

# **Learning Self Psychology Abroad: The Turkish Experience**

By

Irem Anli, Yavuz Erten, Sibel Mercan, Allen Siegel, Alper Şahin,  
Ayşe Özalkuş Sahin, Melis Tanık, Nilgün Taşkıntuna, Verda Tüzer

**(This paper was delivered at the annual meeting of the Council for  
Psychoanalytic Self Psychology, held in Chicago in 2003)**

### **Introduction**

The Self Psychology community is spread across the globe. Training in the theory and practice of a self psychologically informed psychotherapy and psychoanalysis, however, has primarily been available only to people who live in select cities within the US. Those in the rest of the world, as well as some in the US, have not had easy access to the training in Self Psychology they desire. The purpose of this paper and workshop is to share the experience of one group, The Anatolia Center for Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy, a group that has confronted this problem and is actively engaged in the process of working toward its solution. It is our hope that our experience in distant education might be of benefit to you.

## Learning Psychoanalysis in Turkey

When one visits the International Psychoanalytic Association's website to learn what is going on in psychoanalysis worldwide, one sees that psychoanalysis exists on three major continents: North America, Europe, and South America. Although psychoanalytic institutes exist in Australia, Australia is not yet counted as one of the major continents. The European continent is similarly limited, and includes only Western Europe. Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Central Asia, and the Far East are the "others" of psychoanalysis. With globalization and the dissolution of the Eastern Block, the last decade has seen the introduction of these "others" to, rather than the more appropriate *reunion* with, psychoanalysis. This has been the case of Eastern Europe in particular, where the labor pains involved in the creation of formal structures, such as the informal groups that evolve into study groups that finally become institutes have been part of analytic life. It is clear that psychoanalysis is experiencing a global revival and a quantum leap forward after several decades of stagnation. With this leap, however, the psychoanalytic establishment is confronted with incorporating practitioners and patients who are neither Western, Christian, nor white.

Many other changes in the global formal and informal organization of psychoanalysis accompany this shift. The beginning of a subtle shift from the traditional established center of psychoanalysis toward the periphery seems evident. This new decentralization is strikingly present in the following ways: **1.**

in terms of the creation of organizations other than the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA); **2.** in terms of the psychotherapeutic center moving from psychiatry towards clinical psychology and social work; **3.** in terms of changes in the theoretical framework that moves from mainstream psychoanalysis, which is an amalgam of classical theory, ego psychology, and object relations theory, towards self psychology, relational psychoanalysis, and intersubjectivity. Psychoanalysis seems to be moving from its western-based center to a new periphery. Theoretically, movement from the classical theory to new perspectives led by self-psychology is readily apparent.

The parallel between the “others” who are newly introduced to psychoanalysis and the “other psychoanalysis,” by which we mean contemporary psychoanalysis, presents an interesting focus for discussion. This paper can be viewed within the light of these new global developments.

### **Psychotherapy and Psychoanalytic Training in Turkey**

Almost all mental health professions are represented in Turkey. Medical schools offer training in psychiatry and many universities offer a B.A. in psychology while some offer an M.A. and PhD in clinical psychology. The official category of “Psychological Counselor” exists and such training is obtained through undergraduate and graduate programs in some universities. Training in social work is limited to the B.A. and M.A. degrees. Specialization for psychiatric

nurses is offered in limited and irregular training programs. Most of these programs lack an integrated and coherent curriculum that includes training in the theory and practice of psychotherapy. It is the personal interest and specialization of certain faculty members that brings bright moments to some universities. These sparks of light, however, extinguish when these people are appointed to different positions or retire. While there are important piecemeal efforts every now and then, an established tradition of psychotherapy training is rarely seen. Additionally, the nature of the available training in psychotherapy is eclectic and covers a wide spectrum of different theoretic schools. With this mixed structure in “psychotherapy,” training in psychoanalysis is not even mentioned at the teaching institutions. Unfortunately, introductory courses on Freud and psychoanalysis are the only psychoanalytic content covered in undergraduate and graduate programs.

Beginning in the late 1980s, some organizations have appeared outside of universities and have developed through the efforts of people who work independently in the field. These people are psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and psychological counselors who have come together in small groups and have established “centers” of psychoanalytically oriented education. Some of these people also work at a hospital and/or university simultaneously have part-time private practices. With pressures in the field such as the emerging cultural awareness of and need for “psychotherapy,” brought about by an embracing of a western lifestyle, competition has increased among practitioners. A desire to create a “school/institute” atmosphere developed in these “centers” and some of

the people who practiced independently began to contact institutes, schools, and psychotherapy training programs abroad. Some, who had completed specialty training or graduate programs abroad, returned to Turkey and played a part in the establishment of these connections with the West. These developments have occurred during the last 15 years, especially in Istanbul and have led to the appearance of institutes or informal pre-institute structures of varying theoretical persuasions. Psychoanalysis, psychoanalytic psychotherapy, cognitive-behavioral therapy, gestalt therapy, family therapies, psychodrama, and art therapy are all part of this development.

Today, informal groups in Turkey have formed around some Turkish analysts who have completed their training abroad. Four of these analysts are members of IPA and two of them belong to the Association for Autonomous Psychoanalytic Institutes (AAPI). Two of these informal groups represent the classical and object relations schools. In 1998, Yavuz Erten, a clinical psychologist, aided by Allen Siegel, M.D., a psychoanalyst from Chicago, Illinois, established The Anatolia Group with a group of mental health practitioners who adopt the view of contemporary psychoanalysis heavily influenced by self-psychology.

What were the prevailing local conditions when the Anatolia Group set out upon its maiden voyage in 1998? As a starting point, the first members of the group believed that there was a need for another frame of reference in Turkey for psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy. Beginning in the 1980s, Turkey opened its doors to the rest of the world and publications in other

languages became more accessible. One result of this accessibility was that a group of Turkish psychoanalysts followed the newer non-classical developments in psychoanalysis with a sense of admiration and a longing to participate in the ongoing conversation.

Since only a limited number of classically oriented psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic supervisors were available at the time, mental health specialists who were interested in contemporary psychoanalysis turned to other areas of pursuit. Around the same time, Turkey experienced an explosion in the demand for psychotherapy, but the supply of adequately trained therapists was insufficient to meet that need and the available therapists were unprepared for the demand. They were conscientious but largely unsupervised and, as a result, were shy and inhibited in their work. Nowadays, the situation seems to be gradually improving. The number of adequately trained psychotherapists is increasing due to the pressure of this demand in the field. However, as it was mentioned before, the number of classically oriented psychoanalysts still outnumber the number of analysts adhering to contemporary views. As a result, mental health professionals who are interested in learning more about self psychology, intersubjective theory, relational theories still face the struggle of being analyzed and trained by classically oriented psychoanalysts.

This discrepancy of views might seem to be a handicap for the progress of contemporary psychoanalysis within Turkey because it often creates confusion in the minds of psychotherapist-patients interested in the contemporary ideas. This

confusion, with its accompanying feelings of uncertainty and inadequacy, can be demoralizing. On the other hand, this struggle can be enriching in that one learns about multiple perspectives, beginning with the classical perspective and then building upon that foundation with the knowledge gained from teaching and eSupervision from contemporary psychoanalysts and psychotherapists.

In the end, this diversity will, hopefully, enable the psychotherapists in Turkey to create their own way of thinking by going through the dual processes of education and of their own treatment. Going through these processes without having a structured psychoanalytic education and the support of local psychoanalytic institutes makes this a difficult journey. Our feelings range from excitement and enthusiasm to confusion and discouragement.

In the “power game” that is part of psychoanalysis, self-psychology is viewed in many quarters as an oppositional position, a sort of revolt of the “other.” As we noted earlier, the fact that the non-western “other” has started to learn psychoanalysis and is attempting to become the analyzing subject rather than only the analyzed object also represents a revolt. These two conditions, an “other” psychology spreading within an “other” country, superimpose upon each other and create a feeling of anxiety within the analytic establishment.

### **The Experience of the Anatolia Group**

Since it's beginning in 1998, the Anatolia Group for Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy has been seriously involved in the study of



psychoanalysis and self-psychology. On our four-year journey we have accomplished a great deal, illustrated by the following.

1. We have obtained education in both theory and practice of self psychology through the visits of American analysts to Turkey and through regular audio-conferences with Allen Siegel. Over the past four years we have had the good fortune to have had Joe Lichtenberg, Anna and Paul Ornstein, Arnold and Connie Goldberg, Leonard Gillman, Neil Spira, and Allen and Renee Siegel visit us for multi-day conferences. In addition to these visits over the years, the group as a whole meets every six weeks for a full day symposium, either in Istanbul or Ankara. The meeting begins at 9:00 AM and continues until 4:30 PM. The meeting's format includes a morning discussion of books, articles, or films that have been assigned by Dr Siegel who joins the symposium at 2:30 PM via a tele-conference connection

During the meetings before the conference call the group reads and studies the assigned material together. Most recently we have been reading Kohut's "The Analysis of the Self" which is available in Turkish. Different people volunteer to prepare different parts of the book and present it to the group. The members then discuss what they either do or do not understand and later ask relevant questions of Dr. Siegel during the afternoon tele-conference. Over the past four years approximately 30 articles have been translated into Turkish and studied during these meetings.

In the tele-conference Dr. Siegel discusses both theory and clinical issues. He selects the reading assignments so that they shed light upon the clinical material that either has been or will be discussed by the group. The tele-conferences give the group members an opportunity to ask questions of Dr. Siegel, who is helpful and encouraging, as the members struggle to understand some difficult concepts. At times they freely challenge him on issues and a lively conversation ensues.

One of the downsides of these regular meetings has been their infrequency. The members would have a deeper understanding of the theory, in a shorter period of time, if it were possible for them to meet more often. The group, however, now consists of 52 people, some of whom travel significant distances to come to the meetings. This geographical problem makes more frequent meetings impossible. As a solution, some of the group members have decided to form smaller study groups that can meet monthly to read seminal articles. We are hoping to develop a curriculum to guide us in what we need to read, and in what order, so that the members can build solid theoretical foundation upon which they can develop their own ideas

2. We have obtained face-to-face supervision from analysts and psychoanalytically oriented therapists in Turkey. We also have developed a program of email supervision from eleven self-psychologists in the US. Our eSupervision groups are composed of four or five members who usually email their US supervisors on a weekly basis. We will expand on this component of our development shortly. At this point, however, we want to thank our

supervisors, Denise Davis, Connie Goldberg, Jackie Gottholt, Ruth Gruenthal, Sallee Jenkins, Anna Ornstein, Renee and Allen Siegel, David Solomon, Dori Sorter, and Jeffrey Stern for their invaluable contributions.

3. Obviously, the most important part of analytic training is the training analysis, an area that presents serious problems for us. The extreme shortage of analysts living in Turkey, coupled with the financial difficulty inherent in obtaining an analysis, means that only some of our members have the opportunity for an analytic experience. Others are treated in psychoanalytic psychotherapy.

The problematic issue of obtaining training analysis in countries that currently lack sufficient numbers of training analysts is a subject that this workshop might address. In Turkey, special problems arise for analysands who are interested in the self psychological perspective since the available Turkish analysts are classically oriented. The analysands' analytic experience creates an internal contradiction with the self psychological ideas they believe in and use in their daily practice. The analytic process for these people often contradicts the understandings they employ in their own work. One of our members, for instance, mentioned to his analyst during a session that he was afraid that something might have happened to the analyst in the recent earthquake in Istanbul. The analyst interpreted this as an aggressive phantasy directed toward the analyst. That same day, this therapist was surprised when one of his

patients voiced exactly the same fear about him. Our member interpreted this concern as an expression of anxiety over losing someone who really understood the patient, especially after the patient had searched for so long for such a person.

How is such a dilemma experienced and how does an analysand overcome it? What follows are observations of phenomena that exist in people who have to live with this dilemma:

The analysand has mixed emotions about the training analysis. As an analyst from Chicago recently put it when he visited the Anatolia Group, "He/she postpones the hoped for analytic cure to the real analysis he/she is going to enter after finishing this 'ticket-analysis.'" He/she hopes that this second analysis will be with someone who really understands them.

Under the influence of unconscious transference process he/she begins to distance themselves from self-psychology and, in some instances, even becomes reactive against self-psychology.

Another outcome of this dilemma is that the analysand loses interest in both mainstream psychoanalysis and contemporary psychoanalysis and begins to question whether he/she really wants to work in this profession.

Finally, there is a group of people who attempt to integrate these seemingly contradictory perspectives by finding similarities amongst them and by understanding the differences. The increasing interest in Winnicott's work might

be understood in the light of this effort.

Another major issue we have faced during the process of the past four-years and continue to face, is the doubt and fear about whether our training would have any credibility and meaning in the eyes of international psychoanalytic organizations. Other groups in Turkey were viewed as taking valid steps toward becoming IPA-members. The Anatolia Group, on the other hand, has neither official recognition nor support and approval of either the IPA or the self-psychology community. Our continued investment in such uncertainty has been a real “trial of faith.” This “faith problem” has been especially hard to bear when, at the same time, we have had to endure the previously noted dilemma about training analyses. In time, under the influence of these pressures, our group has developed internal disputes, conflicts and polarizations. Different groups within the larger group have formed and we have had conflicts with each other and with the group administrators.

A heterogeneity that arises from the lack of standards in the previous educational experiences of the group members has caused difficulties in establishing an organizational structure. Efforts to minimize this heterogeneity by introducing certain “requirements” for participation in the group have turned into conflicts about excluding and being excluded and have given rise to discussions and concerns of “elitism.”

These problems, nevertheless, do not represent the entire four-year experience of the Anatolia Group. Our experience also embraces many strengths and a

great deal of optimism. We bring these problems to the attention of this workshop because we believe that addressing them openly will help us, as well as others, who experience similar difficulties.

## **eSupervision**

### **The Establishment of eSupervision Groups**

One central part of our experience in distant education has revolved around the supervision we were able to obtain via the internet. Because this experience has been so important to us, and can similarly be beneficial to others, we will describe it in detail.

The thought of obtaining supervision via e-mail was first considered after our group read the article, "eSupervision; Something New Under The Sun" written by Allen Siegel, M.D. (1999). Dr. Sibel Mercan, one of the group members was looking for a supervisor with a self-psychological perspective at the time. She contacted Dr. Siegel for supervision and they decided to attempt supervision in a group. The costly nature of individual supervision from a supervisor in a foreign country as well as the lack of Turkish professionals who specialized in self psychology in Turkey were the motivators of Dr. Mercan's search for an e-supervision group. The first e-supervision group began as an experimental study by Dr. Mercan and Dr. Serpil Vargel, two members of the Anatolian Group.

### **Determining the Number and the Qualities of the Supervisees:**

Size is an important factor in creating an e-supervision group. The group needs to be small enough to be productive for all the members while, at the same time, the number of supervisees must be large enough to cover the expenses. Also, Dr. Siegel recommended at the outset of this experiment that the eSupervision group consist of members who knew each other, trusted each other and felt comfortable being together. Dr. Mercan and Dr. Vargel sought out people with whom they had previously had group supervision. Once they found a third member for the group they proceeded to make admission to the group a matter of shared group decision. If one member of the group voted not to accept a particular candidate, that candidate was not accepted into the group. Eventually a group of five members was created and a decision was made to limit the group to that number. Groups that formed later decided to follow this format and limited membership to four or five members.

### **The First eSupervision Group Experience**

Dr. Mercan, who presented the first patient in this supervisory format, struggled with a number of issues. She had to summarize the sessions, transcribe the process microscopically as she recalled it, and then translate the material into English. A very difficult task for her was to conduct the treatment in as natural a way as possible, despite the shadow of the group falling on her sessions. As the room got crowded, her anxiety naturally increased. Adding to

all of this was the experience of sharing the co-created product of her patient's and her own subjective world with a supervisor whom she had never met.

Initially, the group decided to follow the same case for an open ended amount of time and study it thoroughly. The letters sent to Dr. Siegel each week included the current session notes plus one question from each member of the group that arose from either the previous session or from something that Dr Siegel had written in the previous letter. A pattern evolved in which the session notes were sent to Dr Siegel and the group members on the same day every week. Dr. Siegel usually sent his response, addressed to the whole group, also on the same day of the week. Initially, individual group members sent their individual responses on different days of the week. This flurry of emails created some confusion, so the group decided to write a joint e-mail that included all the individual feedback and that email was also sent on the same day of the week. Inadvertently, a structure evolved and, once this structure was created, the supervision ran smoothly.

Problems, however, arose over time. Because the person who presents is the one who benefits the most, other group members also wanted to present a case. It seemed that the group interest was decreasing with supervision being directed at only one case. As a result of this development, the group decided to meet face-to-face, instead of only via email, and work out the problem. In that meeting some interpersonal issues were addressed and the group decided that each member would present a case every two months. This intervention grew out of the group process and was quite productive.



## **The Beginning of New eSupervision Groups**

After the success of the initial group it became clear that there was a need to establish more eSupervision groups and new groups were formed in February 2002, nearly two years after the formation of the first group. eSupervision group issues such as the frequency of e-mails and the procedure for presenting cases were determined according to the desires, needs and conditions of the supervisors and the supervisees within any particular group. We did not establish rigid requirements for how the supervision was to be conducted.

Currently, we have ten eSupervision groups. Some of the groups feel quite comfortable with their structure and are functioning very well, others, however, have experienced some difficulties with the process, including one group in which the supervisor decided that supervision was not something with which he/she was comfortable

The fee of \$10 per person per letter is clearly quite symbolic with respect to the effort and amount of time that the supervisors voluntarily invest in this process. The supervisees appreciate this effort and feel indebted to the supervisors for their generosity. We cannot end this section without acknowledging the effort Dr. Siegel has made in contacting eSupervisors and in establishing and monitoring these supervision groups.

## **An Example From One of the Newly Established eSupervision Groups**

One of the newly established e-supervision groups that is working regularly and well is the one supervised by Dr. David Solomon. The group consists of four members. A case has been presented each week since February 2002, except for a few months during summer. Each week, after the case is presented, group members e-mail their comments about the material and Dr. Solomon then responds to them. This group has had the unique experience of following a patient who comes from two different cultures other than Turkish and American. The sessions are conducted in English. The result of this supervision is that a platform for four different cultures communicating with one other has been created. The supervisees have found this to be an incredibly rich experience.

## **Advantages of Written Material**

In supervision all the material is communicated in written form, which makes it easy to review the material and make many connections and comparisons that would not be possible in face-to-face supervision. Besides the comments about the case, transmission of theoretical knowledge and suggestions for reading material regarding the subject at hand adds to the richness of the learning experience. Coincidentally, the process of supervision creates what is almost a book that has a primary author (the patient), three

commentators (supervisees), and an editor (supervisor). We especially appreciate the opportunity eSupervision has given us to reread and study the material as often as we feel the need. We are reminded of the Latin proverb, "*Verba Volant, Scripta Manent*" which means, words can be forgotten but writing remains.

### **Disadvantages of Written Material: The Issue of Privacy Over the Internet and Lack of Face-to-Face Communication**

Since there is no way of establishing a completely safe internet environment yet and the fact that hackers can invade even the government's computer systems, we are led to a concern about the issue of our patients' confidentiality during supervision via e-mail.

Unlike face-to-face supervision, written material and transmission of the therapeutic process over Internet creates a potential problem regarding privacy. For example, in a case that was being supervised via supervision, the client experienced an important event that was covered in a major way on the news. The details of the event had been discussed during the session. During supervision, however, the details of the event were hidden in an effort to make the client unidentifiable. In this kind of situation the supervisee might have to communicate with the supervisor in the privacy of a one-to-one email note. While such an action steps outside the frame of the group, when one considers the privacy risks of eSupervision such an action might be required. Also, as a

precaution, supervisees either print a hard copy or save the written material as soon as they can in order to delete the files from the Internet environment.

## **Interaction Between the Group Members and Its Contribution to the Group eSupervision**

Although the initial idea of eSupervision arose out of financial considerations, over time we have come to see advantages of group supervision. While often unknown to the supervisor who is limited to communication via email, group members make contributions, suggestions, and criticism over the phone or during face-to-face meetings. They talk with each other about things they found unclear during supervision and, if they cannot clarify it among themselves, turn to their supervisor for an answer. Issues of the treatment become more understandable as the text is read and interpreted by a number of people. This extra-internet communication seems to be important for the person who presents the case as it seems to diminish the opportunities for misunderstandings that is a part of faceless, voiceless email communication.

Since the communication of the group members outside the Internet environment may be unknown to the supervisor, at times the supervisor feels that the group is being silent. The issue of silence has been raised often during supervision. One of the group members who had experienced both group analysis and group supervision explained, "What could happen in a virtual environment where written materials come and go? When I started writing, I

realized that even only being a reader, not a presenter, has a meaning. Feelings such as being silent, withdrawn, curious, etc. are all a part of this process.”

During the group supervision, the silence of a member became an issue that needed to be understood, just like every issue. This meant that the process among the supervisees was followed just as the process is followed in an individual face-to-face supervision. During this process, the disagreements, negotiations, and the meeting or failing to meet the expectations of the group members are issues that can be expressed.

### **First Face-to-Face Meeting with the Supervisor**

The establishment of the first group occurred over the Internet. The group did not meet with the supervisor in person until one and one-half years had passed. This meeting was attended with deep anxiety by all the supervisees. One of the supervisees worked on this anxiety with her analyst who told her that this anxiety was due to the supervisee’s tendency to idealize her supervisor and stated, “Yes, your supervisor is also a human being and just like you, she eats and sleeps. That is what you realized, right?”.

As we noted earlier, eSupervision provides written material that carries a number of advantages. One advantage of written material is that it provides an opportunity for people for whom English is not a mother tongue to study the material with the help of dictionaries and the support of the other members.

Without that advantage, the thought of having a face-to-face meeting with the supervisor triggered group members' anxiety around their proficiency in English.

Another important point was that while group members knew each other with varying degrees of closeness before the supervision, they had only known each other in the intimacy of eSupervision for 1.5 years. They had rarely interacted with one another in a real environment. One effect of the face-to-face meeting with the supervisor was to increase the group's cohesion and motivation. This group has now met together for supervision a few times and this addition to the eSupervision has been helpful. The group became more productive and, if economic conditions in Turkey allow, it seems useful for the group to come together at least once a year.

### **Summary of eSupervision**

#### **The Advantages of eSupervision**

The written material makes it possible for the supervisee to review and reconsider the therapeutic process a number of times, enabling the reader to focus on the case with an increasing acuity. The experience of writing the process notes creates an optimal distance from the material and enables the supervisee to see the process in a way that is impossible during the actuality of the session.

eSupervision is a time efficient procedure that allows the supervisee to reach the supervisor and the group members without having any concerns about time. Everyone involved works on the material when they have time which eases the pressures that are felt in the course of a very busy life.

The cultural differences between patient, supervisor and supervisee require that the differences that each case brings must be articulated and communicated to the supervisor and the group members. This seems to be a rich way of exchanging ideas, theories, and comments between different countries and cultures. The cultural differences sometimes require the supervisee to define and express himself/herself precisely rather than simply translate the words from Turkish to English. When the session notes are written, all senses (sight, smell, hearing, touch and taste) are used and put into words in an effort to remediate the missing elements that are present in a face-to-face relationship.

We find it a special experience to get supervision from a supervisor who represents the theoretical orientation the supervisee is interested in learning. Concepts come to life in a clear manner as the supervisor helps put the theory into practice.

## **The Disadvantages of eSupervision:**

When the material is translated into English, the subtleties of the Turkish language, that make the material more meaningful, may get lost and the material is in danger of turning into a dull text.

Since eSupervision lacks real time interaction, questions that come immediately to mind and need immediate responses to enable a line of thought to continue cannot be immediately answered.

The absent non-verbal elements of communication such as tone, gesture and facial cues are responsible for complicating communication. Their absence results in misunderstandings that occur with some regularity.

The absent non-verbal elements also create a platform for intense transference reactions towards the supervisor. What is lacking in direct communication gets filled in with projections, assumptions, fantasies, memories, and inferences. Some supervisees who are early in the process of learning to be a therapist readily transfer their past experiences into the virtual environment. When this occurs, the supervisor and the supervisees have to deal with variables that are easier to work with in face-to-face supervision.

The supervisee who presents a case benefits the most from the supervision.



The others in the group work hard to grasp the case and experience the process. This seems to be a bit more difficult than what one experiences in face-to-face supervision, but we find that it certainly is possible. Not being able to ask spontaneous questions of the presenter can have a frustrating impact on the group members who sometimes withdraw into a silence. The silence, in turn, can trigger an assortment of negative feelings and the members, supervisor included, can temporarily lose their motivation.

All these difficulties have occurred in one or more of our nine groups at some time. They have been recognized and overcome either by face-to-face interventions, when possible, or by group members exploring the process together in either real or virtual time. The lesson here is that while struggles occur in group eSupervision they can be dealt with when the group approaches this unique experience with an openness born of the realization that special problems will occur in cyber supervision. Entering the eSupervision experience with an awareness of this potential leads to its eventual solution.

## **Conclusion**

We conclude our paper by stating some important points that were previously discussed in another article written by Yavuz Erten (2002) and published in the Self Psychology Newsletter.

The Anatolia Group has traveled a long way since 1998. We are thankful to everyone, and especially to our American friends, who supported us on our

way. We feel, however, that our pride in what we have accomplished should not conceal the shortcomings we still have to face. The needs of Anatolia members can be grouped under a number of headings:

a. The primary need of our group members is the training analysis that comprises the most important part of psychoanalytic training. The limited number of psychoanalysts who currently live in Turkey presents a distinct problem for us. The “shuttle analysis” model developed by the IPA in recent years could be one possible answer. Psychoanalysts in Europe who are familiar with Self Psychology could be contacted instead of those in the too distant USA.

b. The theoretical training of the Anatolia members is a relatively easy problem to solve through regular visits of teachers from other countries. The financial dimension of these visits, however, is not easy for the citizens of a country like Turkey, which, similar to other countries, has been heavily influenced by a severe economic crisis. Funds need to be raised to finance regular visits.

c. With Allen Siegel’s efforts and the implementation of the “eSupervision” concept, we have taken a giant step in the training

we need through supervision. These efforts, however, need to be enhanced through “shuttle supervisions.”

d. We believe that it is not merely a dream to implement a certificate program that consists of three elements: i) shuttle analyses, ii) seminars that follow a certain curriculum, and iii) supervision that continues for a certain number of years. The four-year “distant-learning” NTP (National Training in Psychoanalysis) program by NIP (National Institute for Psychotherapies), founded by Self Psychologist James Fosshage is one example of a successful model.

e. The Anatolia Group will benefit from collaboration with other groups in Europe. To reasonably implement this collaboration we need the regulatory contributions of International Self Psychology Associations. We can use IPA’s “study groups” in European and Eastern European countries as a model. This model consists of training, shuttle analyses, and funding for scholarships. We believe that a similar synergy needs to be created within the Self Psychology Community. This is true for other countries where Self-Psychology is going through an early stage of development, as well as for us.

We are aware that training is a lengthy and difficult journey. We know that merely being on the way is a very special and pleasurable experience. However, we know that the ability to pass the acquired knowledge to following generations and establish a Self Psychology tradition in our country will require the institutionalization and implementation of set standards. This is inevitable for us. In this developmental process we need the help and guidance of the International Self Psychology Community.

### **References**

Siegel, A., Topel, E., (2000), eSupervision: Something New Under the Sun, in *Progression Self Psychology, vol 16*, ed. A. Goldberg. Hillside, NJ. The Analytic Press.

Erten, Y. (2002), Self Psychology in Turkey: The Distant Learning Experience of the Anatolia Group for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy, in *Self Psychology News*, ed. A Siegel p 19-20.

PAGE

PAGE 17

