Stephen M. Sonnenberg and William A. Myerson

In this contribution, the authors define and discuss the educational boundary in analytic training, which they believe is an often neglected and useful concept in psychoanalytic education. The framework on which their discussion rests includes the recent attention of psychoanalysts to issues of boundaries and ethics. Their understanding of how clinical work affects the mind of the analyst educator, as well as the ways the personalities of various analysts affect their dealings with faculty peers and students, are the other cornerstones of their discussion. The authors contend that many of the institutional problems encountered in the training of analysts can be better understood when viewed through the prism of the educational boundary. They present examples which illustrate several of the ways psychoanalytic educators complicate the training experience of candidates, offer specific explanations as to why analysts struggle as they try to manage their educational interventions, and indicate in a discussion of potential remedies that those behaviors might be avoided if the educational boundary is in focus. They also provide an example of how the educational boundary can be more effectively managed.

The Psychoanalytic Educational Boundary: Definition and Introduction

The psychoanalytic educational boundary is defined here as the zone of privacy that is supposed to surround the activities engaged in by faculty and students during analytic training. These activities include teaching, advising, supervising, and evaluating students, along with training psychoanalysis, the last not normally considered educational except within the world of psychoanalytic training. That these intense and highly charged educational activities take place within an educational boundary creates complexities for psychoanalytic education. In other fields, it is assumed that what takes place between and among teachers and students is appropriate material for open scrutiny by colleagues. But because of the very private nature of the psychoanalytic experience, in which deeply personal discussion of very private information should take place between teachers and students to facilitate good learning experiences, respect for the privacy of what transpires takes on a unique position as a tenet of the educational process.

In this paper, we bring this issue into focus, and add this new term to our nomenclature, because we believe this will help us in our roles as analytic educators when we must focus our attention on two major problems within our institutes: (1) we have so far failed to carefully delineate the ethical boundaries and standards, and rules regarding privacy that should guide the education of candidates; and (2) we have so far failed to acknowledge and master the difficulties we have because of the intense feelings that are generated in both students and teachers about each other.

Background
The literature on psychoanalytic ethics and boundary violations, which describes those who commit gross violations, as well as analysts who commit what are sometimes referred to as non-sexual boundary violations, has been a source of attention and concern in recent years (Gabard, 1999; Gabillard and Lester, 1995a, 1995b; Gabillard and Peltz, 2001). At one extreme of the spectrum of violators are truly psychopathic analysts who will stop at nothing to achieve selfish goals. These analysts are frequently noted by their colleagues to be pathologically narcissistic, envious, vindictive, arrogant, competitive, and mean-spirited, and will consciously employ intimidation and manipulation to gain personal advantage. At the other extreme are analysts who may violate sexual boundaries or function poorly as regards their ethical behavior for complex reasons, without conscious destructive intent. The relatively well-functioning analyst will recognize that she or he occupies a place somewhere along a broadened continuum, knowing that at times, before careful self-reflection and planning, she or he has, at least briefly, engaged in the attenuated seduction of a patient in the midst of a transference-countertransference engagement.

This recognition has brought to us that we analysts need to be continuously engaged in self-examination, mindful of ourselves as members of regressed transference-countertransference dyads, and simultaneously as members of analytic communities (social groups). In response, in recent decades we have become accustomed to acknowledging our need for regular self-inquiry with respect to what is generated in us in our consulting rooms (Sonnenberg, 1991). A parallel awareness that such enhanced self-inquiry is necessary as regards the process of analytic education informs this paper, which will build on the existing literature.

Indeed, a review of the literature on problems in analytic education indicates that the daunting challenges analysts experience when interacting with their students have been appreciated for decades (Calef and Weinshel, 1973; Racker, 1953; Whitman et al., 1969). Either concretely or by inference, every observer notes that analysts have difficulty when functioning as educators because they face a very complex task for which they are not uniquely equipped (Cooper, 1985; Eisold, 1994, 1997, 1998, 2004; Kernberg, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Ross, 1999; Wallerstein, 1984).

Taken as a group, these writers suggest that analysts are not particularly skilled at administration, the management of their own group processes, or in understanding themselves in their roles as individuals governed by the rules which define participation in all social groups. Though it seems reasonable to wish that our own analyses would equip us to do at least a little better than others at managing our membership in social groups, we regularly experience the same difficulties as individuals in other occupations. These difficulties are of special concern when analysts’ inability to manage boundaries interfere with their roles as educators (including the role of training analyst) and negatively affect the trainees in whose education they are participating. In extrapolating from Eisold’s (1994, 1997, 1998, 2003) recent work, one might wonder if our searches for legitimacy, for a scientific foundation for what we do, for a voice with which we can speak as one, and our misunderstanding of the ways we are prone to misperception and misbehavior have too often contributed to our mistreating those we are training.

Speculations about what is wrong with analytic education have in the past included attention to institutional authoritarianism, the effect of uncertainties about what it is to work as an analyst, concerns about the length of the training, the effect of uncertainty about how to measure the effectiveness of training, reluctance of teachers to be candid with students about their strengths and weaknesses, the effect of uncertainty among even senior analysts about the effectiveness of their therapeutic endeavors, the financial pressures on supervisors and analysts that often exist, and the great demands and stresses of doing and being in analysis. The problems of working analytically with patients who are at the same time analytic students, and the challenges of defining and maintaining appropriate boundaries within analytic institutes, have been emphasized by Kernberg (1996, 1998a, 1998b), and Eisold (1994).

The analytic educational boundary is unique in the world of education. That is so because the psychoanalytic teacher relates to the student in an especially intimate way: she or he discusses extremely sensitive privileged information possessed by the student, and there may be a mutual sharing of very personal experiences and ways of thinking about one’s self and others. A supervisor and a supervisee have a boundaried relationship, as does a training (educating) analyst and a student analysand, and sometimes an advisor or classroom teacher and a student. Thus, by the boundaried relationship, we are not simply referring to the confidentiality surrounding the training analysis dyad, but also to the privacy which students and faculty members may share in any aspect of psychoanalytic education.

The analytic educator within such a boundaried relationship, as well as those outside it, often do not
think carefully about what is appropriate behavior between the educator within and the educator on the outside. Analysts regularly, rather than rarely, lose focus on what is appropriate behavior for an outsider who acts or does not act on the boundaried relationship. For example, in well-documented cases of analysts impaired by developing dementia, colleagues who are teachers of students in analysis with the impaired analyst far too frequently look away rather than ask the student analysand if they have become aware of the cognitive problems of their analyst. Another category of example involves situations in which the insider might, but does not, act in a way which penetrates or protects the boundary from the inside. We realize these are complex situations, but they are certainly worthy of serious consideration and study.

We believe, then, that many of the behaviors by teachers which harm students occur because analytic educators are not used to thinking carefully in terms of the boundaries that circumscribe and define the relationships students share with those who educate them. Action to cross the boundary or inaction can be educationally damaging. We also believe that, while we are increasing the regularity with which we discuss case material regarding difficult boundary issues, our ability to discuss these same issues as part of our training efforts is lagging behind.

As analysts and analytic educators, if we are to be able to protect and manage the educational boundary, we must be mindful of ourselves as individuals with personal strengths and vulnerabilities. We must also keep in mind that simultaneously we are members of complex analytic communities made up of other educators who, like us, reside within complex and demanding analytic pairs much of the time, and are individuals with a wide variety of personal strengths and vulnerabilities. As already noted, we analysts have become accustomed to acknowledging our need for regular self-inquiry and even peer supervision, and outside consultation with respect to what is generated in us in our consulting rooms (Sonnenberg, 1991). This paper recognizes the need to extend the enhanced awareness we have developed about our vulnerabilities as clinicians to our training activities. Additionally, it is our hope that increased awareness of how the clinical situation affects our states of mind will allow us to comprehend the complexities of our educational activities. We hope that the next step will be for us to increase our awareness of our thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in the classrooms and meeting rooms of our teaching institutions. The ability to engage in this self-reflective activity and to tolerate the anxiety related to the ever-present potential to harm those we have agreed to help are two of the crucial elements in the maintenance of delicate educational boundaries.

Some Kinds of Behavior Damaging to The Educational Boundary

We will now offer a phenomenological list of the kinds of behavior that are damaging to the educational boundary which can be demonstrated by institute faculty members. We do not suggest that this is an exhaustive list. We do suggest these behaviors occur with regularity, and that they can be attenuated. Our list includes boundary behavior encountered by candidates which are:

1. attacks against the candidate's training analyst;
2. efforts to support the candidate's training analyst;
3. attacks against the administration of the institute;
4. efforts to support the administration of the institute;
5. attacks against an opposition faction within the institute;
6. efforts to support an opposition faction within the institute;
7. attacks against a candidate's supervisor;
8. efforts to support a candidate's supervisor;
9. attacks against a present or past analyst of the attacker;
10. efforts to support a present or past analyst of the attacker;
11. attacks against another candidate;
12. efforts to support another candidate;
13. attacks against the candidate; and
14. efforts to support the candidate.

These categories, it will be seen, are not mutually exclusive: sometimes several of these mechanisms can be at work simultaneously.
An attack against the training analyst

A candidate nearing the end of her training sat for an oral examination. On the examining committee was a young analyst who had long ago been in an unsuccessful treatment with the candidate's training analyst. He was quite angry with this senior member of the faculty, harboring a grudge, and believing that the analyst was not capable of performing a truly successful analysis. What he was not aware of consciously at the time of the oral examination was that he believed that this analyst was so incompetent that he could not work well enough to successfully analyze any candidate, and was incapable of equipping that potential analyst to function effectively. Unconsciously trying to prove this point, in the course of the oral examination he relentlessly attacked the candidate. The candidate fortunately was thoughtful, highly competent, and quite confident, and passed the examination. But rather than it being a positive experience, which in the candidate's mind was associated with pride in her professional and personal growth, it was remembered as an unacceptable attack. It caused the student to slow down her institute progress, and for several months became the focus of her analysis.

An effort to support the training analyst

A training analyst was involved in an effort to reform an aspect of admission policy at his institute, and had encountered resistance on the part of the old guard. A candidate analysand of that analyst was not particularly gifted at using the verbal and pictorial imagery of his analysands as he worked, and was in supervision with one of the old guard analysts, who was interested in the clinical use of dreams. In fact, that analyst worked in a very traditional way, was not particularly interested in more contemporary aspects of two-person technique, and often advised colleagues to view much of what was said in analytic hours as though the analysand were producing dream material. In that supervision, the candidate was offered the opportunity to focus on his shortcomings, which had been his reason for choosing that supervisor. In that institute each candidate had an advisor, and this candidate's advisor was a close friend of his analyst. When candidate and advisor met every few months, the advisor learned that the candidate was finding the work with the old guard supervisor quite difficult, but rewarding. Eventually, the advisor began to question the candidate's choice of that supervisor, suggesting that, rather than experience frustration, he should capitalize on his strengths as an analyst, which were in the area of interpersonal management of conflict, and change to a supervisor who was more interested in that focus of clinical work. After hearing this for a year the candidate left the old guard supervisor. Clearly, the reason for this had nothing manifestly to do with the political struggles within the institute, and could be understood as good educational advice by the advisor. That the candidate lost an opportunity to develop a skill that did not come easily to him could be rationalized: ‘There are so many skills useful in analysis, and no analyst could possess all of them … so why not build on one’s strengths?’ But, unconsciously, it was the wish of the advisor to embarrass the first supervisor, in order to give the candidate's analyst a boost in his battle with the old guard. And for the candidate, this was a real loss, because he never learned to build up certain skills which could have provided a useful form of access to unconscious process.

In fact, what seemed like a constructive educational intervention by an advisor had not only supported the candidate's unconscious resistance to learning new ways to access unconscious processes in his analysands, but also encouraged difficulties for him in his personal analysis. He went on to misappropriate that lesson to construct a parallel resistance in his personal analysis, where he stopped remembering, reporting, and analyzing his dreams. Eventually, focusing only on here and now transference feelings, the candidate created a serious analytic impasse for himself and his analyst, the person whom the advisor was unconsciously trying to support.

An effort to support the administration of the institute

A candidate with a PhD in Business Administration, with enough course work in psychology to entitle her to membership in the American Psychological Association, had worked for a number of years in a university setting. She had written a book on the problems encountered in the administration of organizations. Eventually, she decided that she needed to know more about the psychology of individuals, so she entered analysis, and eventually applied for analytic training. Shortly after her admission, she won her institute's annual candidate prize for a paper on problems in administration. She presented this paper to her new colleagues at the analytic society, to much acclaim, and she was asked to be a consultant by the administration of the institute, as they were working to revise the bylaws governing the organization. This candidate was encouraged to participate in this process of revision, and devoted many hours to the project.
She began to fall behind in her reading for classes, and delayed taking a first analytic case because of the time she was devoting to helping the institute administration. When her advisor, a junior faculty member, suggested to the president of the institute that the lack of a first case was having a negative effect on the candidate's educational experience, the president accused the junior faculty member of envy of the candidate for her prized position. The junior faculty member stated that the candidate lacked clinical experience, and that it was very important that she start a case, were her classes to be experienced as clinically relevant. The president of the institute again accused the advisor of envy. It was not until well into her second year at the institute that the candidate recognized that she was not gaining the insight into individual psychology which had led her into training in the first place. At that point she was able to cut back on her consulting work with the administration. The loss to the candidate was not irreparable, although she did feel that she had lost much from her training experience up to the point at which she remembered why she had sought it to begin with. She also learned in her personal analysis that she had unconsciously used the lure of a special place within the institute as a resistance to her own deepening understanding of her unconscious processes. It was never known if the president of the institute conducted some sort of parallel self-inquiry into why he had been insensitive to the candidate's situation as a non-clinician at the start of an analytic career. Some observers within the institute believed that the president was pathologically narcissistic, arrogant, and competitive, but the president's refusal to look inward and share his conclusions with colleagues meant that some of these beliefs could never be more than speculations.

**An attack against a supervisor**

A candidate was in supervision with an individual who was a leader in his institute. The supervisor was an older man, with a national reputation and a charismatic personality. He was also old-fashioned, somewhat authoritarian, popular with candidates, and an object of envy and competition among his colleagues.

In that institute, candidates were assigned their supervisors, and were required to request permission for a desired change from the education committee. The education committee wanted to scrutinize the reasons for the change, in the belief that would give a better picture of the candidate's progress.

It happened that the candidate's analyst did not like the supervisor because of a bitter rivalry with him. While he had been restrained when the candidate accepted the assigned supervisor, he had taken a different approach whenever the candidate associated to him or the case under his supervision. Then, the analyst was harshly critical of his colleague. Eventually, in response to this, the candidate asked the education committee for a change in supervisor, though previously he had been quite satisfied by his learning experience.

The education committee became involved. A member of that committee spoke with the candidate, and then the supervisor, who sat on the education committee, spoke about his experience with the candidate. He talked about how well he had thought the supervision had been going. Curiously, the candidate reported that his analyst had encouraged him to switch supervisors, and the entire education committee was aware of the bitter rivalry which existed between the training analyst and the supervisor. In the end, the education committee was critical of the supervisor, suggesting he had been authoritarian and insensitive to the candidate, and had missed the boat about how the candidate had felt over-controlled by him in the conduct of the case. The supervisor concluded in his own mind that envious colleagues were using this situation to attack him. There was never any discussion among the relevant faculty members of the many interpersonal issues which 'might' have been involved.

From the perspective of the candidate's education there was a significant loss. The candidate had been misled by his analyst in a personal struggle, and as time passed he came to know it. He then began to hold back in using his analysis to discuss countertransference issues experienced with his control cases, for fear of how his analyst might misuse such associations in ways which reflected his personal feelings about other supervisor colleagues. When, at the time of his graduation, he looked back on his analytic education he was regretful at this loss of the opportunity to have an analytic experience in which he could learn more about his countertransference tendencies and responses. Two years later he went back into analysis with a different senior analyst, and obtained supervision from two senior supervisors from another institute.

This example is particularly interesting because many years later both the former training analyst and
the former student analysand came to a meeting of the minds about what had transpired. In frank discussion, the former analysand characterized the former analyst as behaving vindictively and mean-spiritedly, and with the advantage of time and hindsight the former training analyst agreed that had been the case. In what we believe is a rare example of reconciliation, the former members of this analytic dyad agreed that the analyst had been out of line. This had a healing effect on the former analysand, who for many years had felt not only cheated, but also ignored by those in whom he had placed his trust.

A complex example

Bob was a candidate in analysis with a person who had come highly recommended by a respected teacher. After about a year, the analyst became harshly critical of Bob, often raising his voice as he sarcastically told him that he wasn't 'analyzing correctly.' Bob, filled with idealizations about analysis and the person to whom he had been referred came to believe he was at fault. He did not question the technique of the analyst, or wonder about the possibility that the analyst was impaired.

After two years of verbal assault by the analyst Bob had become very anxious, irritable with his wife, children, and friends, and at times suffered from serious insomnia. When he brought up the possibility of a consultation the analyst said that such a move would destroy the analysis. When Bob asked why there was no reply.

Eventually, Bob left the analysis, in part because of his painful, increasing anxiety. After leaving the first analyst, Bob began with another analyst, and after about one year of careful reflection recognized that the first analyst had been emotionally disturbed. He called the chair of the education committee to speak about this situation, asking for a meeting. He was told they could talk on the phone, that a meeting wasn't necessary. Bob then explained his concerns about the first analyst, and was told by the education committee chair that 'I always thought he was seriously disturbed. Thank you for coming forward. Something will be done.'

Over the next year several other candidates in analysis with the first analyst called Bob to ask if he had stopped his analysis with the first analyst, and why. Bob always responded that it would be better if he did not discuss this with his candidate colleague, and encouraged the colleague to speak with his or her institute advisor. Usually the colleagues then spontaneously told Bob a story of mistreatment by the first analyst similar to what Bob had experienced.

By the time Bob graduated from his institute, he had become aware of many other candidates who had similar experiences with the first analyst, and had switched analysts after suffering, in some cases, severe personal damage. In some cases the ripple effect included the suffering of spouses and children. All had experienced very substantial interferences in their analytic educations.

Bob was aware that nothing was ever done to attenuate the damage caused by his first training analyst, who continued to practice with that status. The damage to the institute was great as well. Because this was a relatively small institute, the impaired training analyst had affected a large percentage of candidates. For the most part these individuals did not remain affiliated with the institute. The effect of this was that these individuals did not encourage potential applicants to apply for analytic training, and the institute experienced a significant decline in the size of its student body.

A few years after his graduation, Bob had his first opportunity to discuss what had happened with several colleagues who had been teachers during his candidacy. Each reported that most on the faculty had not known what to do as they witnessed candidate after candidate drop out of analysis with the training analyst. The training analyst had hidden behind the boundary of confidentiality, refusing to discuss his clinical results with colleagues. Concerned teachers had not been able to conceptualize that in this situation the ruptured boundary which the training analyst shared with each candidate analysand who had interrupted treatment should be further penetrated, at least to the point of offering respectful counseling and apologies to those who were harmed. Bob also learned that the chair of the education committee had been a close friend of the training analyst and had done nothing after their phone discussion. To Bob, this seemed consistent with the chair saying that a face-to-face meeting wasn't necessary in the first place. Indeed, the issue of removing the training analyst status of the offending analyst was never seriously considered under that education committee chair. That was also the case because the training analyst had many close friends on the faculty who would not even consider such an action. Those on the faculty who were not friends of the training analyst had felt unable to suggest divesting him of his training analyst status for fear of being seen as his enemies or as adversaries of the
head of the education committee. Finally, Bob asked if an audit of the work of the training analyst had been undertaken by the institute. The answer was that it was never considered, but that Bob's expulsion had been.

One informant added that Bob had shown early in his candidacy that he was a potential contributor to the field, and that several of the faculty members who had advocated his expulsion resented or envied him for his talents. Additionally, this informant said that he believed that certain members of the education committee had wanted to get rid of Bob's former training analyst, but in a complex group process had projected this desire on to Bob, and then turned against him for what they perceived as his attack on their colleague.

Years passed, and once again Bob had a chance to talk about what had happened during his training with individuals who were at the time younger members of the education committee. By this time both the former chair of the education committee and the former analyst had died. Perhaps because these individuals could no longer be affected by anything they said, these individuals told Bob that in their view the former education committee chair ran the institute as though it were his kingdom. They consistently recalled him as pathologically narcissistic, arrogant, vindictive, and mean-spirited. They also acknowledged that there had been a widespread belief on the education committee that Bob's former training analyst was impaired by his arrogance and rage at everyone around him, even his friends and supporters.

**Discussion and Remedial Suggestions**

In our examples we have tried to illustrate a few of the ways the education of candidates is compromised when the concept of the educational boundary in psychoanalytic training is misunderstood or not recognized at all. These examples also attempt to focus on the role of personal relationships between and among members of the institute faculty, and the ways these relationships affect the education of candidates. Finally, we have noted the ways personal qualities such as pathological narcissism, vindictiveness, arrogance, and mean-spiritedness among faculty members come into play.

In trying to understand the seemingly ubiquitous nature of institute abuses, we offer an explanation. We are aware that in analytic communities many of us experience regression much of the time. Since Freud's first efforts at describing analytic technique, we have moved from the notion of the 'objective' surgical practitioner to the empathic observer, and more recently to the very involved participant-observer. As the embrace of countertransference, freely hovering role-responsiveness, countertransference enactment, and intense identification and counteridentification (mutual projective identification) has moved us into a place of very close, prolonged identification with our analysands, we experience states of intense regression more frequently and for longer periods of time. This leaves us both more empathically involved and more psychologically vulnerable than in earlier periods in the history of psychoanalysis. These vulnerable conditions and their acceptance in us, while potentially valuable when we are self-analyzing analysts effectively engaged in the therapeutic mission of analyzing and supervising, can represent a difficulty when we perform administrative and educational functions, because there we are not accustomed to working with our own intense emotions. Indeed, our tolerance as analysts and analytic educators for more prolonged regression makes clarity of thought much harder when we function naively in the non-therapeutic educational realm, where we must be aware of our own difficulties with the regulation of narcissistic vulnerability, personal disappointment, envy or jealousy, intensely competitive feelings, and tendencies toward arrogance, vindictiveness, the desire for revenge, and mean-spiritedness.

We wish to emphasize that it is even more difficult than it might be for us to successfully negotiate these regressed states of mind and the existence of our personality weaknesses because of the secrecy required by our pledge to maintain confidentiality. Were we analysts to routinely discuss with each other our inner experiences with our analysands, and our colleagues, such consultation might result in an enhanced awareness of what is going on inside our heads. But we keep our states of mind to ourselves, in part because we are trained to contain what we hear and how we react to it, and in part because we are reluctant to reveal who we are and what we do to colleagues we do not fully trust. The result of this silence is that we analysts, more than is necessary, are not fully able to recognize how regressed we often are in our analytic relationships, and how that state of regression may remain active, interfering with self-reflection, as we function as administrators and educators.
In fact, we analysts defend against recognizing such intrapsychic states. Our resistances then make us even less able to perceive what is going on in our interactions with colleagues, in settings which require judgments about our own personal shortcomings, and the ways we function in groups. Then, we simply don't pay attention to how poorly we function when engaged in educational activities. Since a goal of this paper is to suggest remedial measures, here we want to emphasize that

- awareness of our states of mind, awareness of our personal shortcomings, awareness of the ways we may be tempted to mishandle the educational boundary in the service of selfish aims, and the regular seeking of consultation with colleagues to discuss all this will help us maintain our effectiveness as analytic educators.

We believe that in the majority of instances it is not the psychopathic analyst, but the naively self-confident and unknowingly arrogant analyst, who is most likely to misbehave and violate the ethical standards and boundaries of analytic education, without awareness of the level of her or his envy, narcissistic discomfort, out-of-control aggressiveness and competitiveness, and even rage and hatred. We also believe that such behavior is often encouraged by group pressures. It is extraordinarily difficult for us to understand ourselves in the regressive web of the group experience of institute life.

A particularly clear example of such group behavior was provided in the final example: a group of faculty members protected a colleague from scrutiny and criticism, and attacked a student. In what was later assessed by one member of that institute faculty as a projection by other members of that group, their behavior at the time was seen by them as an effort to protect their colleague from what they perceived as Bob's destructive aggression. That person also asserted that the education committee members most involved in that projection did so while unable to clearly define their educational responsibilities, and with no efforts at self-analytic exploration of why they experienced the situation as they did. As regards a remedy, then, we want to emphasize that, along with individual self-reflection and consultation, open discussion about group process within faculties should be a regular occurrence. These discussions should focus, in part, on the forces which motivate groups to deal with educational matters as they do.

In the case of Bob, had such a discussion taken place, we believe his need for support and validation for his troubled decision to change analysts would have resulted in a penetration of the educational boundary. We believe institute representatives would have talked with him about his experience with his former training analyst, and honestly reassured him that the faculty was exploring what had happened. We believe, too, that a host of problems within the faculty would then have been addressed, and that the training analyst status of his former analyst would have been scrutinized. Perhaps measures to help that analyst would have been instituted, but, in any event, faculty behavior would not have been ignored, and the institute would have been far healthier for it.

Avoiding the Misuse of an Analysand

Now, as we near the end of this paper, we offer an example of how awareness of these issues can help prevent the misuse of an analysand. An analysand of a senior training analyst was asked to assume an important administrative position at her institute. Such a position would place that analysand in constant contact with her analyst, who also occupied an administrative post within the institute. When this possibility was examined by the analytic pair, they considered all aspects of what it might mean, and how it might affect the analytic work before them.

The analyst, for his part, became aware through self-analysis of many feelings that made him want his analysand to take the position. He felt that it would constitute vivid evidence of his legacy to the institute, making it stronger and better. He felt warmly toward his analysand, happy that such affirmation of her value to the institute had occurred so early in her analytic career, and pleased by the high regard in which she was held by their colleagues. Yet he feared that such close contact would impede analytic progress.

The analysand, on her part, was flattered by the offer from the institute, asserted that she knew that she would be her own person if she took the position, and felt readily able to disagree with her analyst about administrative matters. She feared that whenever she agreed with him she would be seen as 'his girl,' but even so, considered the offer seriously.

The analyst, who happened to be aware of the issues described in this paper, decided that he should seek consultation with a colleague, who was experienced in matters of educational ethics and boundaries, and how these affect institute life and the psychoanalysis of analysts and analytic candidates in treatment.
The consultant advised against the analysand serving in that way, noting that, ‘From inside the dyad, all kinds of self-deception are possible because of the transference-countertransference wishes.’

The following day, with further reflection, both members of the analytic dyad decided that the analysand should assume an important role in institute life that would not involve constant administrative contact with her analyst. This example contrasts with what happened in the example entitled ‘An effort to support the administration of the institute.’ Here, in contrast, there was a purposeful penetration of the educational boundary, through the use of a requested consultation. The result was that the misuse of an analysand was avoided.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have tried to provide examples of situations requiring our awareness, as analytic educators, of our own personal shortcomings, our ways of experiencing group pressures, and our need to be sensitive to protecting, maintaining, or penetrating the educational boundary. We believe that if we are aware of and discuss these issues regularly, when functioning as educators, we would more readily recognize what motivates us as we consider staying out of or penetrating the boundary of a candidate's analysis, or supervisory relationship, or student-teacher relationship.

In our examples of problem situations, the consequences of the actions and inactions of faculties were neither examined systematically nor remedied institutionally at the time the problems occurred, and personal, educational, and administrative challenges were not seen for what they were. Even though the situations as we write of them are dramatically clear, and on some level in each instance at least some faculty members knew that their institutes were suffering from the misbehavior or acting out of even troubled analysts, nothing was done at the time to address what was wrong.

We want to underscore our view that most faculty analysts who act in the ways we have described do so without full awareness of the consequences of their personal shortcomings or interpersonal motivations and behavior. This is so because we are members of a profession where regression and keeping secrets are what we are accustomed to living with, which renders our complex task of self-reflection and interpersonal cooperation even more difficult. But we also want to emphasize that our profession's failure to carefully delineate the ethical principles and standards that should govern the education of candidates, and study the use and misuse of educational boundaries during that educational process, must be remedied. Most analysts who have failed in the ways we have described have done so because they are unaware of the psychodynamics motivating their and their colleagues' thoughts and actions in the educational arena, the group process pressures influencing them, and the concept of the educational boundary. Attention to educational ethics and boundaries is a critical step we must take, as we work to enhance our awareness of our motivations, and the influences on us that come from our participation in educational groups. We hope that this paper will increase the focus on the need for both personal and organizational remedies for these difficulties and thus help analytic educators function more effectively and humanely.

Translations of Summary


Los límites en la formación psicoanalítica. En esta contribución los autores definen y discuten los
límites en la formación psicoanalítica que consideran ha sido un concepto muy importante y muy a menudo descuidado. El marco de la discusión incluye la atención reciente de los psicoanalistas al problema ético de los límites. La comprensión por parte de los autores de la manera en que el trabajo clínico afecta al analista didacta y de la influencia que su personalidad tiene en la interacción con colegas y candidatos constituyen otros elementos esenciales de la discusión. Tomando en consideración todo esto proponen la hipótesis de que muchos de los problemas institucionales que aparecen en la formación psicoanalítica se pueden comprender mejor si se afrontan a través de la visión de los límites de la formación. Se incluyen ejemplos que ilustran varias de las maneras en que los psicoanalistas didactas complican la experiencia de formación de los candidatos. Proponen explicaciones específicas respecto al por qué los analistas luchan a la hora de tratar de manejar sus intervenciones didácticas, e indican en la discusión las soluciones potenciales que permitirían evitar estos comportamientos si a la noción de límites en la formación, se le prestara la debida atención. Los autores proponen además un ejemplo de cómo los límites en la formación pueden ser manejados con mayor efectividad.

La notion de limite dans l'enseignement. Dans leur contribution, les auteurs définissent et discutent la notion de limite dans la formation analytique, qui selon eux est un concept utile et souvent méconnu dans l'enseignement de la psychanalyse. Leur discussion repose sur un cadre incluant les récentes élaborations des psychanalystes sur les notions des limites et de l’éthique. Leur compréhension de la façon dont le travail clinique affecte l'esprit de l'analyste enseignant, tout comme les façons dont les personnalités des différents analystes affectent leurs échanges avec leurs collègues de faculté et leurs étudiants, constituent les autres pierres angulaires de leur discussion. En tenant compte de la totalité de ces différents aspects, ils affirment qu'un grand nombre des problèmes institutionnels rencontrés dans la formation des analystes peut être mieux compris s'il est considéré sous le prisme de la limite dans l'enseignement. Ils exposent des exemples qui illustrent diverses façons dont les enseignants en psychanalyse compliquent l'expérience de formation des candidats. Ils proposent des explications spécifiques sur la question de savoir pourquoi les analystes se battent en essayant de gérer leurs interventions didactiques et indiquent, dans la discussion, les solutions potentielles qui permettraient d’éviter ces comportements, si la notion de limite dans l’enseignement était au centre de la réflexion. Les auteurs proposent également un exemple de la façon dont la limite dans l’enseignement peut être mieux gérée dans la pratique.

Importanza dei confini nella formazione psicoanalitica. In questo contributo gli autori definiscono e dibattono i confini educativi nella formazione psicoanalitica, che ritengono sia un importante concetto spesso trascurato. Fra gli elementi al centro della discussione si trova la recente attenzione accordata dagli analisti alla questione etica dei confini. La comprensione dell'impatto psichico che il lavoro clinico ha sull'analista formatore e dell'influenza che la sua personalità ha sull'interazione con colleghi e candidati sono altri elementi centrali al dibattito. Preso in considerazione tutto ciò, viene avanzata l'ipotesi che i molteplici problemi istituzionali incontrati nella formazione psicoanalitica possano essere meglio compresi se visti attraverso il prisma dei confini didattici. Vengono illustrati casi in cui l'esperienza dei candidati sia stata complicata dagli analisti formatori e gli Autori forniscono spiegazioni relative alle difficoltà di intervento pedagogico da parte degli analisti. Tali difficoltà possono essere evitate se si presta la dovuta attenzione ai confini educativi. Viene infine dimostrato con un esempio che questi confini possano essere gestiti in modo efficace.
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