually had been planned already, and at the moment she’s, last-ditch attempt to help her, she’s working through Christine Padesky’s book, which seemed, which we’d planned out and what would be the best thing, so on. And then giving her some booster sessions in between now and follow up to help her with that.

So at what point did you realise?

When she...when I realised it was all, not fantastic, was when she told me that she’d been to some kind of strange institute up in C, which had found that actually, all her problems, all her problems were to do with balance or something. And, they’d given her these exercises to do. And a letter came from the people saying, ‘Could you offer her support during this time.’ To which I said, ‘No.’ So, that left... Really you should have the notes with you, because it’s quite difficult remembering exactly what happened. That left her a sort of three- or four-month gap while this thing was supposedly taking effect.

So you didn’t see her for that time?

No.

How many sessions roughly had you had until then?

About twelve I think.

So, you’d already sort of gone beyond a ten-session point.

Mm, yes I had.

And how did that happen?
Well I would say it happened because, again because I realised things were more complex than they seemed at first, and you did quite a lot of schema work and stuff like that. And you know, did extend it by, instead of by five, by another seven sort of thing. So... It was all a bit... This is even depressing talking about it; I think she has made a little bit of progress, but...

What’s depressing?

Well just the thought of her sort of thing. (laughs) Very very dependent as well, saying, ‘You’re not going to end it are you, you’re not going to end it?’ So...

So, definite things coming from her that make you carry on.

Yes.

And making you feel guilty about that?

Guilty again, yes. And when you see her in the waiting room, oh my God!

Sort of, seeing her against your better judgement?

Yes, yes, really, yes.

In a way.

In a way, yes. I really think that it would have, that was a waste of, you know, National Health time; I could have... With the others, I don’t think that, but I think something went on there, I could have, in less than ten sessions what I’ve, what we’ve achieved over the period of twenty-four or twenty...no, about twenty... No, I think it’s about twenty-six, twenty-seven sessions. And there was a lot of complaining about other professionals,
which I think influenced it as well, what rubbish treatment she’d had when she had
anorexia, what rubbish doctors, rubbish this that and other, so I think that might have...

How did that make you feel?

Thinking, I’m going to be not the rubbish one, you know. I’m going to be the one person
you don’t complain about. So, I think there was that, yes.

Anything like, ‘I’m going to be the one who’s going to do it this time’? Sometimes there’s
this kind of challenge that I’m finally going to be the one.

Yes, there’s that. I’m finally going to be the one that makes it. They all obviously
couldn’t find what it really was, and get to the bottom of it, you know, but I will be able
to. And then perhaps the feeling each week of, it’s got to be this week, imagining there’s
going to be some tremendous ‘ah-ha’ mode.

So you carry on.

Mm.

And then, in the end you realise that you were no different from all the others.

Yes.

I think we’ve all been there.

Yes. (laughs) Yes. Yes.

So, so with somebody, we called this carrying on for the wrong reasons.
Yes.

And, sort of being unable to let go.

Very very much carrying on for the wrong reasons. Yes, that one in particular.

And even this sort of feeling, well I've spent all these sessions now, and in order not to waste them...

I'll have to do another one. (laughing)

...and I'd better see her some more.

Yes, that definitely happened. Oh my God! I've already seen..., and hardly anything has moved. I know, I'll do another... (laughs) So, yes. But...

I've spent ninety sessions doing that. Just getting nowhere.

But you keep thinking, today's going to be the day, I've got that funny feeling with it, just, we're going to turn round.

Now did you discuss her with your supervisor?

Well the funny thing is, I'm worrying a bit about, that people will see this actually, and sort of, being very sort of honest about everything, the funny thing is, I didn't really discuss it with him. In some ways I...I wonder if it was sort of a bit of a secret.

A shameful secret?
A bit, yes. And also that feeling of, oh it’s all going badly, I won’t mention it now; I’ll just wait till the next one when I’m sure I will have...you know, one of my interventions will have been good. I think I did mention her at first, and he was very helpful and saying, ‘You will need longer sessions you know, it’s...I’m very clearly with personality disorder,’ and so on. But then after that, it did become a bit of a sort of, shameful secret, and in fact, it’s funny, thinking about it a bit more deeply, she comes at the end of the day when nearly everybody’s gone home as well. It’s that sort of... Yes. I stopped talking about her after the personality disorder conversation.

And he hasn’t asked?

No he hasn’t actually. But we don’t, it doesn’t really work like that either. No, he doesn’t.... I think, oh God! it’s... (laughs)

Interesting. I think we’ve all done that probably.

Mm.

But not so much pressures from outside. It’s something that’s happening between the two of you, the patient and you.

Yes. Yes. And also there’s a feeling of, if I do mention it at supervision, he might say, ‘You’ve got to stop,’ or ‘I think it would be better if you stopped.’ And I’ve got to make that decision myself, sort of feeling. I can’t leave her unless I’ve...

What about, there must have something quite powerful coming from her that...

Yes.

...you can’t stop.
[pause] A lot, a lot of crying at any sign of ending.

[pause]

But you have made the decision now?

I have made the decision now, yes.

And how did that come about?

[pause] Oh, actually that is completely wrong. I did speak to him about it, yes I did.

And we decided that we, I would say to her, 'Now look, you're not sort of doing the homework, things aren't moving on terribly well. Let's just have three really really concentrated sessions.' And it was after this strange thing that she had been to. 'Let's have three sessions, see how it goes, if you can do the homework, and so on.' And if anything moves. Because, you know, obviously it's, it's no good just car...the only thing that will keep things going is if things are improving, and they're sort of, whatever I'm doing isn't really...what I'm doing isn't helping terribly much. So we went through those three sessions, and during that time, that was when I started her on the Christine Padesky book, and, she did seem to be finding it useful. And then, we actually ended at the third session, and said, she should carry on with working through the book, because it seemed to be the thing that had got her going, but that we would have booster sessions every two or three months, until she had finished the book. And I reiterated about, you know, there's no...there was only any point in us carrying on if things are changing, which in some ways I wish I'd said before. (laughs) Yes. [pause] So yes, out of them all, that's the one that I feel, you know, as you say, the guilty secret a bit. And it's strange about seeing her at the end of the day, but that's what she wants anyway, but you know, sort of...
It's important that.

Mm. Yes. And I think the other two were much more about such, you know, such a complex set of difficulties, problems, plus lots of other things. Mm. I also think that sometimes, the more you see people, the more...once you do go over it, it can be a bit, just as you say, you know, oh I've gone this far, I've got to do another five now. And then another five. Yes. Yes. Interesting. Do you think that people with more experience or...do it less, or...?

I doubt it actually. Although some people are very focused. I mean I personally don't do it less. And I'm looking forward to seeing a couple of other people later on who, I just don't know if they do or not, but who are very experienced people, and I'm interested to hear what they're going to say.

Yes.

I've got a whole mixture, I've got the whole range of people that I'm interviewing.

Yes. Actually, I do think it would have been better, but I don't know whether you do, to have the notes with me. It's quite difficult remembering the exact thing when you're...

Well the exact thing doesn't really matter I suppose.

No, no. When you reviewed and so on.

No, it doesn't really matter.

Mm.
I think it's getting the general picture of what people do. So would you see things differently now, after this interview?

Yes, as I say, it's very interesting talking about the third one, the sort of, the guilty secret one, because, I would see it much more that, you know, that it was in some ways a mistake, but I did even before I talked about it. And I feel more positive about the other two actually.

Why?

Because I tend to think, oh my god! it's so terrible to have so many sessions, you know. The ultimate therapist is the one who can do things in three sessions or less. But when I'm talking about them, I think, God! there was a lot to do, and you know... But the third one I think, oh God!

So do you think that then, I mean one drifts along, and feels guilty and gives more, but then giving some structure and some concentrated thought to someone might actually spur them on? Or is that a red herring as well?

I think it might be a bit of a red herring. I think maybe the Christine Padesky book just might be just another way of not letting go. But now you say it, yes. I might be kidding myself that, even after all that help I've given her that book.

And I noticed the...

And go away. (laughs)

I noticed you said you'll see her while she's working through the books, and she might end up never quite finishing at all.
Yes, I’ve thought of that, I thought of that the other day. (laughs) And then I’ll probably end up saying – well I won’t now, because I’m going to be...you know, it’s got to be a chapter a week or whatever.

Shall we stop there?

Yes, yes.

End of Interview
...twenty-six or more sessions, and it may help you to think about specific patients. But it's your decisions that I'm interested in. So... Why did you offer some people more than, twenty-six or more sessions?

Oh, now that's a difficult question to answer.

You can think of different cases.

Well this man that I was working with with OCD, who I've offered the most sessions to ever, as far as I can remember, he had such complex OCD that the whole of his life was debilitated, every second involved some kind of ritual, neutralising and mental task. And when we attempted to count them, there were just thousands and thousands and thousands of obsessions. He worked really hard in therapy and actually became quite obsessional about the treatment of OCD, because he'd had a trial of treatment before, and it was mainly the exposure and response prevention treatment. So given that this was more cognitive, he got caught up in the obsession for knowing about the therapy, (laughs) which took quite a long time. So there was that element to it. He also did very well, he managed to get his rituals down to about ten a day, but he found it extremely hard work, and he was extremely depressed. On top of that, I guess he had masses of potential. He was somebody who you could just see, if you took away the OCD, he could do phenomenal things. He was incredibly bright, he was...he was actually a really nice bloke as well, although he had dreadfully low self-esteem, he thought he was dreadful, and lots of his obsessions and rituals were about sort of eternal damnation. So, I guess, a lot of it was about attempting to get him to a more functional state, which we managed, but then, he was extremely distressed still. So, we probably, of the forty-three sessions we probably did about twenty working on the OCD, probably about eight or so on the depression, and then another chunk on self-esteem issues. And a lot of the work at the end was sort of spaced out, and I saw him over...I'm just looking... Oh it was only over a year I saw him, so perhaps it wasn't spaced out as much as I thought.
And so, at what point did you decide that he was going to have more sessions?

I’m not sure that I can remember. No, it’s too long ago for me to remember.

Do you think when you first saw him, you were trying to see him in ten?

I thought it would be very unlikely that I could see him in ten sessions. This is somebody who was treated by a very senior member of our staff previously, and she saw him for about twenty sessions plus, so, I thought it was unlikely that I’d be able to do anything in ten sessions.

So, that must have been right at the beginning then?

I think I probably had in my mind that I wouldn’t be able to see him in ten sessions at the beginning of therapy.

And then, how did it keep going?

I think, I would be guessing, because this is what I do now, so I would just guess that what I would have done is, I would have got to a block, say, of ten, and then I would have contracted to do another ten, and another ten, and so on. Although what I imagine is that towards the end, because there was a point where I had to finish, because I was actually going off on maternity leave, I think we probably didn’t contract in the last few, and it was just that we’d noted a point where I had to finish.

And when you finished, you didn’t arrange to see him again when you came back?

I didn’t think that would be useful at that point, because what was also evident, and became more so, was the dependency issues, which I was always aware of, and I was aware that to some extent as a therapist I was taking some responsibility, which helped
his obsessions. And whilst I was aware of that, and that’s not ideal, the aim was for that
sort of responsibility to I guess be tapered out. Yes, whilst that wasn’t ideal, he was able
to do so much more, and he was able to, he started a course at a Farm Centre, which is
some kind of agricultural project, he, he managed to go out a little bit more. These are all
things that he’d never done, he was pretty much confined to his room. He managed to be
able to cook meals. So I kind of felt that it was a balancing act of improving somebody’s
quality of life, and my taking some responsibility for his, his sort of fears and obsessions.
And the idea was that, that was, that responsibility that the therapist was taking would be
phased out. Although, as it came toward the end of the therapy, the dependency issues
became more and more evident, and he was actually very distressed in therapy. This is a
man whose mother committed suicide when he was about, I think he was about five or
six years old. [pause] Actually that took a large part of the therapy as well, just
attempting to understand all that, and his issues of loss.

What about the other?

There was another man I saw with bipolar disorder, who I saw for thirty-six sessions. I
was surprised I saw him for so long, because, he was actually quite a difficult man to
work with, and I think I got fatigue of this man. He...I think, it’s probably fair to say, and
again I’m thinking back a long way, but it took him a long time to stick with the task in
hand; although he had bipolar disorder there was lots of other complex problems going
on, self-esteem issues, and relationship issues, and it probably took me a large part of the
therapy to just get him to stick to the task. And I think perhaps through some very sort
of, good supervision with Z. in fact,, and that strategy was just to get him to stick to a
task, and I think we were looking at sort of treatment outcome. But it took us a large part
of the therapy to get to that stage. And then there was a huge chunk of work that needed
to be done around his managing highs, managing lows, managing low self-esteem, and
the relationship issues that occurred week in, week out. And again, he was somebody
who had very difficult relations with his mother, which he blamed a lot for his illness.
But there was just a huge chunk of work to be done with him. And the other person...
So when did you realise that there were no [inaudible], did you decide, how did it come about that he got more sessions?

I've just realised that all of these stopped having sessions because I was going off on maternity leave. And what I would imagine with each of them is that, I probably took these people on at a point in my career where I didn't feel so rigid about a ten-session limit. I'm just looking... These all started treatment probably just about three years after I qualified. I would have always contracted with them for a certain number of sessions, but because of the complexity of their problems, and two of the patients that I'm thinking about had bipolar symptoms, so I would have always been thinking in mind of about twenty as a minimum, in the two patients with bipolar symptoms. And for those two where I decided to continue, it was mainly because the tasks didn't get done because of their chaotic nature, I think, and the difficulty of sticking to the task in hand, and I guess my difficulty as a therapist in getting them to stick to the task in hand.

Do you think you would do that differently now then?

Yes. Yes. I'm not saying I would never give anybody a large amount of sessions, but I, what I learnt from each of those patients were strategies, I guess more sort of, clearer therapeutic strategies, that would give me information about how people might respond to therapy, how to ensure that the patients used the therapy more productively when it's offered, and one of these patients in particular, again with the woman with bipolar disorder, we probably spent the first ten sessions just deciding whether or not she wanted therapy; whereas now I'd be more inclined to say, 'We usually offer people five sessions in the first instance, to see if they can use therapy well.' And, I guess another strategy that I'd learnt with the chap with bipolar disorder, who again struggled to use therapy, or I struggled to help him use therapy in the most constructive way, was that, if I started the session with a, 'How are you?' we'd probably end up having half an hour of...unstructured therapy of him just going over the same kinds of difficulties that he was experiencing week in, week out. So I would have done things differently now. Although I think the one with bipolar disorder did use therapy very constructively, each session,
with the exception that he would occasionally come with a little checklist of things that
he was concerned about, although we were able to reflect that, of what he was actually
doing in therapy was seeking reassurance, and to some extent passing on some of the
responsibility to me. [pause] I don’t envy you trying to make sense of all this. (laughs)
It’s very difficult remembering back actually. If it was somebody more recently, I think
I’d find it easier to say.

What about the other one?

Mm. Right. Now I’m pretty certain I would have seen her for more than twenty-six
sessions, because I saw her for well over a year, and this was pretty shortly after I
qualified. My reasons for... What were the questions again? What were my reasons,
what were my reasons for seeing them for longer? Oh well partly because she was
extremely disabled by her difficulties. She was at times extremely suicidal, and she had a
history of coming in to hospital on a number of occasions for attempted suicide. She
again was somebody who struggled to use therapy in the first instance, and there was lots
of interpersonal issues that arose through people working with her. So, she was
somebody who I had to work quite hard with, creating a team around her; she wasn’t
somebody who was a CMHT patient, she was, she was seen in outpatients, and she was
also seen by another service. So we had to create almost a mini team around her, and
provide very consistent support, because she was somebody who would relate one thing
to somebody and relate something slightly different to somebody else, and cause all sorts
of tensions. So, a lot of the work was joint meetings, although there was, the vast major
of the work was individual sessions. I think she benefited from, from the joint meetings,
in terms of us offering a very consistent and clear but fair and supportive approach to her.
She also gradually began to get better, she began to use therapy, albeit in an unusual way.
One of the things that she really needed to work with was issues of low self-esteem, and
cognitive strategies to deal with her low mood, although what she used more than
anything was behavioural strategies, and they seemed to have quite a useful impact for
her. And she, she was just somebody that was, was contained I guess throughout the
course of therapy, and I think she was somebody who I saw before I went on my first
maternity leave, so this would have been, I would have seen her about four years ago.
Yes, I’m sure I saw her straight after I qualified. And when I stopped seeing her, it was
the...the consultant in outpatients felt that she ought to be taken over by the team, and
actually she went into quite severe decline at that point. I think the system that had
contained her seemed to break down, it didn’t carry over as well as it could, which could
have been a failing on our part, although we did all we could to make sure that that did
happen. And she was somebody who then was using, once we’d finished contact, and, I
think...I think I possibly saw her for over two years, off and on, and I kept her out of
hospital for about two years, but shortly after we’d finished she did start coming back
into hospital using a specialised service, and becoming a quite dependent patient again.
So there was something about containment and keeping her out of hospital, and keeping
her as well as possible, although clearly she wasn’t able to utilise strategies to such an
extent that she was self-contained with them, in any sense whatsoever. Yes?

Right. So, you’ve sometimes mentioned that the patient was motivated and able to do
something.

Mhm.

And you’ve mentioned that some were difficult, were difficult to work with.

Mhm.

You’ve made it sound as though that was a contrast, that the man who wanted to work
was therefore easier to work with.

He was easy to work with in that he was motivated, and very keen, and he would go and
read texts. I was being supervised by U., who was obviously very knowledgeable about
OCD and she would give various papers, and he was quite into reading various papers, so
he was motivated from that point of view. But his motivation was obviously quite
obsessional also, so that... I'd say that each patient was difficult to work with, but in
different ways.

Do you think that that, how you got on with them, was a factor, whether you saw them for
longer?

Yes. Yes.

In a positive or a negative way?

Both. I think... [pause] a woman that I saw who was depressed had no self-esteem, and
a difficult and complicated personality, had struggled to make relationships with people,
and the fact that we made a relationship that she began to trust, I actually felt was a
positive thing, and it probably aided my decision to see her for more sessions than we
would normally offer, because I felt it was necessary to form that relationship before she
could make any shifts. [pause] Sorry, I'm just trying to think... The two people with
bipolar disorder interestingly were both quite, were both patients who I found quite
difficult to work with in that they were quite...there was something quite irritating about
both of them, which sounds very unprofessional. [pause] I'm trying to think how that
would have kept...how that would have been influential in, for making me keep them on
for treatment. I'm not quite sure.

Because you have a guilty conscience?

[pause] No, I didn't have a guilty conscience, because I... I guess part of the irritation
might have been that, they were quite demanding of my time, and quite demanding in
wanting more sessions, whereas I felt, I did actually think that they weren't using
sessions as well as they could. So I guess the factor that, that kept them on in therapy for
a bit longer was to do with their demands, despite not actually using therapy. And for the
patient with OCD, I guess one of the, what was the most, the sort of, the relationship, the
therapeutic relationship issues was...was that the question
Yes, yes.

I think the thing that, well the emotional thing for me that kept me wanting to really help this person was that, he was actually a really, really nice person, and he had so much potential, and his life was so sad, and so unfair. It was actually quite distressing. I mean apart from the fact that his mother committed suicide when he was five, he wanted to deal with it by staying with his grandparents, and his father moved him away to live with him, and put in this boarding school, which is so horrible. And he was still just, not able to cope with it. And he blamed himself. So I guess there was all...yes, there was a lot of personal... I did actually feel very personally distressed by his story.

Well it's sometimes something to do the patient, they're demanding it.

Mhm.

And sometimes it's the relationship between you, like building up trust between you before you can even get going. And do you think it's also something to do with you?

[pause] Yes, although, I don't get the, the feeling... I mean these were people who I took to supervision very regularly, and I didn't get the impression that they were exclusive to me, the facts were exclusive to me. And the chap with OCD regularly went...in fact U. supervised me solely on that case, because it was shortly after I qualified, and he was somebody who was identified as being one of the most complex people who had been assessed through that service. And she, I could see that she... Gosh, actually I...yes, mm, you might have to scrap this on the tape, because I shouldn't be identifying names there, but...

They'll be obliterated.
Right, OK, that’s fine. But she also took on board this idea that, oh it would be so good if
we could help this person just that bit more, because he’s obviously doing really well.
And yes, I think she could recognise the potential if we just took away the OCD.

So that was almost like supervision pressures, to go on seeing him?

Not supervision pressures, but supervision support. [pause] And also for one of the
patients, a person with bipolar, there was a lot of...there was a lot of outside pressure
from her family and the system, because she was somebody who was fairly well known
to the system, and there was some kind of connection with services as well.

What’s the difference between the system or the services?

I’m just trying... She was an anonymous patient, I’m just trying to be quite careful.
There were contacts with the system. [pause] There was a, I guess there was a pressure
from the mental health system for this woman to receive an adequate service.

[pause]

Right. And you’ve mentioned the system in the sense of having a team that was
supporting you, but did you get pressures from the team to see anyone, or to carry on
seeing anyone?

No. No. Although, one of the difficulties I think for all of these patients to some extent
was the kind of work that could be done in a sort of maintenance role, and who was
available to do that. For one of the people there was a bit of pressure for me to start
seeing them again in fact, and I’m resistant to do that, and it’s fortunate that in our team
there’s somebody who’s quite interested in CBT and quite knowledgeable about CBT,
and what I’m actually doing is supporting her in continuing the work that we’ve done, as
opposed to me getting in there and re-doing it.
Why do you think you don’t want to see them again? Because you gave them so many sessions?

Yes, and I didn’t feel that they used sessions as... [pause] In an ideal world where there wasn’t pressure on services, I think there were good pieces of psychological work that could be done. Given the current climate where there’s a pressure on services, I feel that what we can do is, we can offer brief cognitive therapy, and we can train people in strategies, cognitive therapy strategies, and I think that’s about all we’re able to offer with the current pressure on services. This person in particular who’s asking for more work had all sorts of self-esteem issues; the main issue was coming to terms with her life now she had this diagnosis. Again this was somebody who was extremely bright, had potential to go really far, and she’s not only dealing with coming to terms with having a lifelong psychotic illness, in terms of the bipolar affective disorder, but the sort of social slide, that she’s not going to be a great musician or a great geologist or whatever; she is going to be a patient with mental health problems. And a lot of our work was really working and coming to terms with that, what it meant for her, all the self-esteem issues. There’s also lots of issues about relationships for her, and I would say another big chunk of our work was about her coming to terms with a relationship that hadn’t worked out, and quite an abusive relationship that was all tied up in the mental health system also. So they were, I saw them as good pieces of psychological work, because they were using not only CBT strategies but other strategies that we’ve, we developed during our training, so, in sort of systemic and more sort of dynamic styles of thinking. But I just feel that the pressure on services doesn’t allow us to offer that kind of work when we’ve got waiting lists of x number of months. [pause] And likewise for the other patient with bipolar.

About seeing them again?

Well he, yes, there’s been no request for him to be seen again. But I do think that there’s... Even if we’re not offering straightforward CBT to patients, there’s something more that we’ve gained through our training that other people in the CMHT can’t necessary offer, or don’t...whether they can’t or they simply don’t offer it, is another
matter. But certainly when I’ve suggested that things like coming to terms with their sort
of position in life, coming to terms with their mental health problem, could be explored in
a slightly different framework, I think people have just found it’s not been particularly
helpful to do that with other professionals, and that’s not me meaning to slag off
professionals. I think that’s part...

But you see that that’s an important part of what...an important thing for the patient to
do?

Mm. Yes. Yes. Particularly people who have got long-term, yes, lifelong problems.

So not formulating into problem-focused CBT work, but looking at wider issues of the
person.

Mhm

You feel that’s something that you as a psychologist are better able to offer than other
team members?

I have been told that it’s been more structured than what other members of the CMHT
have offered, and more helpful. Because I guess we are using cognitive therapy
strategies, because a lot of the work is self-esteem stuff, it’s about people perceiving that
they’re at the bottom of the heap because they have a long-term severe mental illness,
whatever kind of severe mental illness that might be, from OCD, complex personality, or
a psychotic or bipolar affective illness. There’s a huge quantity of people out there with
those kinds of diagnoses that have this perception that they’re at the bottom of the heap.
And all the things about what...I mean all the potential to do that sort of Padesky type
self-esteem work, what makes them at the bottom of the heap, somebody who’s not able
to have normal friendships, normal relationships, a job, these all apply to these people,
withdrawn people who don’t have jobs, they don’t have relationships, they don’t have
really friendships. And it’s actually quite difficult to work in challenging that, I think it’s...it presents a huge challenge to me as a therapist.

But you see it as something that you should be doing?

Yes, because...

Not just working on the OCD rituals but these wider things as well.

Mm. I think in an ideal world it’s something that we could offer, and it’s probably something that I started to offer these patients when I was sort of earlier in my career; as one becomes more aware of wait lists and the importance of people going through wait lists quite quickly, one feels less inclined to be, to offer that.

So that’s really the pressure from the system.

Mm.

What about supervision, you’ve mentioned it a few times as keeping you, Z. keeping you focused, U. supporting you.

Yes, I haven’t had any supervision for a while. I can’t remember when I last had any.

Oh, what about it?

Well, has that played a part in the number of sessions that you gave, in keeping you going, or keeping you extending the therapy, or stopping the therapy?

For each of the people I’ve mentioned, I think supervision was probably being sought more frequently, and I would say that each supervisor supported the ongoing work that
went on with each patient. So it was never a sort of, an independent decision I made to see each of these patients; it would have been. It would have been something that arose from supervision for each of them.

So the decision to carry on.

The decision to carry on would have been discussed in supervision for each of them.

[pause]

And did it help you to stop? Well your maternity leave sounds as though that was the deciding factor.

(laughs) Unfortunately for each of these patients, I stopped seeing them all because I went on maternity leave. Although... Do I really want this recorded? I think, again it’s this sort of, this process of learning how to contain such complex patients. And it was interesting that when we had an end point, and we had to work towards it, and there was no option to extend it, that more work seemed to get done. So, therefore I think I’m now less likely to see people as long, because I’m much more rigid and clear about offering a specific number of sessions, and often say at the beginning of the session, as we start to sort of get quite into it, ‘Well this is session number eight now,’ ‘This is session number nine now,’ or ‘We’ve been meeting for nine sessions now, we need to review this week, or whatever.’ So I think there has been a learning process on my part.

What do you call long term now?

Over ten sessions.

How much over?
[pause] Well I have set in my mind that I will work with most referrals with Axis I disorders for ten sessions, and people with psychosis, which would include bipolar, for about twenty sessions, because they seem to be guidelines, and the ten sessions are set, the guideline set by this department. Twenty sessions seems to be the average number of sessions that is offered to people with psychosis, if you look nationally, that's how research studies et cetera. And so I have that figure in my head. Because people will often say to me, 'Oh how long do you think this will take?' It will be rare for me to do a piece of work in ten sessions, it usually kind of creeps up a few more than that. And ditto twenty, it all seems to creep up a few more than that.

And in the past, what did you see as long term, was that different?

I think generally I would have thought anything over twenty was long term.

[pause]

So, somebody mentioned that long term people were seen like a shameful secret; did it feel like that to you?

[pause] It doesn't feel like a shameful secret. When I'm relating it to you now, some of it feels like, that a lack of experience played a role, and perhaps a lack of awareness about the pressure on services. It's almost like a sort of, painful awakening to the reality of what we can actually do, because... And the ones I've concentrated on, the four I've concentrated on the most today, I think with a bit more structure, two of them I could have possibly reduced the sessions by, I don't know, five or so, but two of them, the other two, I think the work was quite important, and it would have been difficult, I think it would have been difficult to give them less. And what...what I'm now faced with is, when I look at the wait list, and I see people with complex, very long-term problems, I sort of feel a bit of a heart sink, what can we do with this patient in ten sessions? Not a lot. Therefore, what can we offer them really? There's been a complete shift in my mind as to, what can I do to help this patient, what can I do to help this patient help themselves,
as to, how on earth are we going to get this patient through the wait list quickly? How on
earth are we going to get them functioning with the limited number of sessions that we’re
able to offer? So it’s more of a...it’s more of a cognitive shift on my part now.

What about line management?

What about it?

Did that have any influence on the number of sessions you gave to those particular four,
or others?

Well, for those four, the line management would have been the same as supervision
practically, not necessarily for all. So, yes it would have been influential in that it would
have been supported. Whereas now, I think line management is more interested...well
not necessarily more interested, but that the thrust of the moment seems to be about
reducing wait times. And I’m sure that if one was to expand on that, it’s reducing wait
times, yet offering people a high quality service, but sometimes I think that’s quite
difficult to do with people who have got very longstanding complex needs.

Yes, it’s quite a dilemma isn’t it.

Mhm.

It’s all impossibilities.

Mm.

So, it doesn’t sound as though you had that feeling of, coming from the patient, like a
countertransference feeling, I must rescue this person?
No, that wouldn’t be true to say that. I think...I think people generally that I’ve seen for a lot longer have a big rescue me pull, and I think that can still hook its way into me. Although I’m acutely aware of when it’s happening.

So what do you do?

I take it to supervision. (laughs)

So as not to give in to it? Or to give...

Not so as not to give in, but to make sure I separate that from, can I do some useful work here, or am I simply trying to rescue this person? Can we do some useful work together?

But the chap with OCD, I desperately wanted to rescue, although we could also do some really useful work. And there’s somebody also at the moment I’m working with who I’ve got a rescue-me feeling, but I mean other people who’ve worked with this man also can see that. I think for me it’s particularly difficult when people have experienced a huge social slide, it’s almost like an added problem that they’ve got.

Is that something that particularly speaks to you?

I think so, yes.

Mm.

Yes, I guess it’s just seeing wasted potential.

What about those people where one feels I’m going to be the one?

[End of Tape Side A]
And... 

Like, I imagine those people have had - well you have mentioned some of them, have had previous therapies.

Yes.

And even quite, very experienced therapists.

In fact, it doesn't ring...it doesn't ring true completely. Although I do remember a person with OCD, the person who treated the person with OCD saying to me, 'I feel really bad, because I was the first person to see them, and I didn't help them.' And I remember thinking then, oh that's probably a little bit like me feeling the need to really want to help this person. I guess it's...it's not so much, all the previous therapies haven't worked, therefore I'm going to be the one to do it, but it's more like, I can't give this person another failure experience of therapy, or I think it would be really bad for this person to have another failure experience of therapy.

Right. So that spurs you on?

Mhm. [pause] This man with OCD had been an inpatient, he'd had, he'd gone through all the sort of, the kind of specialist type behavioural programmes, and then he'd seen somebody in this department for, I don't know, a huge chunk of sessions, but he'd had very old-style behavioural sort of therapy, and I think a large part of our work at the beginning was, that was him trying to work out that if he'd had the treatment of choice at the time, and it hadn't worked, what was happening now, if there was a new treatment of choice, if cognitive therapy was the new treatment of choice, and what if that was to be sort of, changed in the future? And his sort of attempting to understand that. I get the
impression it was probably like, do people, know what on earth they're doing with me.

(laughs) But the cognitive therapy made a lot more sense to him, because it took on board the thoughts and feelings and beliefs that he had.

So, is there anything else you want to tell me?

(laughs) No I don’t think so.

How do you feel now, having told me those things?

[pause] I think it’s... The questions that you’ve asked have been more difficult for me to think about, because it seems like a long time ago, even though it’s probably only, well it was about two years ago I stopped seeing these people, so it’s difficult to be clear. Although throughout the course I’ve remembered more and more details that have helped me to sort of, clarify my answers. I think if we were to do the interview again, and record it again, I could probably be clearer and more concise, but I’ve just kind of rambled on, sort of helped my thought processes that way. I feel certain that I will be identified.

Is there anything you would see differently now as a result of talking about it?

[pause] I guess the first question was, why did I decide to see these people for longer? And I guess my clearer answer would be that, there was a large piece of psychological work that could be done, that I could offer, if it was supported by supervisors and line managers and services, and I was less aware of the pressure to see people quicker. I was, I was much more caught in the, fairly... I mean I was fairly newly qualified, I stopped seeing these people two years ago, I must have been just about, I think I was just about two and a half years qualified or so when I started to see these people, so I was still in the sort of slightly idealised role of... the role of the psychologist is to enable people to help themselves, and we shouldn't be sort of pressurised to do that in x number of sessions. So I think I would have just been clearer, and less rambling.
Anything you would do differently now?

As a...

As a result of thinking about it here.

Anything I’d do differently with these patients, or...

Or in the future.

In future? Other than...I mean I think I’ve already said that I’m, as part of a learning process, I’m now much clearer about setting session limits, contracting in, checking out that people can use therapy. I guess before, I wasn’t so clear about that when I first started working, I wasn’t so clear about that.

OK, shall we stop there?

Please do.

End of Interview
I'd like to ask you about why you've offered people that many, patients, that many sessions, twenty-six or more, and it may help you to think about specific patients, but what I'm interested in is your decisions about that, why you did that.

I suppose it stems largely from the fact that I'm working over that period of time principally on my own; there's been some help in the last ten years, not sufficient, so I've still been busy. And in that respect, being in Fourth Team away from the city here, which has got various other, both components to the Health Service, but also other agencies helping people in a diverse range of ways, up in D. often there isn't anyone else. So, sometimes you might handle people that can maybe go elsewhere in a larger set-up. I think also, over the years one has started to work with patients with increasing severity, and I think, again maybe just circumstantial or D. in particular, I think has quite a developed counselling — no, not counselling psychology, counselling service, in many GP practices. And I think it is fairly common, and I've been particularly aware of it over these last few years, of increasing difficulty finding cases simple enough, say, for trainees, that they tend I think to go to the counselling service more, and more and more severe particularly so-called personality disorder patients are getting referred to our service, and often then finish with me. [pause] I suppose also I offer people more than twenty-six sessions when they're far from very much better, but one's still either, in the possession of evidence they're still improving, though one anticipates that slightly. And I suppose there are some patients who...

So you go on seeing them because they're getting better?

Yes. It doesn't seem sensible to cut out half the tumour.

Right, right.

And, and I'm sure there are some cases who, there is an element of more practical day-to-day support. It varies a bit with people like say, some borderline, some borderlines you're
maybe trying to do fundamental work, but others you’re just trying to keep them out of hospital, stop them self-harming, and that can be a rather lengthy, erratic course. [pause] So, I haven’t done any preplanning or thinking, about this, I’m just speaking off the top of my head, and I shall stop there.

That’s fine, that’s absolutely fine. So do...at what stage do you decide that they’re going to have more sessions? Is that something you know straight away, or that happens as you go along?

No, I mean it’s an evolving process I think, you know. From the beginning in most cases you have some sort of prediction about the problem, how long it might take I think; everyone’s different, circumstances are different. And often of course there’s...not infrequently the case you start off with isn’t the case you finish up with. They either divulge, or other circumstances reveal maybe greater pathology than you first thought.

So, do you go through a process, like some people do, of having five sessions and reviewing, or ten sessions and reviewing?

It’s not formal. I think one’s reviewing all the time. I think one reviews what one’s doing each session, where you’re at, and where you’re going. I don’t make that’s always explicit to the patient, but... Most cases one will start off by saying, we’ll have a few sessions and see where we are, see what we can offer them.

And what then makes you decide?

Sorry?

After a few sessions.
Well, I mean, one of the things is whether they’re actually still attending. (laughs) That
doesn’t always happen, does it?

No. Especially those sort of people.

That who’ve, you know, you’ve formed a judgement in many ways, that is, there is a
working relationship there, a collaborative working relationship and productive. That’s
it’s practical from their point of view; I mean there is sometimes problems of access to
the clinic. And I do very little in the way of domiciliary visits, but, I think there are three
at the moment who I see in their homes, because of, for a variety of reasons why they
can’t actually get to the clinic. But, you have to keep a limit on that obviously, or you’d
spend half your time charging through travelling expenses.

That’s no bad thing. (laughs) So you think it’s partly because other services aren’t
available in D. and that, that’s a big factor?

I don’t think it’s a big factor, but... There doesn’t seem to be anywhere else for moderate
and severe personality disorders for example, which is a big wedge. I don’t...I try not to
take them all on, obviously; those of whom eating disorders is a component, we try and
smuggle down to E.. (laughs) It’s not my favourite condition, eating disorder. (laughs)
But, you know, there isn’t a range of expertise available which we feel is adequate to
meet these people’s needs. And certainly, even when I have had help of my own in the
past, people have professed an interest in some of these more severe cases.

You mean other professionals?

Other clinical psychologists I’ve had working with me, they’ve either been relatively
young or inexperienced, and one has felt that whilst their technical personal knowledge
may be more than adequate for the job, sometimes a burden of coping with suicide people
is not something you want to rest on their shoulders, so you carry that lot.
90
91 [pause]
92
93 *Does that sometimes make you cut the therapy short, or shorter, because it's a burden?*
94
95 No, it's a burden on them.
96
97 *Well, isn't it also a burden on you?*
98
99 No. (laughs) No, no, never do that, it's my job. [pause] What's so funny about that?
100 (laughs) It's not a burden, I like working.
101
102 *Are there...are there other pressures from, from other services or other professionals or
teams or, that kind of thing, that also push you into seeing patients for longer, or those
kinds of patients?*
103
104 Those kinds of patients, certainly, yes, and I think, you can see them dribbling through
105 various referral routes and just finishing up in clinical psychology. (laughs) Particularly
106 from psychiatry. But quite often other people will get a bit stuck, or they're
107 overwhelmed. Not always, I mean I think they manage often very well, but, quite often
108 come from that source as well.
109
110 *Do you feel that's a pressure though, or a pressure to go on seeing them?*
111
112 I think, I now feel it's a pressure for two reasons, as I'm working half-time, and plus, I
113 have a trainee at the moment and a half-time person still pursuing statements of
114 equivalence, and feeling that they have to have very straightforward cases, and my half-
115 time therefore isn't sufficient to meet that need, and the waiting list is a bit of a farce,
116 although I'm beginning to get to grips with it again. So that is a problem. Another
117 problem that raises itself automatically in my mind is that some of these people you
would certainly, if you’re going to continue taking on such cases, you have to anticipate being in post a considerable amount of time, because it is my view that for some of them certainly there is a period of what I would call, like Jeff Young, limited reparenting, a bit of attachment issues, other people might call dependence. (laughs) Which takes a while to work through, and it’s absolutely, totally unprofessional to abandon them in the midst of that. So, at my stage of my career, that is a factor that I’m feeling at the moment as well, so not letting myself take any more, though I’ve taken two in the last week. (laughs)

So there aren’t other professionals who are saying, you must go on seeing this person, you can’t stop?

Don’t say must go on, of course not; there are people there in need. We’re a small team, and we all scrabble around trying to meet it as best we can.

So, you’ve said that it’s partly coming from the...well not coming from the patients, it’s the type of patient... I mean...

Those who I take on for a long time, yes. I mean I’ve been perhaps, particularly thinking of the moderate severe so-called personality disorder. I see there’s an article of Ian James in the current *Behavioural Psychotherapy*, objecting to schema therapy swamping the world. (laughs)

Yes, I saw that.

Yes. But certainly... You know, when you get severe obsessional disorders, you know, there’s all sorts of severe and/or chronic conditions which lead to a longer-term involvement than would happen with more simple, straightforward Axis I disorders.
But could it also be something about the patient, about how they are, how...not just the relationship, but how, factors of the patient, like, they're very motivated, or not motivated, or...?

Well the right thing if they're very motivated, that they shoot through a bit quicker. And, the unmotivated, I think one, you know, has to recognise that if attempts to motivate them fail over a fairly brief period of time, then one just shuffles them into day services or something like that to get some social psychological programme or support for something.

So, and you did say the relationship was a relevant factor.

Yes. [pause] I think it has been throughout my working life, everywhere, with any human being I meet. (laughs)

So, so...so does that mean that, if you like them or like them less, they might get different numbers of sessions?

[pause] I don’t think so, no, I can’t think of any of that. There are one or two patients have, I’ve just had that feeling inside, you know, of how they must feel. But that makes me more determined to sort it out, help, rather than retreat and avoid them. It’s very rare.

Any factors to do with you?

I’m dogged. (laughs)

I mean, you...to me, you seem to be saying quite a lot of things about yourself that make you carry on seeing patients for a long time.
Of course, I think, you know, people you want to provide the best help you can. I'm not saying I'm highly effective and efficient, you know, I could work harder, certainly a lot better on many occasions. But, there are needy people, and it's very pleasant when they go out the door smiling. I find that rewarding, and that overlaps with my job responsibility. (laughs)

So you get something out of it.

Oh! [pause] Something. (laughs)

Something. You never find it a burden?

No. I'm not saying on a Monday morning I might prefer to play a game. (laughs) Which I can do now I'm working half-time. But I've never minded going to work, and certainly have never minded working with patients. The only two glitches I can feel in my professional life have both been with others, trying to deal with awkward colleagues, and latterly increasing frustration with structure and management in the Health Service, and our Trust. That's the burden.

Do you, do you ever carry on in the sense that you're hoping they're going to get better, so you carry on a bit more, and you still go on hoping and then you come to the point of no return and you think, I've put so much in, I can't stop now, so I'd better carry on?

Yes, I mean, depends what you mean by better. I mean I think one has variable targets according to the person and their circumstances. I'm working with a chap just now who I have known for almost five years, and who was an inpatient for two and a half years, and my ambition for him is to get him able to go and take his dog out, getting his dog and taking it out for a walk. At the moment he's still terrorised from leaving his house. I see him once one week, twice another week, the specialised team see him other days contain him in the community. They sort of, take him to the dentist and things like that, I try to
do something with his psychological state. So my target there may not be realised, but I still think that it’s possible. So what I’m saying, the work is entirely to support him until he’s better; sometimes it’s to stop them killing themselves, and sometimes it’s to get back into work.

So you don’t have that experience of, you’re on a hiding to nothing, that you’ve put all this work in and nothing...nothing you’re still not...

Oh no, many people have stopped attending, and many people which we’ve decided, we’re not going to get any further, at various stages, of six sessions or sixteen sessions, or twenty-six, is that the magic number?

Yes. (laughter)

Of course.

So what makes you decide to stop?

Well it depends obviously on social supports, the network they’re in, what other services are available and what they’re doing. So it’s a complex matrix. But basically, you stop when you feel you’re not going to improve matters, and you’ve got them to a functional level that you feel you can’t improve, and that they’re safe. And hope they’ll not make so much demand on other services, maybe primary care or secondary care, in the future. So there are people I see two or three times. (laughs)

I mean do you have the...do you have the kind of ten session thing in your mind at all, and the waiting list?

I’ve had the waiting list on my mind for twenty years [inaudible].
I've had the waiting list in my mind for twenty years [inaudible]. And it's something I've had to carry myself.

Well in the sense of thinking, I've got this waiting list, I'd better stop with this person, or not continue with it.

It seems daft...you know... All the time.

So you sort of ignore the waiting list?

Well not ignore it, you have to take account you've got to keep people moving through, yes. But you don't stop treating someone to treat someone else. (laughs)

So once you're seeing somebody, you're sort of, it sounds as though you're committed to them, to get somewhere, even if it's a very small...

Oh, one...one looks at them and works with them, and if it seems they're not getting anywhere, then you sort of shut up shop on that particular individual, or you'd just be plugging away mindlessly. But if there is scope for improvement, improvement, and there still is evidence of movement, then you stick at it.

So what do you call long term therapy?

Long term would be certainly, six months plus.

How many sessions is that?
Well it depends, I normally see people initially weekly, then perhaps fortnightly, and then, depending on the individual...

So sort of, twenty?

Oh not as much as that, no.

Less than twenty?

I mean the last time, in the middle Nineties, I made presentation here, and I counted up my average patient contact session and it was 9.1. Now, I think it would be more than that since I've discovered schema focussed therapy. (laughs) But nevertheless, it's, you know, it's...there's a wide, wide range of complex issues.

Do you think you sometimes carry on because you can't let go?

Oh it depends what you mean by can't let go. I'm reluctant to let go if I feel there's still something to be squeezed out of the situation. I'd like to think that it's not because I can't tell people we're stopping; I do that all the time with others. I think, I work with some patients, like most clinical psychologists, in a degree of isolation, although I do have trainees for six months every year, and... So there is a small part of my caseload which is relatively unmonitored, you know, You can do your rating scales and things but that doesn't tell the whole story I don't think. But, the sorts of people that we're talking about usually have got other parts of the service in contact, involved, particularly CPNs and psychiatrists, and a psychiatrist who refers me a lot of his cases, and in the next door room to me we try to manage these cases frequently. So, there's a lot of discussion and monitoring all the way through the whole process. Does that make sense?
Mhm. Mhm. Yes, I was sort of going to come on to that.

So, the basic problem really is being persuaded to take them rather than hanging on to them. (laughs)

So that implies that you do know before you even see them that they’re going to be long term?

Oh yes, I mean quite a few of these I’ve picked up in inpatient emergency admissions, very severe, chronic cases.

Does line management play a role in keeping you focused or monitored, or...?

No.

Supervision?

No, not currently. I used to see X. irregularly.

X?

X. And I used to come and discuss cases with S. for quite a while. But what does happen informally and in D. is that all these cases that we’re discussing, longer-term ones, with obviously maybe the occasional exception, but the vast majority, we’re discussing them all the time.

Does that affect you in terms of focusing more, or, hanging on, or discharging?
Well, various... No, sometimes it facilitates a decision. But, you know, and the CPAs, there's quite a few of them as well, so I mean, you know, there are lots of inputs about where we are and what we should try to do.

[pause]

So you said there's only a small proportion of your caseload that's unmonitored. What's the unmonitored proportion?

Well I mean if people who are may be a direct referral from a GP, that patient comes and sees me, I work with them and that patient goes away, so no other component of the service either knows them, has met them, or is involved with them.

So, they're more likely to be the more straightforward ones?

Yes. Yes. Yes, I was contrasting that with these more complex ones, long-term. Usually there is some other involvement as well.

So, it sounds as though in your case these longer term people are all more complex severe personality disorder people, and they're known about to the rest of the team, they're discussed openly?

Yes, the majority.

Because...

They're not all necessarily personality disorders, it could be severe PTSD occasionally.

Yes.
And obsessional disorder.

Because some people have seen it more as having a shameful secret.

Sorry?

They've seen...

(laughing) What, having people over twenty-six sessions?

Yes.

Yes. (laughs)

But it sounds as though you don't.

I remember someone who had better remain nameless, who, in the early days, well, in this department, shall we say, was supervised by an eminent academic psychologist, and this person's only training in what was then behaviour therapy, and the contract was terminated, I think like fourteen sessions, but in actual fact the therapist continued to see the patient for another year or two. (laughs) It wasn't me. No, not at all, no. I mean I'm not saying I do the right thing, I'm not saying I do the best thing at all, but, it feels more right for the system, and the circumstances that you work within. And it's not ideal but you have a duty to the patients not occasionally have to [inaudible] be alive the next day.

So, you... Mm. You actually sound as though you are in less conflict about it all than some of the other people I've interviewed, that you feel....
I don't live a life of conflict. (laughs) I think I want to resolve conflict, instead of something you can't resolve, I've mentioned the frustration of the health care system earlier.

So what do you do about that?

Oh, brief despair.

Brief?

Oh yes. Lots of other things to do. It's not my responsibility.

Right, we seem to be whizzing through that.

Good.

So, well... (laughs) What about the sort of rescue factor, feeling that, maybe getting the feeling from the patient about wanting to rescue them?

I mean, some people need a bit of rescuing limited reparenting, yes. That's not a thing I carry in my shoulders alone. Certainly if they're still inpatients obviously, you can establish sometimes productive and supportive relationships with nursing staff, you know. The chap I mentioned who I want to get to take the dog out for a walk, has formed very strong attachments to two nurses, one male, one female, so it's not sexual or anything. And that was very important, because, you know, it also allowed me to begin to, continue work with him, there are people there who could listen. As time passed he kept discovering all these people who weren't bad. (laughs)

Do you... do you ever get attached to a patient?
Attached? No. I'm fond of some, and admire. My experience of those with severe problems is that I am just amazed at the resilience and the guts, the effort they have to make to keep going compared to us, that, they certainly deserve help and support in a world of many less desirable causes. But attached, no, I don't think so. I mean I've described some patients who, I'm fond of them, I like them. I wouldn't like to say what percentage. But there's none I dislike; some irritate. There's one actually I'm a bit wary of, I've seen for years, there's a mixture of personality disorder, drug addiction and probably a bit psychotic, and been in prison several times. Just slightly wary, he's a bit unpredictable in his behaviour. I wouldn't say that I'm enormously delighted to see him. [telephone ringing]

I won't answer that.

All right.

Well, I suppose....

[break in recording]

Trust issues? Does it take longer sometimes because a patient takes a long time to trust?

Or not trust at all. Yes.

Yes.

I mean it's a very vexed question. At the moment, well I have a male Dutch chap who...

Male...?

Dutch chap, R.
Yes, as a psychologist, not as patient.

As a male trainee, a male trainee.

Yes.

And some woman who can't sit in the room with a man. There's no chance of trust there. I'm afraid, we try and shuttle them off. (laughs) And that trust I think is variable with women who have been abused, and some men as well who have had a tragic upbringing, don't trust anyone. And they may be uncomfortable too with a female and so on. So trust is a big issue. As with everything, if you engage properly you work properly, then trust exists.

But, so... Yes. So engagement, is that one reason why it takes longer because it takes longer to get engaged?

I don't think it would take more than twenty-six sessions to get engaged. (laughs) I think I'd have given up by then. But I think it... I think certainly, I think it can... I think sometimes it doesn't happen.

The trust doesn't happen?

Mm. People remain very wary. I think certainly, certainly several sessions often used to get people to begin to feel that we were trying to work with them, to help them. Perhaps longer in some cases.

[pause]

Right, so, is there anything else you want to tell me?
Not really, no. [pause] You know, I mean I think the way I work is obviously something to do with me, I mean it goes without saying. But that me has changed over the decades, you know, so... I think that'll always happen and that should happen. But a lot of the way I work I think is to try to fit in and provide the best sort of service with the particular skills and resources psychology has in Fourth Team, to the service and the community as a whole, rather than just do defined operations.

Rather than...?

Do just the defined operation. So it's a bit broader, sometimes a bit vaguer, and sometimes a bit more diffuse than it should be or that you might find elsewhere. That's all. I'll go and play golf now. (laughs)

Well, how's it been, being interviewed?

Well, I mean obviously it's...it's very helpful to be forced to reflect upon what you're doing. I think it's very... I think one feels that one is protecting one's position rather than looking for faults in it, and justifying it. But other than that...

Anything you'd see differently now?

I might count the number of sessions.

Yes, that's not on the tape, is it, that you don't count...

Well, I think I've got a rough... I know.

Yes, I know, I know one always has to...
Yes, of course I know. I know when I'm seeing someone for the twelfth time or the sixth time.

I always do, it's part of what I do.

Yes. But what's happened in the last year or two is that the psychology routine data monitoring, you know, has broken down in Fourth Team (laughs), and I haven't been writing down an actual number for patients for a long time. And I'm trying terribly hard to be a good boy and get it started again.

Right, shall we stop there? Thank you very much.

If that suits you, yes, it's for you... Yes.

End of Interview
....ask you about why you've offered patients twenty-six or more sessions, and it may
help to think about specific patients, but it's your decisions that I'm interested in.

OK.

So when do you decide to...?

Well, it's often not a decision. The kinds of people who I take on are, and who are
referred to me, are nearly always people with very complex longstanding problems, who
have had lots of previous treatment. The intention is, in some cases, to start with a trial
run to see if they will respond to cognitive therapy, and in practice, most of them show
some signs of responding, and so one continues with them. That's not a very good
answer is it?

Is that something that was agreed with a line manager?

Yes, yes it was. So, in a way it's been providing a special service, though I have also
borne in mind that it should be as brief (laughs) as possible. And I've not looked at my
caseload ever to...from the opposite angle, which I think I should do, which is to see how
many I see in under twenty-six sessions, because in a way that would be quite unusual.

To see people for less than twenty-six?

Heavens. I'm sorry, it may be fifty-fifty, so it may not...but you know, it's...

Has it always been like that?

No.
So can we maybe look at that separately, in the days when you maybe were more under the ten-session pressure, and now when it's sort of been...

Mhm. Where the ten-session pressure is no longer there.

Well, I...

Or not in the same way.

Not...not...or not for you in the same way, which sort of patients you're seeing at the moment.

Mm. I'm not sure that I'll be able to make much of a distinction, but I'll try.

Well, if you can't, you can't.

OK.

So in the past, at what point or points did you decide to make it a longer therapy?

[pause] I'm muddled by the question. Do you mean, when we were operating the ten-session limit?

We still are operating it.

[pause] Well I would say...

Or when you....

...we're not, or I'm not.
You're not, no. When you were.

Then, that decision would have been made in the last few sessions before we got to ten. But that would have been made to prolong it, and then that would have been repeated, because, I also reviewed every ten, and I think we all did at that stage. Though I must have had an internal memo to myself with some people that we'd be unlikely to finish before, or within a limit.

So what sort of people would they be?

Predominantly they'd have been people with child sexual abuse histories; with very disrupted relationship patterns; with self-harming behaviours; and probably very poor social support. So, with very little in their lives, maybe in terms of work or friends or partnerships, or children. So they'll often be people for whom therapy became very important if it got going.

If it got going?

If it got going. And of course it didn't sometimes, so I must remember that, because of course the people that dominate my memory are the people who I'm seeing for the longest times.

So what's the difference between the people who don't get going and those who do?

[pause] I don't know. Between them, or...? Once again... [pause] I'm just...I'm just trying to think of cases. The people I go on with are likely to be the people who engage well in the end, and with whom I have the sense that there really is some potential for change, or genuine movement, or fluctuating movement, so that they make gains and then lose them. For instance, I had somebody who used to say to me, 'I'm standing but I'm
not yet walking.’ And, I knew exactly what she meant, and I think she had fifty-eight
sessions. But by the time we got to the end she knew she was walking, and we’d phased
out over a long period. So that’s the kind of person I’d go on with. But I also have
recently by mistake gone on with people who were failing, and...or, I have one dramatic
case like that at the moment, who I probably should not have gone on with.

So why did you go on? And why shouldn’t you?

Because I had learnt...

Why should you have stopped?

OK. I thought that I had learnt how to do this sort of work, and that eventually I could
help these people change, even if it took a long time. And I think I was wrong in this
case. And that going on, because it wasn’t working, has actually made things worse.
And so I’ve been thinking about how I could have known that earlier, and whether I’ve
actually lost the thing you were trying to get at earlier, the assumption that I’m making a
decision about who to go on with and who not with. I think... And who not. I think I had
been working with the assumption that I can get somewhere with everybody, which is a
bit arrogant.

So at what point did you say to yourself, I’m not getting anywhere, and I’m not going to
get anywhere, but you’re still carrying on with this person?

No, I’ve stopped.

You’ve stopped?

Well I’m doing a sort of holding business until another system is set up, that, then there’s
going to be a stop.
You’re going to pass them to somebody else, another system?

Mm, a system rather than a person, because I think our service is so unable to provide what these people need. That is another of the reasons why I go on with people, the provision is so poor for these people...and the multiplicity of people involved with them is so great that there’s a lot of, a lack of consistency in their management. So they may well be involved with their GP, with a psychiatrist, with social workers; maybe with the day services, or with alcohol services or something, and these services...or with, a specialised service is another one that they get involved with, or with a self-harm service. And, there’s a tremendous lack of coordination and consistency, and I have felt often that it’s been economical for them to be involved with one person, provided that takes the strain off the rest, and they’re seeing less of the rest. And so if the engagement is going well, and that works, then, I stick with it. And you’re quite right, with that one person, my involvement had no effect on lowering demand on other services, or on lowering frequency of crises. In fact, social services, police, the law, the GP, the psychiatrist, you know, everybody’s been constantly involved with these people, and constantly dropping them, constantly saying, ‘There’s nothing more we can offer, she’s not willing to help herself.’ And so, I’ve persisted thinking that’s a very unfair judgement, and the service is letting this person down. I actually still think it is letting this person down, but I don’t think the service I’m providing can fill the gap. So I certainly have taken on a bit of a personal inappropriate crusade perhaps. I mean it’s not quite that is it, but... But there’s...certainly I feel there’s a commitment that I can make, and have been allowed to make by my manager, that it’s efficient and economical to make. And I’ve also found it I have to say very interesting. So it suits me, and I felt it suited the service.

So are there many where you make this kind of mistake?

Well there haven’t been until recently.
If I'm in doubt I always bring them to the CBT supervision group or to other supervision. And I recently brought another one to the CBT supervision group, and received the strong advice from everybody, 'Don't stop,' because the question I brought was, how do I stop? Because I think that, I've got as far as I can with this person, and I think in this case it's about twenty-eight sessions, so they're probably only just over the twenty-six. And their strong advice was, there's a big risk of losing the gains you seem to have made, if you disrupt this at the moment, and it really wouldn't be efficient, and other services have dropped off, so there aren't...there is no longer the additional support system around this person, but they are much better. And instead of saying, now dropping them, you really ought to ease out, but keep a contact for quite a long time in the future. And I must admit, that was music to my ears, because it was rather what I felt like doing, but was feeling guilty about going on.

In the past did you feel guilty about going on?

Oh yes, I've often felt guilty about going on. And particularly when you know how big the demand for these, how poor the service provision is I should say, for this patient group. And I think I've argued to myself that, better to do one thing properly than two things improperly.

[pause]

Do eat if you want to.

I shall make an awful lot of noise. Thank you. [packet rustling]

So what do you call long term, how many sessions would you say that is to you?
Oh, I would say, you know, anything over twenty. I mean I suppose twenty is quite long too.

Have you realised before you've taken somebody on, particularly perhaps more in the past than now, that they were going to be a long-term proposition?

Mhm. Particularly when for instance there are legal issues, and self-harming behaviours.

What sort of legal issues?

Taking previous abusers to court.

Oh right.

I've had a number of cases where people have been trying to sue the social services in whose care they were abused, and the cases drag out forever, and are very very painful. I've had another with a road traffic accident, one dragging on forever. Somebody who's had multiple traumas of various kinds, including a road traffic accident. I'm getting embarrassed by the noise of this. (laughs)

As long as you're clear, it doesn't matter. So in those cases where it drags on, are you doing therapy or support?

Oh, I always think I'm doing therapy, and I could be wrong. I try very hard to do therapy not support. So, and I do that by trying to structure it using the cognitive model and being clear about a formulation. And trying to be explicit about what I'm working on with somebody. Do examples help?

Yes.
So there's somebody who was chronically depressed, and it was eventually agreed that I could see this person for six sessions a year.

Agreed with...?

With management – oh with the Trust in this particular case, and with the GP. So, so instead of...so altogether this person had, I think in the region of eighty sessions, and...but they were spread over ten years. And at a period we were having just six sessions a year. And in the end this person would come in and say, 'I'm going to work on my responsibility schema this time.' So she had the language. That's the point I'm making, that, that it wasn't support, it was in that particular case, I would call it schema-focused therapy I suppose, but, it was definitely informed by a shared formulation, an explicit understanding of that, specific foci, if that's a word, for things that we've been working on. A totally different type of example, if that's useful, is somebody who had had a most horrendous childhood, came out of that, went to university, and then was horrifically raped by somebody she knew. Came to treatment twenty-five years later. Had never got over the rape, which had basically endorsed her sense of being valueless, and that nobody would help her and all that. And, she just eventually took off in treatment in her own way. So although it wasn't...it was definitely not support, and it wasn't structured cognitive therapy, she would never have said, 'I'm going to work on my responsibility schema,' she did a lot of choosing the particular focus for her, and writing about it, and then, together we would try and bring the learning that she'd got from that into the present, so that she could change her behaviour in the present, and endorse the new, the new strategy, new ways of being, new perspectives on the world. So it felt to me very constructive. I mean that's just one of the ways, one of the reasons I love this sort of work, because it seems to me that the people are so very different and they do it in very different ways. Somebody who, who worked mainly through drawing, and was able to gain a lot from that, but couldn't talk to me, but she could talk to her pictures, at first. Mm.
Do you think you sometimes go on seeing people for longer than you might need to?

Than I should. [pause] I... Well, I think the feeling I have about that now is that I never used to but now I do by mistake. And I think I never used to because I was clearer about what I was doing, it was newer work, and I was putting more new thought into it. I could also be wrong of course. Now I think I know how to do it, and I think that’s led me into a whole lot of difficulties. I think I’m...you know, because I think... I think I haven’t been clear enough about what I’m doing, and I’ve allowed myself to drift, and be what I...excused myself, and I’ve drifted by saying it’s creative and interesting. (laughs) But I think sometimes it hasn’t been. And I was very shocked when somebody just didn’t come back, who I thought I was getting on well, very well, and wouldn’t communicate with me about why they didn’t come back, and that was the first time it had actually happened to me in ten years, or more. And I never knew why. But I did have an uncomfortable feeling that I had been listening without adding sufficient structure or additional guidelines for her about what to be able to do. She, she had under twenty-six sessions, but, so I don’t know if you... Well she voted with her feet. But I think, I think I may have drifted away from the structured part of therapy too much.

Mm. Do you still do the ten sessions and review?

I start off saying I’m going to do that, and I do review. And I don’t know whether it’s because of the kinds of cases that other people refer to me now. I don’t think I... I very rarely stop in under ten sessions. I have recently stopped one person who decided that she didn’t want therapy at all, in about ten sessions, and another who’s done an amazingly rapid piece of work in about twenty. So I think I’m quite aware if somebody doesn’t want to go on, and if they’re improving fast enough to accelerate it, and stop. I’ve lost track of your question there.

Whether you’re still doing ten sessions and reviewing.
Or reviewing every ten sessions.

No I’m not reviewing every ten. I am reviewing regularly. And I do have a plan, so I write down on my session sheet something, plan, in big letters, ten more sessions working on X, and then I put, two out of ten, three our of ten, for the next ones, so that I keep, so that I know when to review. The other thing I do is prompt myself to review when, if there are natural breaks, like somebody goes away, or I have a break. And I try to use those reviews as opportunities to re-plan, to... I wonder if I’m making it sound more structured and focused than it actually is.

So when, how do you decide to stop?

I think above twenty, or, perhaps it’s a bit more than that. I’m always thinking, how are we doing, isn’t it time we put a limit on this. I have to say, except with one person, I’ve got one dramatically difficult case at the moment who’s had fifty-one sessions.... When we do do reviews, she always hooks me in to going on, by saying something to the effect that she is making changes, it’s the first time she’s been able to, it’s really really important to her. And she’s frightened she’ll lose them if she’s stops. (laughs) And I’m seduced by it all, it’s true. [pause] There’s another factor though, which I might as well...which is certainly a personal feeling I have, about the horror in these people’s lives, and the disadvantage they’ve suffered, combined with the poor service provision, I mean I feel they deserve it, you know, personally. And I suppose that’s a duty to me too. Having got here, having been able to talk, and assuming that, you know, if they’ve got on that long, they’ve been able to make a relationship, and to gain something from it, then it’s important, and it seems to be important to go on, so... But the question you asked was, how do I stop?

How you decide to stop.

Mm.
I'm always thinking about it once people... So what tells me? [pause] A sense that the changes are... All sorts of things. A sense that the changes have gone as far as they can; a sense that they're solid and therefore not going to dissipate as soon as you stop; sometimes a sense that you might want to do some more work but say in eighteen months or whenever, so then, what would help now is a consolidation period. So I'm very aware of the possibility of encouraging too much dependency and working always towards fostering somebody's independence and ability to make choices and decisions that are functional for them. And as people do that, it would certainly come to my mind, now is the time to stop, and to endorse that, and to endorse it by not being there for them, so they can do it on their own.

So, you've been saying something about, that you get something out of this work.

You find it very interesting.

You've also mentioned how it can be something about the patient, that they hook you in...
...into continuing. Would it be other things about the patient as well? Like making you feel guilty, or maybe even not liking them that much and feeling guilty? Or liking them a lot?

I'm not aware of those things influencing that decision.

Or if they come up with crises all the time, so you sort of can't stop?

I mean I've mentioned feeling that the service provision is so bad, so I suppose that would be a bit...there's a guilt thing, is that what you mean?

I was thinking of a more direct guilt, rather than an impersonal guilt.

That I would be doing something wrong if I stopped? [pause] I don't think, guilt doesn't really come into it for me, I don't think, unless I'm misunderstanding the...

Do you ever feel guilty for carrying on?

Oh yes, I do. I mean I do feel ashamed rather than guilty. I mean I feel, I can't be doing this well enough, I should be better at this. There are other people waiting. But then I also so to speak excuse it by the thing I said before, about feeling, better to do one job properly than two jobs badly. [pause] I was going to say something else, it's gone away, I'm sorry.

Excuses.

For carrying on.
I've been terribly sad to lose some of these people, but I'm absolutely certain in my own professional mind that I've not carried on longer than I should have done, and one reason that, one way I make that easy so to speak for me is, thinking about ending from, as soon as I can, but also – and talking about it openly – but also having a tailing-off period so that you have periods when you might meet every couple of months, or, you know, as you ease out with the follow-up.

What about a need to rescue somebody, wanting to rescue?

I don't think that's part of it for me, because, if that was it, you know, I'd be running a hostel or something. There are so many people who need to be rescued. I feel quite...you know, I feel a sense of humility, a sense of, you know, really privileged to be able to help, and to be told the things I'm told.

What things?

About the awful things that have happened to people largely. And how they feel about themselves as a product of that. And the intimate details of their lives. I don't think I feel the need to rescue... I feel very very pleased when people begin to change, of course. So that's the reward for me, and sharing that with them, and of course they're pleased too, so, you get the reward from them. And I think I feel...and I think that's what's made me go on too long with the one I was talking about before, in a sense of that, I knew we can get there, I know we can get there, and we didn't, and I think I made things worse, so, I do need to rethink that.

So what about the relationship between you, is that a factor?

I need a more precise question. I mean of course the relationship one makes is one of the most important things about it, but, the factor in what?
Carrying on, giving longer therapy.

No, I don’t think so. I mean... Sorry about this. Crumbs all over your room. It’s a factor in the pleasure I get out of it. [pause] The person who voted with their feet and didn’t come, I really really liked, and I thought we had a good relationship, and I did ask myself in that case, you know, it was not a long treatment, whether my liking for her had been one of the things that had put her off somehow, and then prevented me being more objective and structured. But as I like lots of them, and all of them, I’m not really sure about that.

Do you ever dislike anyone?

Temporarily. I mean they can exasperate me, all of them.

Even the one that...

I mean you can go through...

...you inherited from me the one that walked out?

I can’t remember which she was at the moment.

I don’t want to say her name.

Oh. She exasperated me, but I was always interested and curious, and fascinated, and trying to understand, and indeed she didn’t get very far. But then because she was a research person, there was a reason for stopping. But I do ask myself questions about whether I’m doing these people a service in the way that I think I am, because I may not be, it could be an illusion. And it could be that they benefit more from something else. But as that something else isn’t available, they’ve got me, and that seems fine. (laughs)
come free; most of the other things they have to pay for. That’s another big factor for me, doing it for the NHS, a really big factor. I think these people, though I say it myself, are getting a high quality service that they deserve.

What about things like motivation, patients’ motivation, or getting engaged in therapy?

Mm. I find, I treat those things in my mind as being puzzles to solve, I suppose. So often it’s difficult. I think the cognitive model is so helpful, I really really do though. So if somebody doesn’t engage, doesn’t do things, doesn’t appear motivated, it’s because of their perspective on the world. That’s one of the stories you can tell yourself. So then you can get interested in their perspective on the world, and on how you can shift that, which is the whole essence of cognitive therapy. So it does engage my curiosity. I also quite frankly think I’m good at it. (laughs) I mean I think I’m good at engaging people who don’t want to engage. I mean I don’t know how I am, or why I am. I think I can do that bit. I think the bit I’m not good at is facilitating people going deeply into really painful stuff, and a lot of the work that I do involves understanding the meaning of the painful stuff, rather than wallowing in it, and I sometimes ask myself whether I’m avoiding that personally for me, or whether I’m using the cognitive model in the way that it’s helpful for it to be used. I think that’s an unanswered question.

By looking at the meaning you’re standing back from it.

Yes. And I’m... But you see of course, what one’s trying to do in a way is to help them stand back from it, and I’ve got one person at the moment who can’t, and isn’t, and I’m finding that very difficult. [pause] And so in a way my frustration and exasperation with him is the same as it would be with any human being so to speak, any relationship, it’s bound to be there to a degree, and so it’s more of a question of how one handles it than being bothered by the fact that it’s there. [pause] [bag rustling] I think for the sake of your transcriber, you need to know that the hospital sandwiches fall apart.
Yes, they are disgusting, on the whole.

And are in crinkly paper. [blowing crumbs] I must try and rescue the situation.

And these patients, these longer term patients, now and maybe even more so in the past, would you have talked to other people about them, or had them as what somebody else has referred to as a shameful secret?

Oh, my... None of these were shameful secrets, so, I don’t like being in that position, so I’d always have talked about them, and somebody would always have known that they were long-term cases; maybe only X. but somebody would have known. And I would bring them to a supervision group, and I would seek supervision when, with difficult issues concerning them, most with specific people in the department usually.

Supervision from people in the department?

Yes. So... I wonder if I’m mis-remembering that from the past though. It could be that I did have a sense of doing something wrong, going on too long.

So what role do you think supervision does play, does it help you to focus, does it help you to stop, carry on?

I’ve used supervision more frequently at the beginning of an intervention with somebody than towards the end. It helps me then to formulate, to find a focus, to understand. In some cases it’s really felt like sharing a burden, and a sense that it wasn’t clear what to do, but it was worth having a go. I mean it’s interesting that you ask that when I have also already mentioned bringing somebody to supervision because I felt I should be stopping. And I do sometimes do that as well.

In order to help you stop, you mean?
To... Yes, or, in order to discuss the issue of whether to now. [pause] It’s quite interesting, when I look down the list of people. There’s usually been a reason for stopping, it’s been quite... [pause] Mm, why did do people stop? [pause] In most cases they just feel they’ve gained enough for the time being.

And you say that line management has currently given you permission to carry on, and in the past you let X. know about these people. Has she, has she...

I mean there have been other people in the Trust who have known, and I don’t know if that’s relevant for your research, but, there was a stage way back when I talked to one of the psychiatrists who was here, had been here for a long long long time, about the issue, who actually said to me...

Yes, I remember.

Can you remember?

Who came down here, a woman.

Mm.

Mm.

But who actually... We had a long discussion about the kinds of people who were willing to be involved with these sorts of complex and difficult and demanding cases, with a sense that if people were willing to, then although it wasn’t something the Trust acknowledged they were providing; it was something valuable. And most people who have been here a long time had one or two such cases on their books; if they were prepared to, that was a valuable thing.
Yes, well she has someone that we've both involved, been involved with too.

Mm. Mm.

Who I've heard from recently.

How interesting.

Mm. I'll tell you afterwards.

Mm. Mm, I'd love to hear.

So then actually factors in the Trust that...well, give you permission occasionally.

Mm, occasionally.

And rather...

Not only there though.

But rather informally though.

Mhm. Except for the one case when I was allowed to see somebody for six sessions a year. I mean that was a proposal I made, together with the patient, that went to my line management here, to the psychiatrist involved and to the GP. And everybody saying they thought that that would be a good use of services. Mm.

So do you ever get pressure from other services or other professionals to carry on? I know you've said you see it in the context of other services...
...but do they say, 'Oh you can't stop seeing this person now'?

Mm. Sometimes. Sometimes there's the opposite, rarely, but there is sometimes the opposite when somebody starts talking about things, you can't stop them and they get fantastically distressed, and provoke crises in their lives, and then people say it's all you cognitive therapists making them worse, and you shouldn't do it. And one can come across quite a lot of anger. So, I've been there too. (laughs) [pause] And then there's the other thing that happens, which is that, which I think is really...I wish we could change, which is that, people hold on to somebody who's in crisis, saying, 'Eventually the psychologist will see you. And then, they'll deal with it, and it'll all be better.' And one's, you know, set up to be the person who's going to change a situation which is probably impossible to change.

[End of Tape Side A]

[Tape Side B]

Well I'm not fond of going back to the referrer and say, 'Don't say that ever again, consider your wrist slapped.' (laughs) I do try and disabuse the patient of the view that there's one answer and it's coming from me. But you...I don't want to dash their hopes either. And then of course I suppose at some level I think there is one answer and it can come from me. (laughs) I don't actually, but, you know, one might hope that.

Well that, that sort of brings me to, that, sometimes one may have felt that, all these other people haven't been able to help, but I am going to be the one.

Mm.
Or they haven't had a proper therapy yet, such as I'm going to provide.

Mm. [pause] I’m never too sure about that line, because I never feel sure that I’m actually providing therapy properly or right. Because, one has to be so creative in its use. And so, I’ve fallen off the straight and narrow. So it isn’t, you know... That...that bit I’m embarrassed about, you know, I feel if anybody listened to my tapes they’d think, what on earth does she think she’s doing? [pause] So... I do... I don’t think I have much of a sense though that, what I can provide is the one and only thing. No, I don’t. I have a different view, I have a view which is that, there are many different kinds of therapies, and some of them are far more sophisticated than cognitive therapy was until recently, and probably still are, much more sophisticated in some respects, and they know things that we don’t. They do things that we can’t. And so, there could be a better option for this person than I can provide, but it’s not available for free on the health service, or locally, or readily.

[pause]

Well I guess we’re coming towards the end now. Are there...is there anything else?

About...

...you want to say?

...working long term?

Any of this.

I can’t think of anything in particular. I’d hate to stop doing it. I do think that one develops and changes as a therapist – well, which I’ve always known obviously, and that
one can lose one’s edge as well as gain one’s edge, and I wonder at the moment, because
of having particularly difficult cases, and this one that I mentioned to you about feeling
that I’ve actually made worse, or continuing has made them worse, I do sometimes, I do
think I need to pay careful attention to what I’m doing, and I wish there were more
supervision. I like to bend people’s ear all the time.

Yes. Yes, I do it all the time.

Mm.

I just love talking about them.

Mm. [pause] Mm. Actually, one other thing. That there’s an element of CBT training
and psychology training that always stays with me, which is in simple terms, at some
level it all makes sense, and if that’s so, then understanding how it makes sense can help
one understand how to change. And also, the implication of that is that one always can
change and that you don’t have to be stuck. And I think that informs my relative
imperviousness to pessimism with these people. And I think I’ve also been lucky, you
know, I’ve had wonderful patients who have responded, and maybe I’ve been
unlucky...you know, been particularly lucky, and only recently got the harder ones.

(laughs)

There may be something about you as well.

That would be lovely.

How has it felt doing this interview?

Mm, interesting. Concerned at times that I’m not giving you what you want, but... And
I’ve been talking about things that are of interest to me.
Anything that you would see differently now?

No. [pause] Though I'll go away thinking about guilt, because that's the question I couldn't answer. Something I'm blind to here. (laughs)

It's very convenient to be blind to that one. Shall we stop there?

End of Interview