

Forty Five Years and Counting...on You

Taibi Kahler, Ph.D.

Abstract

The author presents a history of the Process Communication Model, including those upon whose shoulders he stood and those with whom he now stands.

Purdue University

It was September of 1968, and I had been given a Research Assistantship by renowned author and child development scholar, Dr. William Ellsworth Martin, Head of the Department of Child Development and Family Life [CDFL] at Purdue University.

{Dear Reader: We are extremely fortunate when a mentor takes interest in us, and helps shape our life, and thereby the lives of those whom we touch. Bill Martin is such a special person in my life. He was the first of several mentors who would guide me on my journey. I have love and admiration for him, and lasting appreciation for his having seen something in me. We have maintained contact for all these years, and I am honored to say he signs his letters, "Brother Bill".}

My undergraduate degree from Purdue University was in English Literature, and now I needed to do a Master's thesis in CDFL. Again fortune smiled on me, as I was assigned to work under the tutelage of Dr. Mary Endres, recognized as a Purdue's Teacher of the Year. Mary was a compassionate, sensitive, and warm lady, with energy of someone years younger, able to work endless hours on projects she loved. {Dear Reader: Have you surmised her Base and Phase?}

Mary was always interested in helping new teachers become better communicators with their students, and encouraged us graduate students to do educational research on such communication dynamics. So began my academic interest in process before I had ever heard of Transactional Analysis [TA].

That Fall I started my Master of Science degree research on the thesis: "The effects of teacher management process code via video tape feedback on the verbal behavior of student teachers" (Kahler, 1971). {Dear Reader: I would be remiss if I did not mention that the most important lesson I learned in those two years came from Mary's Harmonizer Base, connecting to my Harmonizer Phase, with what she called "Giving Back": help someone with no intention that he or she pays you back, but rather that you continue this process.}

Several months later Mary invited me to accompany her to a lecture on “OK’ness” by local psychiatrist Edward “Pete” Stuntz, M.D.. It was a cold evening, but I felt a warmth grow within me listening with fascination as he spoke of how each of us has a Parent part, an Adult part, and a Child part. He quoted another psychiatrist who had created this theory -- a Dr. Eric Berne. This I’m OK – You’re OK model of therapy not only explained human behavior, but also allowed an observing of it by words, tones, gestures, posture, and facial expressions. He called it Transactional Analysis.

I had to know more. Dr. Stuntz must have read our minds, or simply used this TA observational tool to read our behavior: “Those of you who want to know more about this, please call me at the Wabash Valley Mental Hospital for an appointment.”

His office was just large enough for a small group, with a low table in the middle, and different sizes of chairs and sofas around it. In one corner was a flipchart, with three circles drawn atop one another.

“I’m in Child Development and Family Life at the university, and would like to become a TA therapist,” I began, expecting a response. But no response. I saw that he was wearing a hearing aid, and assumed that he had not heard me. “I’m in Child Development and Family Life at the university, and would like to become a TA therapist,” I repeated loudly, nodding as I spoke.

“I heard you the first time. Did you hear that you did not ask me anything?”

I was momentarily confused, attempting to remember what I had or had not said. I really wanted to make a good impression. What was he trying to tell me? {Dear Reader: recall my Phase was Harmonizer.}

“I want to be a TA therapist,” I blurted. He sat silently. Thus began my first lesson in TA.

Collecting my thoughts, I proceeded: “What do I need to do to become a TA therapist?” I felt quite relieved when Dr. Stuntz responded, “Join a TA therapy group as a patient, attend our TA seminars, and become a Clinical Member of the International Transactional Analysis Association.”

My Research Assistantship afforded me enough money to live and attend the university, but I had no insurance that allowed me to enter therapy. That is when Mary Endres introduced me to her philosophy of Pay it Forward: “I will pay for your therapy on two conditions. On the weekends and holidays that I leave, you agree to house and dog sit for me.” [Mary had two wonderful dachshunds, Bitte and Danke. Years later my first pets were two dachshunds.] “And you agree to help someone when you can afford it, either with money or in deed.” I agreed.

As the months passed, I went from being a patient to being an observer in Dr. Stuntz's TA groups. He and a young minister, Steve Winners, formalized the TA seminars into "The Winner's Circle", whose members included several doctors, and a few of us graduate students. One such graduate student, Richard Erskine (Erskine and Zalcman, 1979), was also destined to receive the Eric Berne Memorial Scientific Award, and make significant contributions to TA.

In one of our TA seminar study groups Dr. Stuntz taught us Dr. Stephen Karpman's Drama Triangle (Karpman, 1968), which postulated that people in [negative] Drama assumed one of three roles: Victim [V], Rescuer [R], or Persecutor [P], often times then shifting to another role. I was fascinated with the simplicity of such a profound concept. Little did I know that I would have my first experience in one of the roles of the Drama Triangle that very week, while being supervised by Dr. Stuntz as a co-leader in one of his therapy groups.

"Who would like to begin this evening?", inquired Dr. Stuntz. Just then a man appeared in the doorway, reaching out as if to be grasping the air.

"I don't know where to sit", said the newcomer. "No one will be sitting in this chair", offered Susan.

Jim moved slowly, with stuttered steps, again reaching out with both hands. "Oh, the man's blind," I said to myself. Just then Jim veered toward the low coffee table in the center of the group. I instinctively rose to stop him, but was restrained by Dr. Stuntz's hand on my shoulder. I felt a welling of anger, almost blurting out loud the words in my mind: "What's wrong with you! Can't you see?! The man's blind, and he's going to get hurt!"

At the last second. Jim turned and missed the sharp edge of the table and sat down. Dr. Stuntz began again, "Everyone, this is our new member Jim. Susan, let's start with you."

In our supervision debriefing Dr. Stuntz began with a searing statement: "You believed you had to be responsible for someone close to you when you were growing up."

How did he know that? Then he went to the flipchart that still had the diagram of the Drama Triangle, showing the three roles of Persecutor, Rescuer, and Victim. He pointed out that Jim had not requested anything, advertising his being in a Victim role. Susan entered into the Drama Triangle by taking on the role of Rescuer, one of the reasons why she was in therapy.

Dr. Stuntz continued by telling me that Jim has conversion hysteria and is not organically blind. I justified with, "I just wanted to stop Jim from getting hurt....I didn't know he wasn't blind."

Prone to giving homework, Dr. Stuntz said, with what I interpreted as a wry smile, “Let me know in our next supervision session if you were in the Drama Triangle with Jim.” How would I know if I just wanted to do something thoughtful or if I had Rescued? Wouldn’t anybody want to help someone from getting hurt in the same situation? After several days of self-reflection I realized that I must have been a Rescuer because my anger at Dr. Stuntz was not only in believing he was wrong, but also that he was “not OK”. I had switched to the Persecutor role.

So that’s why he had first said to me, “You believed you had to be responsible for someone close to you when you were growing up.” {Dear Reader: Steve Karpman and I have been friends now for forty years. Thank you, Steve for your genius contribution. Not a week goes by that I do not find application value in your Drama Triangle.}

I began conducting group therapy at the Wabash Valley Mental Hospital, still under the supervision of Dr. Stuntz. As those of us in The Winners’ Circle became more and more interested in TA, Dr. Stuntz invited Dr. Hedges Capers, Sr. to demonstrate how to do TA in a group setting, called a marathon. Hedges was a friend and confidant to the originator of TA, Dr. Eric Berne.

This experience was to be life changing for me.

Hedges came to Wabash Valley Mental Hospital to lead a two-day TA marathon. He ended the weekend with an experiential fantasy exercise. He instructed us, “Let’s imagine it’s five years from now, and we’re having a reunion to share all that we have done and felt these past five years.” I approached Hedges and said, “We sure have had a wonderful five years together at your institute in La Jolla. I finished my Ph.D., became an ITAA Clinical Member, and have had a few ideas published.” I felt scared and searched his eyes for any sign of rebuff. But instead, with a hand on my shoulder and a genuineness in his voice that I will never forget, Hedges said, “Taibi, my friend, we have helped people and thank you for being with me at the institute. And those TA ideas of yours have touched the lives of thousands.” That permission was given to me before I was even a Regular Member, let alone before my first inclination of what a Driver would be.

I shall never underestimate the power of permissions. Within five years I had my Ph.D., discovered and developed the miniscript therapy model, published a handful of articles, was Guest Editor of the *Transactional Analysis Journal*, member of the Board of Trustees of and a Provisional Teaching Member in the ITAA, and had been Director of Clinical Training for Hedges at his institute for several years. He became my mentor, and my father-figure.

As I think of the potency of permission, I believe it is a function of personality structure. Hedges was a Rebel Base, then in a Harmonizer Phase. I, a Thinker Base, was also in Harmonizer Phase. His natural Harmonizer Phase Psychological Needs of Recognition of Person matched mine: "Taibi, my friend, we have helped people and thank you for being with me at the institute." And he intuitively addressed my Thinker Base recognition of work needs with, "And those TA ideas of yours have touched the lives of thousands."

I was inspired to utilize TA more in my practice. And I did. One evening after having just reviewed classic defense mechanisms and Berne's ego states, I made an interesting discovery in one of my therapy groups. With a knack for seeing how things fit together, and a natural skill for observing detail, I noticed that just prior to a patient showing signs of neurotic, psychotic, or personality disorder behavior, as evidenced by functional [i.e., observable] ego states, he or she would show behaviors that repeated consistently, lasted only a few seconds, and functioned like doorways to further distress. These observable behaviors were analogous both to classic defense mechanisms and to "counterscripts" in TA. I had discovered Drivers.

Dr. Eric Berne had quantified behaviors by looking at words, tones, gestures, posture, and facial expressions. My hypothesis was simple: if these Drivers did function as a doorway into obvious distress, then by making and completing a chart of these observable behaviors that were mutually exclusive, yet comprehensive, to any other such behaviors, then I may have discovered something of value.

After several weeks of observing in person and videotapes of patients, I had completed my matrix of five sets of mutually exclusive behavioral cues, all of which immediately preceded verbally attacking, vengeful, or victim behaviors. These five Drivers I called Please, Try Hard, Be Perfect, Be Strong, and Hurry Up. I coined the word Driver from Freud's drive, or basic instinct to repetitive behavior.

Since each such Driver could be projected or internalized, they represented an attitude of "for me" and "for you". [I originally called these Parent Drivers and Child Drivers, respectively]

As I conceptualized this in a TA framework, I thought of the four life positions hypothesized by Dr. Thomas Harris (Harris, 1967): I'm OK – You're OK, I'm OK – You're not OK, I'm not OK – You're OK, and I'm not OK – You're not OK. Drivers, however, fit in none of these positions. Rather, they represented a conditional position of "OK if", which further suggested a sequence.

Having an aversion to classifying people negatively, I took exception to Harris' contention that people assumed any form of "not OK" life position.

Consequently I postulated that there was only one existential life position: I'm OK – You're OK. The others were just behavioral. And Drivers represented another behavioral life position --

OK if, in two forms: I'm OK – You're OK if... and You're OK – I'm OK if...

As a Base Thinker I was drawn to the TA of the sixties, which focused on using one's Adult [thinking part] in order to solve one's problems. Consequently I created a TA inventory and decided to use it in my doctoral research: "Predicting Academic Underachievement in Ninth and Twelfth Grade Males with the Kahler Transactional Analysis Script Checklist" (Kahler, 1972). Interested in further validating the inventory, I expanded it for adults, included Drivers, and continued to gather data. After a sufficiently large sample population size, I asked a statistics professor for his evaluation and interpretation.

The results were at first disappointing, in that the strongest correlations were just with Drivers and scripts (Berne, 1970; "negative life blue prints"). The statistician, however, pointed out to me that whatever I was researching did have significance. The data naturally fell into six, mutually exclusive clusters at a high enough significance not to be random.

Several years later I realized that these clusters were actually the foundation for the Process Communication Model® (PCM) (Kahler, 1982a) and the Process Therapy Model™ (PTM) (Kahler, 1978) to be comprised of six Personality Types.

Of all his work I was most fascinated by Berne's explanation and interpretation of the script dynamics of Mrs. Sayers, described in his 1961 book *Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy* (Berne, p.124). He had analyzed her behavior second-by-second and discovered her whole life script which she "had repeatedly played out over varying lengths of time ranging from a passing moment to several years." How incredible – the "telescoping of a whole script into a few seconds."

By the summer of 1971 I had discovered how Drivers reinforce life scripts thousands of times a day. As we move into Drivers, "energy is drained" from the OK – OK part of us, and this affects how we (preconsciously) structure our thoughts, as evidenced by Driver contaminated sentence patterns. (Kahler with Capers, 1974; Kahler, 1975a; Kahler, 1975c).

So by definition, a script is a failure pattern with a false belief originating in Drivers, reinforced through sentence patterns, and replayed throughout life in intensity as a function of distress.

With the discovery of the miniscript (1971-1972), I became more interested in process sequences: (1) an order of cathecting negative functional ego states (Kahler with Capers, 1974; Kahler, 1975b); (2) an order of entering the Drama Triangle (Karpman, 1968; Kahler with Capers, 1974), with Drivers at the Rescuer or Victim (of a Rescuer) roles; (3) an order of starting games, with Drivers at Con and Gimmick. (Berne, 1970; Kahler with Capers, 1974).

The miniscript is the foundation for our current three degrees of distress for each Personality Type. This original miniscript had four positions, starting with (-1) any Drivers, then (-2) what we now call Drooper, then (-3) what we now call Attacker or Blamer; and finally (-4) Despairer. This showed that there was an observable order of a person going into distress. However, I had not yet realized that there were only six such sequences of distress. That would come later with the discovery of Phases and Phasing.

I conceived of the idea of the Four Myths in 1972 and wanted to be able to say in simple language how we reinforce and further negative behavior interaction by interaction:

- “I believe I or others can make you feel good emotionally.” [R→V]
- “I believe you or others can make me feel good emotionally.” [V→R]
- “I believe I or others can make you feel bad emotionally.” [P→V]
- “I believe you or others can make me feel bad emotionally.” [V→P]

Myths are at the basis for justifying staying in maladaptive, distressed behavior.

The following everyday examples seem in and of themselves to be innocuous, but their repetition invites a belief in the Myths that can lead to justifying further distressed behavior.

- “I knew that would make you feel good when I told you that.” [R→V]
- “You just made me feel so proud by saying that to me.” [V→R]
- “That must have hurt your feelings when he said that to you.” [P→V]
- “Bullies just don’t know how much they are hurting other kids’ feelings when they call them such bad names.” [V→P]

Note: I do not condone bullying. The point is that if I [am encouraged to] believe someone can hurt me emotionally by calling me a name, then I act like a Victim, and by doing so invite Persecutors who believe they can make me feel bad emotionally to continue such behavior.

On the Lecture Circuit

Dr. Paul Ware and I met in 1974, and became life-long friends. After he attended a weeklong seminar I had done in early 1975 in Dulzura, California, Paul hosted a seminar for me later that year in Shreveport, Louisiana, in which I: (1) presented six basic miniscripts, each reinforcing a different life script. I still did not think in terms of personality types, but rather of the six scripts I had earlier researched: Until, After, Never, Always, Almost I, and Almost II; and (2) demonstrated the positive transactions to offer when a person shows a Driver. These transactions became what we call Channels in PCM.

<u>When offered</u>	<u>Respond with</u>
Be perfect (for me or you)	Adult ⇌ Adult [Channel 3]
Be strong (for me or you)	+Critical Parent ⇌ Adult [Channel 2]
Try hard	Free Child ⇌ Free Child [Channel 5]
Please you	+Nurturing Parent ⇌ Free Child [Channel 4]

TA transactions were defined by the offering ego state and the receiving ego state, interaction by interaction. However, ego state theory had not yet encompassed positive and negative ego states, let alone “provided for” a diagramming of the location of Drivers. So, the discovery of Drivers led to my expanding of TA theory in several ways. One such was that classical, observable ego states had to be diagrammed more precisely, separating the Parent and Child parts to show that there were positive and negative behaviors that were mutually exclusive (Kahler, 1975b). Additionally, that there was a sequence of how these ego states “cathected”—were used and observed. I soon realized that a three circle diagram of ego states was inadequate to indicate these discoveries (Kahler with Capers, 1974).

What I had been observing that was effective was that to invite someone out of a Driver, use a particular transaction [Channel], Based on the new designations I had made in functional ego states, that identified the behaviors of the positive halves of the Parent.

In 1976 Paul and I co-lead a marathon in Shreveport, Louisiana. What I had been doing by selecting different transactions to use to connect with a client, depending on his or her primary Driver, Paul was doing with selecting Berne's designation of feelings, thoughts or behaviors. Whereas I focused on intervening at beginning distressed behavior (i.e., with being presented a Driver), Paul looked at the person's preference of feelings, thoughts, or behaviors.

Seven years later Paul had refined his concept of therapy "Doors," and what he called six Adaptations, and wrote an article in the 1983 *Transactional Analysis Journal* entitled "Personality Adaptations" (Ware, 1983).

In 1977 I finished *Transactional Analysis Revisited* (Kahler, 1978a). Paul Ware wrote the introduction: "Taibi has enlarged on his Process School of TA...his Process Therapy will become an important contribution to psychology."

Later that year I received the Eric Berne Memorial Scientific Award for the "Miniscript" (Kahler with Capers, 1974).

In 1978 I wrote the *Process Communication Model in Brief* (Kahler, 1978b), and *Managing with the Process Communication Model: Selecting, Retaining, Motivating* (Kahler, 1979a). I reasoned that if there are six clusters of negative behavior (the six scripts and the six clusters from the 1972 research), then there are six clusters of positive behaviors. Hedges Capers had suggested the OK miniscript. Jack Dusay had conceived of the Egogram (Dusay, 1972), which although suggesting a "measuring" of both positive and negative ego states, still suggested that we have an order of positive ego states in us. Paul Ware's Doors (Ware, 1983) strongly argued for an individual preferential sequence.

I coined the term "Personality Types" to emphasize that they are not clinical diagnostic categories, and that they have positive behaviors associated with them. My terms are Believer [Persister], Feeler [Harmonizer], Thinker [Workaholic], Doer [Promoter], Funster [Rebel], and Dreamer [Imaginer]¹.

In 1979 I wrote and published the *Process Therapy in Brief*. (Kahler, 1979b), in which I: (1) separated the Process Communication Model (for non-clinical applications) and the Process Therapy Model (for clinical applications) by using different terminology, referencing Paul Ware and calling the Personality Type Adaptations: Doubters, Overreactors, Workaholics, Manipulators, Disapprovers, Daydreamers, and added a seventh, Cyclers; (2) described and diagrammed the miniscript in terms of three degrees of distress - words, tones, gestures, and facial expressions are given for each, as well as life positions, myths, and roles; (3) offered how to assess a client: Quadrize, Contactize, and Driverize; (4) created, presented and explained the Assessing Matrix:


(5) placed Thoughts, Feelings, Reactions, and Actions on the Assessing Matrix; (6) placed Drivers on the Assessing Matrix; (7) put Overreactors, Doubters, Disapprovers, Manipulators, Daydreamers, Workaholics, and Cyclers on the Assessing Matrix; (8) suggested traits, Drivers, stoppers (functional script injunctions), rackets, games, scripts, and dynamics for each Type; (9) showed Drivers and scripts on the Assessing Matrix; (10) provided a table for what positive transaction (Channel) and contact area to use with each Type; (11) gave a table for the contact, target, and trap for each Type; and (12) offered a table for therapist-client potentially incompatible Adaptations.

The Coalescence of PCM

1978 was a pivotal year for PCM: I theorized that personality structure is composed of six Personality Types, discovered and defined Phases and Phasing, and began research.

For several years I had been conceiving of personality structure as a layering of six "positive" Personality Types within each individual. I was looking not only at clinical, distressed, or maladaptive behaviors of people, but also at all the positive behaviors as well. I visualized a six-floor house, with a different set of positive personality traits on each floor. I hypothesized what these positive traits would be for each of six Personality Types, that I then called Reactors, Workaholics, Persisters, Dreamers, Rebels, and Promoters. (I now wanted neutral terms, as I was not just focusing on my previous TA clinical miniscript view of them.) Such hypothesized traits included: Character Strengths, Personality Parts and Channels of communication, Perceptions, Environmental Preferences, Management and Interaction Styles, facial expressions, home/office preferences, and Psychological Need motivators. I was no longer looking at just a single negative pattern of a person clinically, but rather seeing each person as having a personality structure made up of six Personality Types available to him or her, and in some measurable order.

As I contemplated this, I asked myself question after question: Why are people motivated by different Psychological Needs at different times in their lives? Why doesn't a person's primary Driver ever change even though he or she might have a different distress sequence? Why does a person have a different script at different times in their life? Why do some people demonstrate not just one but two Distress Sequences?



As I asked myself these questions, I thought of how many people change throughout their lifetime, as if going through passages—growing from the pain—different in attitude, but same in their basic structure. I remembered what seemed like different “Phases” of my life. As I did, I realized that in each of these Phases I had a different miniscript (distress) sequence, as well as different Psychological Needs, although I was basically the same person.

I had a burst of insight. People start out with the miniscript (distress) sequence that matches the Personality Type on the first – or “Base” – floor of their six-floor personality “condominium.” When they don’t get the psychological need(s) associated with the Personality Type on that floor met positively, they show the miniscript (distress) sequence of that Personality Type in order to get the same need met negatively.

Furthermore, each such Distress Sequence has a key psychological issue associated with it. If a person does not deal with that issue (i.e., experience the underlying authentic feeling associated with the issue), he will be “stuck” in that floor-related Distress Sequence.

When the person finally experiences the underlying authentic feeling and resolves the issue, he or she will then “Phase” to his next floor, and have a new Distress Sequence, new potential issue, and new Psychological Need motivations in his or her life. These would be those associated with the Personality Type located on this next floor, which I refer to as the Phase Personality Type or, simply, the Phase.

The person would still have the relative order of positive characteristics of his or her personality structure. For someone who had not experienced a Phasing, the Base Personality Type and the Phase would be the same.

NASA

Research was needed. The timing was perfect. I had been hired by Dr. Terry McGuire, NASA's Lead Psychiatrist for Manned Spaceflight [1959-1996] in charge of selection and crew management, to work with him in choosing astronauts. {Dear Reader: It is time to give my profound thanks to one of the smartest, wisest, most knowledgeable, most OK individuals I have ever known. Terry, your humor, humility, and compassion for others is an inspiration for us all. I include humility as a major virtue of Terry's, as it was years after we had met that I found out he was the inventor of the first high altitude space suit, and the first external heart pacemaker.}

As Terry would kindly state in the foreword to the reference manual of Insight (Three-Sixty Pacific, 1992), "Dr. Kahler was invited to participate with me as a consultant in a selection cycle. As I conversed with the individual applicants, Dr. Kahler sat quietly and listened, only rarely asking a pertinent question. Ten to fifteen minutes into each two hour interview, he would make a few notes on a piece of paper and place it on the floor. When each interview was concluded, we would share our findings. To my amazement, he had been able to extract and commit to paper at least an equal amount of meaningful data about the applicant's personality structure in a fraction of the time it had taken me. My response was, 'I must learn how he does that.' Thus began a long and very satisfying personal and professional relationship that continues to grow and be enriched with the passage of time."

Hundreds of the best of the best were being interviewed, but we needed a more efficient selection process. We decided to do a research validation of a pencil and paper inventory to do what we were doing in person. It gave me the opportunity to expand into non-clinical applications, as well as test my hypotheses. It was to be the birth of the Personality Pattern Inventory™ (PPI) (Kahler, 1982b).

I had moved to Little Rock, Arkansas, more as a result of intuitive destiny than cognitive design. Among those with whom I would have a life-long friendship were Dr. Ron Boyle, who had asked me to come there and conduct a yearlong therapy training with a group of clinicians; Dr. Luther Johnson, who would become a Vice President in our company and be a trusted friend and advisor; and Dr. Bob Maris, who would help with the validation of the PPI, be an unconditionally caring and giving friend, and who would interpret spiritual contributions to PCM.

The research took several years. By early 1982 the research was completed—with interesting results (Kahler, 2009). Now the 1972 research made sense. When I went back to it and inserted the new hypothesis, the data became significant at the $>.01$ level (Kahler, 2008, p. 271). The reason that I did not get the correlational significance at first was that I didn't factor in Phasing in life. For example, only one out of three people will have and show the distress sequence of their Base, because they have not Phased—that is, their Base and Phase are the same, as is their distress sequence. Two out of three of these people have Phased, and consequently will have a different Distress Sequence than that of their Base-- that of the floor Personality Type of their Phase.

These research findings included confirmation of the six positive Personality Types, each with its own measured amount of energy and order of Character Strengths, Environmental Preference, Perception, Psychological Needs, Management Style, Personality Part, and Channel. The research also identified the normal Distress Sequence of the current Phase the individual is in, as well as the Base Distress Sequence of his or her first floor Personality Type.

Correlations further indicated that each Personality Type has a certain Psychological Need(s), and that when not met positively, the individual will attempt to get the very same need(s) met negatively—with or without awareness. This showed how and why PCM could accurately predict distress behaviors in astronauts and the rest of us.

As Terry chronicled in a letter to me (McGuire, 2010):

“Hi Taibi,

This is to confirm in writing something you and I have discussed in the past. While functioning as NASA's Lead Psychiatrist for Manned Space Flight, I predicted significant crew function between selected crew members on five occasions. The primary source of friction was commonly someone imposed upon the flights for political reasons. In four of the five instances, the conflict became visible in-flight... In each case, the behavioral predictions were Based upon what I had learned from you and the studies of Process Communication through which you guided me.

With respect and appreciation, Terence F. McGuire, M.D.”

In 1982 I incorporated Kahler Communications, Inc., and wrote and published the *Process Communication Management Seminar* with profile report (Kahler, 1982a) and the *Process Communication Model Seminar* with profile report (Kahler, 1983), each computer generated by paper and pencil *Personality Pattern Inventory* (Kahler, 1982b). Our first formal seminar was held in Little Rock, Arkansas in April, 1982. [A special thanks to Dr. Brad Spencer for his financial input and to Charlie Owen for his friendship and wise legal advice.]

The data that was derived from the research included the following:

Personality Types are correlated to both positive and negative behaviors. Paul Ware's 3 "Doors" are shown to be six mutually exclusive ways of experiencing the world, behaviorally observable as Perceptions.

<u>Ware Doors</u>	<u>Perceptions</u>
Feelings	Emotions
	Thoughts
Thoughts	Opinions
	Actions
Behaviors	Reactions (likes and dislikes)
	Inactions (reflections)

Paul Ware has now agreed with my Process Therapy Model, and has changed his original clinical theory to match PTM (Ware, 2010), as he acknowledged in the following letter.

"Dear Taibi,

Over the years we have had good times, and learned from each other. This is to confirm in writing several things you and I have talked about on many occasions since I learned about your Process Communication and Process therapy Models through my visits to you and my bringing you many times to LSU Medical Center in Shreveport to teach your materials to my staff, colleagues, residents, and interns.

You have expanded through research my three Doors of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors into six Perceptions, each one correlating to one of your six Personality Types.

I also agree with your concept of each person having all six Personality Types available in a set order to form a personality structure “condominium”, as well as one of these types being the “Base”, most used floor [i.e., strongest Perception, ego state, transaction, character strengths, etc.] and one of them being the “Phase”, which determines psychological needs and distressed sequence miniscript. When this miniscript warrants a diagnosis, it then is identified as one of my Adaptations.

I have always considered my six Adaptations as identifying distressed, miniscript behavior to the extent of warranting a “diagnosis”. Your research correlations of Base, Phase, and where this occurs in a person’s condominium adds new insight into what injunctions, games, and scripts would be involved and active. This means that we cannot just have a table of injunctions, games, and scripts to match a given miniscript or Adaptation, but need to consider the entire personality condominium structure of an individual – what is the Phase miniscript, and what have they Phased through and dealt with.

My Contact Door is what you call the Base, first floor Personality Type, open to being contacted with the matching Channel plus Perception of that type. My Trap

Door is what to avoid, so I agree that that would be any top floor in the person’s condominium with scores there less than 20%. So, agreed, whatever Channel and Perception of those floor Personality Types should be avoided as the trap. I agree that the Target is actually the Phase issue, which when dealt with results in the person phasing to the next floor, and showing more of that floor’s Perception (Door).

May we continue our friendship, learning and growing together.

Paul D. Ware, M.D.”

Process Model Confusion

From 1978 to 1982 I lectured on these Process Model concepts at TA Conferences, Institutes, trainings, and invitational gatherings throughout the world.

During these years my audiences included Vann Joines and Ian Stewart. Vann, when I presented my Process Model of six Personality Types at his Southeast Institute in Chapel Hill, and Ian when I trained in London, England in 1981. As Ian writes in the preface of Vann and his book, *Personality Adaptations*, (Joines, V. and Stewart, I., 2002), "Above all, I want to acknowledge the work and generosity of Taibi Kahler PhD, who, along with Paul Ware MD, developed much of the material described in this book. It was Taibi who (at a memorable training workshop in London, 1981) first brought home to me the power and usefulness of the model of personality Adaptations and the related ideas that make up his Process Model."

Although Joines and Stewart agree that what they call the Process Model in their book is my work, confusion has arisen, primarily due to their referencing my Process Model, mostly in its outdated form, from my 1970's publications.

To their credit, Joines and Stewart have vowed to continue to clear up any confusion about the origination and contributions to my Process Model, including correcting outdated and non-credited references in further editions and translations of *Personality Adaptations*.

Issues

In 1985 I postulated the issue for each Phase type, and began collecting data. The following table identifies the issue that will cause the Phase distressed behavior until that issue is resolved, at which time the person will Phase to the next floor of his/her condominium and have a new psychological need and a new distress sequence. Also offered is the probable early, unconscious decision associated with the issue. Note: (1) each issue is the only key to phasing for that Phase; (2) an emotion may be a cover-up or authentic, depending whether it is experienced in distress or in the condominium.

<u>Phase Emotion</u>	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Cover-up Emotion</u>	<u>Authentic</u>
-----------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------

Harmonger	Anger	Sad	Angry
The early decision is likely to be, "If I express my anger at you, I will have hurt your feelings and/or you will reject me. Therefore I will please you and hold in anger."			

Thinker	Loss	Frustratedly Angry	Sad
The early decision is likely to be, "If I don't do the thinking for you, then something bad will happen. Therefore I will be perfect and not make any mistakes, and as long as I am critical of you not thinking clearly I can avoid my grief."			

Persister	Fear	Righteously Angry	Afraid
The early decision is likely to be, "If I don't make sure you believe the right way and do the right things, then something bad will happen. Therefore I expect you to be perfect and not do the wrong thing, and as long as I am preaching at you, I can avoid my own fears."			

Imaginer	Autonomy	Insignificant	Potent
The early decision is likely to be, "Things and people can make me feel bad. Therefore I will withdraw, and as I become passive I can avoid making my own decisions."			

Rebel	Responsibility	Vengeful	Sorry
The early decision is likely to be, "If you don't do the thinking for me, then I won't be happy. Therefore I will just try hard. When you don't make me feel good, then it's your fault I feel bad, and as long as I blame you I can avoid taking responsibility for making myself feel good or feel bad."			

Promoter	Bonding	Vindictive	Intimate
The early decision is likely to be: "Things and people can make you feel bad. Therefore you will have to be strong and abandon anyone who gets too close. And as long as I abandon you, I can avoid intimacy and bonding with you."			

Around the World

For many years I lectured regularly in Mexico, the Caribbean, South America, and Europe. This provided many relationships to develop into PCM business collaborations. Initial contracts included the rights to Canada (1987) and to Belgium (1987); the following year, Denmark and France. {Dear Reader: France was a milestone for PCM and for me personally, as it created a relationship with my dear friend, Gerard Collignon, who has done so much in spreading the word of PCM, not only in France, but also now in Europe and Africa. Gerard, I am grateful for your friendship and thankful for your significant contributions to our mission: Significantly to enhance the quality of lives for generations.}

We now have representation in five continents: North America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia, with PCM having been taught in more than thirty countries, in more than a dozen languages. As of the end of 2012, we have profiled 900,000 people worldwide. Thank you, certified trainers and coaches, who number more than 3,000 over the years, and you authors of more than 50 books on or referencing PCM in its various forms.

Bill and Hillary Clinton

In 1984 I was asked by Hillary Clinton to give a private three-day PCM seminar to then Governor Bill Clinton, her, and a few of their close friends. I was immediately struck by how dedicated, bright, clear-thinking, and charming both of them were. We visited and had lunch at our home.

The very night that the seminar ended, I got a call about midnight from Bill. He informed me that he had just received a death threat on his life as well as on the lives of Hillary and his daughter, Chelsea. His security people were on the way to my house with a recording of the threat, and he asked if I would listen to it and give him all the feedback I could about the person. I did. Apparently it was of some value, because over the years in relation to a variety of situations and issues, Bill has called upon me. We became friends.

During his campaign I was asked to review and edit speeches. People listen most attentively (to a candidate) from their perceptual frame of reference. In other words, Thinkers listen through thoughts and want the candidate to give the facts. Harmonizers listen through emotions and want the candidate to give from the heart, and so on.

Therefore, how (the process of word choice) we say what we say (content) is indeed crucial to inviting people to even want to listen to us. This is the same phenomenon involved with connecting and establishing rapport in sales. Furthermore, it appears that people make major decisions (such as voting or buying) from their Phase because of the Psychological Need that is motivating them.

Once elected, the Clintons chose PCM to be used in training the White House staff.

Process Education Model

Our Process Education Model (PEM) has helped us fulfill our mission statement by spreading the information to educators, students, and parents. And for more than twenty years Joe and Judy Pauley have been the leaders of PEM, speaking at conferences, training at colleges and universities, writing books and papers, encouraging PEM masters theses and research, and impacting the lives of thousands of youths around the nation.

I know of no more dedicated a couple to the values of our model, and what it means in the lives of educators and students. Their efforts and results have not gone unnoticed. In November of 2008 at the U. S. conference of the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network (NDPN) at Clemson University, attended by 1,300 educators, Dr. Judy and Joe Pauley, were presented the Crystal Star Award by the NDPN. This honored them as the persons who made the most significant contributions to education in America in helping kids to want to and do stay in school. {Dear Reader: Please join me in saying to Joe and Judy, "Thank you for your perseverance and dedication. We are most grateful to you and for all you have given us....And, yes... You aren't done yet! □"} }

The Pauleys are retiring in 2013 from managing PEM, but not from PCM or PEM. They have chosen my good friend and colleague, Dr. Michael Gilbert to take over the leadership of PEM. Michael has been responsible for the supporting of many dissertations, as well as his own research, including a recent validation study of the PPI with Ryan Donlan and Frimpomaa Ampaw. To date in the U. S., PEM and PCM have been the topic for 38 dissertations and theses, and has been taught in 29 colleges and universities.

Some interesting additional information includes:

The Base Personality Type of an individual is either present at birth (my belief) or develops soon thereafter, and according to test-retest reliability research does not likely change in life (Stansbury, 1990, funded by a grant from NASA).

Observations from 1978 to 1996 of more than 20,000 children in Brevard Community College Day Care Centers by Process trained professional parent educators (Geier, 2007) support that the order of the Personality Types (i.e., the individual's personality condominium) is set by about seven years of age.

Research also supports Phasing and Phase issues, including dealing with the Phase issue associated racket and underlying authentic emotion: Face validity: 97% of participants in our Advanced Seminar who had Phased reported that they had experienced the expected (theorized) frequent and intense Phase distress sequence in resolving that issue, and then Phased. Of these, 93% reported that they had experienced the expected (theorized) associated issue cover-up emotion, and then the underlying authentic emotion (Kahler, 2008).

The Future of the Process Model

I have no intention of shuffling off this mortal coil anytime in the near future, but when I do the model is in good hands. My friend and trusted colleague Rob Wert will captain and guide the ship ably.

And we have so many others of you, who will be carrying on the model message to help the quality of lives for millions. My sincere thanks and appreciation.

International Owners: Gerard Collignon (Africa and France); Cyril Collignon (Europe); Jacques Leloup (Belgium); Ulla Lindroth (Finland); Miyako and Isao Miyata (Japan); Rainer Musselmann (Austria, Germany, Switzerland); Andrea and Werner Naef (Australia and New Zealand); Jean Pierre Raffalli (Luxemburg); John Parr (Romania).

PCM Master Trainers: Gerard Collignon, Michael Gilbert, Luther Johnson, Jerome Lefevre, Jacques Leloup, Hideyuki Masuda, Isao Miyata, Miyako Miyata, Rainer Musselmann, Andrea Naef, Werner Naef, John Parr (also Certifying Master Trainer), Joseph Pauley, Judith Pauley, Nathan Regier (also Certifying Master Trainer), Robert Wert.

PEM Master Trainers: Michael Gilbert, Joseph Pauley, Judith Pauley, Nathan Regier.

PTM Master Trainers: Michael Brown, Gerard Collignon, Rainer Musselmann, John Parr, Nathan Regier.

“Cognosco, ergo sum.” T. K.

References:

- Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Berne, E. (1970). *Sex in human loving*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Dusay, J. (1972). Egograms and the “constancy hypothesis”. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 2(3), 37-41.
- Erskine, R. and Zalcman, M. (1979). The racket system: a model of racket analysis. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 9(1).
- Geier, S. Email of October, 7, 2007. Appendix B. *The process therapy model: the six personality types with adaptations*. Little Rock: Taibi Kahler Associates, Inc..
- Harris, T. (1967). *I'm OK – You're OK*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Joines, V. and Stewart, I. (2002). *Personality adaptations*. Chapel Hill: Lifespace Publishing.
- Kahler, T. (1971). The effects of teacher management process code via video tape feedback on the verbal behavior of student teachers. Purdue University, thesis.
- Kahler, T. (1972). Predicting academic underachievement in ninth and twelfth grade males with the Kahler transactional analysis script checklist. Purdue University, dissertation.
- Kahler, T., with Capers, H. (1974). The miniscript. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Kahler, T. (1975a). Drivers: The key to the process scripts. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 5(3), 280-284.
- Kahler, T. (1975b). Structural analysis: A focus on stroke rationale, a parent continuum, and egograms. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 5(3), 267-271.
- Kahler, T. (1975c). Scripts: Process and content. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 5(3), 277-279.
- Kahler, T. (1978a). *Transactional analysis revisited*. Little Rock: Human Development Publications.
- Kahler, T. (1978b). *Process communication model in brief*. Little Rock: Taibi Kahler Associates, Inc..
- Kahler, T. (1979a). *Managing with the process communication model*. Little Rock: Human Development Publications.
- Kahler, T. (1979b). *Process therapy in brief*. Little Rock: Human Development Publications.

- Kahler, T. (1982a). *Process communication management seminar*. Little Rock: Taibi Kahler Associates, Inc..
- Kahler, T. (1982b). *Personality pattern inventory validation studies*. Little Rock: Kahler Communications, Inc.
- Kahler, T. (1983). *Process communication model*. Little Rock: Kahler Communication, Inc.
- Kahler, T. (1996). *Personality pattern inventory (revised)*. Little Rock: Kahler Communication, Inc.
- Kahler, T. (2008). *The process therapy model: the six personality types with adaptations*. Little Rock: Taibi Kahler Associates, Inc.
- Kahler, T. (2009). Research. <http://kahlercommunications.com/research.html> and <http://www.kahlercom.com/research.html>.
- Karpman, S. (1968). Fairy tales and script drama analysis. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 7(26), 40-41.
- McGuire, T. (2010). Written communication. February 20, 2010.
- Stansbury, P. (1990). Report of adherence to theory discovered when the personality pattern inventory was administered twice. Little Rock: Kahler Communications.
- Three-Sixty Pacific, (1992). *Manual for insight to greater personal and professional success*. Campbell: Three-Sixty Pacific, Inc.
- Ware, P. (1983). Personality adaptations: Doors to therapy. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 13, 11-19.
- Ware, P. (2010). Written communication, November 10, 2010.