

rapport



ISSUE THIRTEEN

AUTUMN 2008

Lisa Butcher

On Cognitive
Hypnotherapy

NLP

and Motorsport

The Butterfly Effect

Michael Carroll

Robert Dilts

Generative
Collaboration

THE MAGAZINE FOR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUBSCRIPTION ONLY



Welcome to the Autumn issue of Rapport.

I'm really hoping that by the time you read this, we are enjoying some 'Indian Summer' weather, to make up for our wet Summer. Mind you, regardless of the weather outside, the sun is always shining in our office.

For those of you who do find yourselves needing that extra bit of resilience on occasions, Cait has written a beautiful article which puts everything into perspective (p12).

On page 6, Andy controversially asks whether the NLP community is really a community. I'd like to think so – I believe we can make a much bigger impact and achieve so much more by working together and supporting each other, especially in these challenging times. Am I too much of an idealist? Well, if I am, I'm in good company, because Robert Dilts is a firm believer in generative collaboration (p10)

Talking of challenging times, Teresa Reay tells us how we can develop strategies for coping with the Credit Crunch – very topical, and some really useful tips as well.

So with the credit crunch in our minds, let's bear in mind what things we may be doing now, that will have a huge impact on our future. Michael Carroll explains about the Butterfly Effect (p16)

I think I'm going to move to Ireland, where Anne Marie Ferris is doing some wonderful work transforming the prospects of young people, as Eve reports on page 18. On second thoughts, with our new home so nearly complete, and counting down the days we have to live in a caravan at last, I think I'll stay put for now!

Until next time

Karen x

rapport contents autumn 2008

- 4 NLP
Presuppositions
- 6 DEBATE
Is NLP a community?
- 8 BASIC NLP
Police your state
- 9 CONFERENCE REVIEW
Sea of Change



26



20

- *10 NLP
Robert Dilts
- 12 PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
Resilience under pressure

- *16 NLP
The butterfly effect

- 18 EDUCATION
Helping children learn for life

- 20 INTERNATIONAL
United Arab Emirates

- *22 CELEBRITY
Lisa Butcher

- 24 BUSINESS
Credit crunch

- 26 HEALTH
NLP and nutrition

- 30 COACHING
Martha Beck

- *32 NLP
What drives Robert Ford

- 34 BUSINESS SUPPORT
Building a better website

- 36 RESEARCH
NLP and academia

- 38 TRAINING
GWIZ learning



24

44

22

Cover stories*

- 40 DIARY
Events taking place over the next few months

- 43 BOOK REVIEWS
The latest books reviewed by our panel

- 44 AUTHOR INTERVIEW
Lindsey Agness

- 46 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Be bold and opinionated

- 48 REGIONAL GROUPS
Worcestershire Group

- 46 ENDNOTE
Proposed legislation

Editorial Team:
Caitlin Collins, Andy Coote, Eve Menezes
Cunningham
Team@rapportmag.com, 0845 053 1162
Art Editor: Enzo Zanelli
Advertising: David Hammond
david@rapportmag.com, 0845 053 1189
Membership, subscriptions and back issues: Lala Ali Khan
Members@anlp.org, 0845 053 1162

Publisher: Karen Moxom
karen@rapportmag.com
0845 053 1162
Company Reg No. 05390486
Phoenix Publishing Ltd
41 Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1LD
Rapport published by Phoenix
Publishing on behalf of ANLP.
Design: Square Eye Design

DISCLAIMER The views within this magazine are not necessarily those of the publisher, nor does the publisher endorse the products or services promoted in the magazine. Articles are for information only and intent is to inform. Readers should seek professional advice before adopting any suggestions or purchasing any products herein.



David Rowan

NLP, Talking Therapies and the proposed Psychotherapy Legislation by the HPC

As Practitioners, Trainers and Master Practitioners of NLP, we may debate amongst ourselves whether or not what we do may be considered to be a therapy, a coaching process or a form of personal development and education. We might wonder whether we are engaged in an art that is mystical or a practice that is medical; is NLP advanced personal coaching or a healing profession of the mind?

To those outside of our field, the distinctions may be less clear and for the general public there may be no distinctions at all; for them, we are proponents of some kind of guiding care that involves talking ... and we engage in the act of influencing an individual's mind.

For those in private practice, the general public, our clients, are the bread and butter of our trade; and they are the most important people in any debate regarding legislation, insurance or quality assurance. For the public, it is important that we are perceived as competent professionals, happy to stand tall beneath the harsh gaze of any critique; confident in the efficacy of our trade. We get results; great results – do we not?

We can often provide reams of anecdotal evidence of our work and yet, for the public, let alone the NHS, BPS and the scientific community at large, we need to either provide what might be termed, 'hard science', to support our claims or, to reassure our potential customers that we are on a par with all the other talking therapies available in the market place, we need to be members of the talking profession's club: the can-do register. We need to demonstrate that we are an

equal choice and that we meet the stringent national standard of good practice. Above all, our clients need to know that if an unscrupulous member of society should acquire our skills and lurk within our ranks then this rogue element will be identified and removed. It is vital for our good name that our clients are properly protected. As far as the general public is concerned, this would mean our inclusion on a national register of approved talking therapies. To be excluded, surely, would indeed raise an eye brow of suspicion.

That a stringent standard of good practice does not yet exist raises an eye brow of many a new student of NLP training; the breath of the undertaking to create such a register is not always apparent. For example, if an individual were to talk to a taxi driver about a personal problem, in that specific moment the taxi driver is performing a psychotherapeutic role. How can we legislate for that? Should we even try? Is it possible to legislate for a code of practice every time two adults consent to engage in a conversation for the purpose of a mutual benefit or exchange?

So far, the HPC; Health Professions Council, is still at an embryonic stage of forming such a blanket code of practice and the pluralistic nature of talking therapies is not lending itself to a clear cut, results/target driven system at all. They are forging ahead though and it might be a wise step for all exponents of talking therapies to ensure that their particular method and approach is included in any register that may arise. At present, the HPC is fact finding;

gathering as much information as it can about methodologies and perspectives so that it can attempt to create a code of practice and procedure that will suit all and inhibit none. Given the diverse range of approaches and practices within the talking therapies profession, it is hardly surprising that the formulation of a stringent working practice that all of us should adhere to has ground to a halt. The letters pages of The Times have been busy voicing the opinions from a diverse range of guilds, academics and universities. It would seem that the breadth of approaches in the field of talking therapies is so broad that a set of guidelines that supports one practice would be stifling to another. Personally, I think such an approach is unworkable. To create a flexible set of guidelines is probably more workable and possibly reassuring enough for the public. It is also possible, of course, that there might be an agenda within the HPC to eradicate certain talking therapies or practices by making it impossible for them to continue.

Meanwhile then, while the HPC is unable to find agreement on the specifics of working practices between the more well known and recognised talking therapies, it would be wise for the NLP organisations to ensure that they are included on any forthcoming registers. If NLP is truly a technology and a methodology then this too needs to be included in the approved skill listings created by the HPC.

We might not like the idea of legislation or restrictions placed around our methodologies or approaches; what about our freedoms? We're not criminals!

No, we are not criminals, but some people are. We are professional and competent, but some people aren't. Most of us, I imagine, enter NLP for humanitarian reasons but some are motivated by nothing other than profit. A profit hungry human being, armed and primed with skills in hypnotic manipulation of the highest calibre is a daunting prospect; the potential for the creation of which is present within every training room.

We have laws in society. Some people break them. Society votes every 5 years to continue the practice of having a society that polices its rogue elements; we are willing to have a highway code, accident insurance and a licence of competency to drive; to protect ourselves from dangerous rogues. Is it a problem for NLP if we take just as much care to reassure our clients that it is safe for them to place their trust, their very mind, in our hands?

We could be rebellious and partisan about legislation; and find ourselves marginalised and ultimately unable to practice within the law. Alternatively, we can embrace the concept of legislation and take this as a golden opportunity to fully take our place on the playing field of talking therapies. We have been frowned upon too long by narrow viewpoints and fearful antagonists. Quite literally, the process of legislation may provide us with the chance to get even. ●

If you'd like to know more, please visit: www.hpc-uk.org

David Rowan MA:
MAP@davidrowan.co.uk

NLP, Talking Therapies and the proposed Psychotherapy Legislation by the HPC

David Rowan

As Practitioners, Trainers and Master Practitioners of NLP, we may debate amongst ourselves whether or not what we do may be considered to be a therapy, a coaching process or a form of personal development and education. We might wonder whether we are engaged in an art that is mystical or a practice that is medical; is NLP advanced personal coaching or a healing profession of the mind ?

To those outside of our field, the distinctions may be less clear and for the general public there may be no distinctions at all; for them, we are proponents of some kind of guiding care that involves talking ... and we engage in the act of influencing an individual's mind.

For those in private practice, the general public, our clients, are the bread and butter of our trade; and they are the most important people in any debate regarding legislation, insurance or quality assurance. For the public, it is important that we are perceived as competent professionals, happy to stand tall beneath the harsh gaze of any critique; confident in the efficacy of our trade. We get results; great results – do we not ?

We can often provide reams of anecdotal evidence of our work and yet, for the public, let alone the NHS, BPS and the scientific community at large, we need to either provide what might be termed, 'hard science', to support our claims or, to reassure our potential customers that we are on a par with all the other talking therapies available in the market place, we need to be members of the talking profession's club: the *can-do* register. We need to demonstrate that we are an equal choice and that we meet the stringent national standard of good practice. Above all, our clients need to know that if an unscrupulous member of society should acquire our skills and lurk within our ranks then this rogue element will

be identified and removed. It is vital for our good name that our clients are properly protected. As far as the general public is concerned, this would mean our inclusion on a national register of approved talking therapies. To be excluded, surely, would indeed raise an eye brow of suspicion.

That a stringent standard of good practice does not yet exist raises an eye brow of many a new student of NLP training; the breath of the undertaking to create such a register is not always apparent. For example, if an individual were to talk to a taxi driver about a personal problem, in that specific moment the taxi driver is performing a psychotherapeutic role. How can we legislate for that ? Should we even try ? Is it possible to legislate for a code of practice every time two adults consent to engage in a conversation for the purpose of a mutual benefit or exchange ?

So far, the HPC; Health Professions Council, is still at an embryonic stage of forming such a blanket code of practice and the pluralistic nature of talking therapies is not lending itself to a clear cut, results/target driven system at all. They are forging ahead though and it might be a wise step for all exponents of talking therapies to ensure that their particular method and approach is included in any register that may arise. At present, the HPC is fact finding; gathering as much information as it can about methodologies and perspectives so that it can attempt to create a code of practice and procedure that will suit all and inhibit none. Given the diverse range of approaches and practices within the talking therapies profession, it is hardly surprising that the formulation of a stringent working practice that all of us should adhere to has ground to a halt. The letters pages of The Times have been busy voicing the opinions from a diverse range of guilds, academies and universities. It would seem that the breadth of approaches in the field of talking therapies is so broad that a set of guidelines that supports one practice would be stifling to another. Personally, I think such an approach is unworkable. To create a flexible set of guidelines is probably more workable and possibly reassuring enough for the public. It is also possible, of course, that there might be an agenda within the HPC to eradicate certain talking therapies or practices by making it impossible for them to continue.

Meanwhile then, while the HPC is unable to find agreement on the specifics of working practices between the more well known and recognised talking therapies it would be wise for the NLP organisations to ensure that they are included on any forthcoming registers. If NLP is truly a technology and a methodology then this too needs to be included in the approved skill listings created by the HPC.

We might not like the idea of legislation or restrictions placed around our methodologies or approaches; what about our freedoms ? We're not criminals ! No, we are not criminals, but some people are. We are professional and competent, but some people aren't. Most of us, I imagine, enter NLP for humanitarian reasons but some are motivated by nothing other than profit. A profit hungry human being, armed and primed with skills in hypnotic manipulation of the highest calibre is a daunting prospect; the potential for the creation of which is present within every training room.

We have laws in society. Some people break them. Society votes every 5 years to continue the practice of having a society that polices its rogue elements; we are willing to have a highway code, accident insurance and a licence of competency to drive; to protect ourselves from dangerous rogues. Is it a problem for NLP if we take just as much care to reassure our clients that it is safe for them to place their trust, their very mind, in our hands ?

We could be rebellious and partisan about legislation; and find ourselves marginalised and ultimately unable to practice within the law. Alternatively, we can embrace the concept of legislation and take this as a golden opportunity to fully take our place on the playing field of talking therapies. We have been frowned upon too long by narrow viewpoints and fearful antagonists. Quite literally, the process of legislation may provide us with the chance to get even.

If you'd like to know more, please visit: w.hpc-uk.org/

David Rowan MA

MAP@davidrowan.co.uk