Chapter 2
Paradigms and Maladaptive Thinking

What seems to be is, to those to whom it seems to be.

—William Blake (1757–1827), poet

Introduction

What is a paradigm? How does a paradigm apply to a shift in paradigmatic thinking? Kuhn advanced the concept of the societal paradigm. While adopting the concept of a framework that is generally recognized as part of a paradigm, we, however, are analyzing the construct "paradigm" from a different perspective—from the individual's point of view. Rather than a "community" or "societal" paradigm, it is the individual's "pattern" or "archetype" that takes precedence; the individual's "philosophical or theoretical framework" that the individual applies to a given circumstance and particularly to a given challenge or stimuli.

We include the issues that affect the ability of an individual to develop the necessary knowledge, skills, and courage to make a shift from maladaptive thinking or at least manage it better. Given this context, we view a paradigm as the boundary or confine of action or reaction, particularly, but not exclusively repetitive, including thoughts or thought processes, to stimuli that is perceived by the actor (or reactor) to be similar or the same as previous stimuli. The most important aspect of the definition of paradigms is the "boundary" or "confine"—the limitation on our ability, or flexibility, of thought process *if it* results in maladaptive thinking and the inability to change it. This is based on schemas.

The concept of schemas was first introduced by Jean Piaget:

> Piaget called the schema the basic building block of intelligent behavior—a way of organizing knowledge. Indeed, it is useful to think of schemas as "units" of knowledge, each relating to one aspect of the world, including objects, actions, and abstract (i.e., theoretical) concepts. (McLeod 2012, p. 2)
>
> Piaget emphasized the importance of schemas in cognitive development, and described how they were developed or acquired.

E. A. Kreuter, K. M. Moltner, *Treatment and Management of Maladaptive Schemas,*
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-06817-6_2, ©Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

> A schema can be defined as a set of linked mental representations of the world, which we use both to understand and to respond to situations. The assumption is that we store these mental representations and apply them when needed. (p. 2)

The concept of maladaptive, as commonly understood, has negative connotations. "Maladaptive schemas" can, depending on the particular situation, be seen as a foundation or personality or as building blocks for maladaptive thinking. They can also equate to the maladaptive thinking itself. In the context of this book, maladaptive thinking are thought processes injurious to the person insofar as they intrude upon or inhibit the person from making a paradigmatic shift away from that thinking. Maladaptive thinking are thought processes that for the individual do not reflect his/her "true" inner self or results in a failure to succeed, which creates palpable frustration or anxiety, if not depression and thus, if responded to affirmatively, compels an impetus to change. At first blush, the thought of an affirmative response to a feeling as deep and abiding as depression may appear to be inconsistent with that attitude. But that is the point. It is the very issue that tugs at one's mind and heart that necessitates affirmative action and is the launch pad for change. After all, if the issue does not create anxiety, or worse, depression, and is not recognized by the person as creating that feeling, then there is no reason to change. That issue is often recognizing exactly what his/her truth is. His/her truth was, for example, homosexual, not heterosexual. His/her truth was not religious even though she/he was brought up religious. The way of thinking, especially, but not exclusively if it becomes a way of life, is maladaptive for the person until she/he overcomes or modifies it. As Mark Twain put it, "A man will do anything, no matter what it is, to serve his spiritual comfort … A man cannot be comfortable without his own approval" (Twain 1917, p. 17). As we discuss below, however, the concept of truth is not theoretically easily categorized or realized. Perhaps somewhat ironically, the truth in the above examples is more easily understood by the individual—it is the action to change if not overcome that can be the challenge. Change and modification to make the individual "more fit," resulting from stimulation mainly because of self-motivation promoted by self-actualization is the essence of the individuals' thinking that underlies this book.

What it took in the individual situations discussed in this book to overcome the maladaptive thinking, and the assistance required (if any), varies upon the circumstances, and perhaps most importantly their drive, their will, and perhaps their respective levels of risk tolerance. The time that it takes to change, whether the steps are "large" or "small" are likewise situation dependent, and ultimately defined by the person's perspective. That perspective stands in marked contrast to a societal perspective or view. In fact, the societal perspective—the current mores—can act, depending on the person's thinking, as a deterrent to the person from realizing his/her truth, and thus either be maladaptive in and of itself, or a challenge to overcome. In short, the thinking that results in reaction to the stimuli, however relatively great or small the person perceives that stimuli to be, forms the essence of paradigmatic thinking.

The authors suggest that the individual's paradigm is bounded by multiple sides and societal mores and pressures have a significant effect. How we are raised and what we are raised to believe in have a significant effect on our behavior and internal processing of information.

Paradigms are a belief system—we engage in them because we perceive (even if we do not affirmatively think about it), that they do something for us—they have meaning. This is not always a conscious process, which explains why they are sometimes challenging to treat. People engage in paradigmatic thinking even though they may perceive that it is not good for them. For example, a person who eats, smokes, drinks, or takes drugs when under pressure (a stimulus) may well realize that the action is not "good" for him or her, but does it anyway. In this sense, the paradigmatic thinking is maladaptive—it is a coping mechanism that does not address the underlying issue(s), it is *a way of not dealing with reality*. Smokers, for example, may feel while the health risks of nicotine use are well-known, they are not currently diagnosed with emphysema or lung cancer and they probably will not die from a smoking-caused disease today. Denial is a major factor in a person's general reluctance to shape-up or to adopt a new regimen. Realizing that a behavior or situation is detrimental to the person's being and changing is the shift from maladaptive thinking that is explored in this book. In order to change from maladaptive thinking, we need to achieve that understanding.

Implicit is the critical understanding that we rely on paradigms. This is the starting point to understanding how to change them. We indulge in paradigmatic behavior for one of two reasons: we cannot or do not care to control it or we expect it to lead to a certain result. In turn, paradigmatic behavior is predicated on our reaction to stimuli.

If we do not rely on a particular paradigm, and, concomitantly, if we do not believe that the paradigm has value or will "work" (to whatever extent and a subjective concept) there is no rational reason to act in accordance with that paradigm. Put otherwise, if, for example, achievement of a specific goal is the end game, it is not rational to engage in a process that one perceives will not achieve that goal. Doing so engenders more than a gratuitous expenditure of energy and time. It feeds into the falsity of the paradigm. This is not to say that people do not sometimes begin down a path only to discover that it is not working—and it is not always clear when an objective may or might not be achieved which would necessitate a change in the process to achieve that goal. The willingness to engage in changing thinking when a paradigm is not working toward an individual's self-fulfillment and the ability to effectuate that change is also critical.

Failure in and of itself is not indicative of maladaptive thinking at all. Rather, maladaptive thinking results from a paradigm that causes the individual frustration, or worse, affirmatively deters the person from achieving his/her trust or goal. An inability may be attributable to a physical factor (or factors) that affect the mental process, with which we do not discuss in this book. Or the lack of result may stem from a manner of perceiving or thinking that can be changed.

Superstitions

Accepted paradigms may themselves be maladaptive or at least not rational. Superstition is a primary example. Superstitions are commonly understood to be actions taken without a definable cause and effect, an action that is predicated on a belief that has no factual foundation.

Superstitions are not predicated on logic. Because they are not logical they can morph into or lead to maladaptive behavior. Superstitions, and superstionistic paradigms, abound in society. Past success is no guarantee of future results. However, that is precisely what a superstition is supposed to "guarantee" or help realize, despite the fact that there is no logical (read objectively caused) nexus between the two. The athlete engages in his/her ritual; the person thinks the way she/he does in order to attempt to preordain or at least influence an outcome in his favor. That "achievement" may be positive—as in making the dispositive play in a game—or negative—as in not throwing a home run ball that can lose the game, or not fumbling on the one-yard line. It may be positive as in doing well at a presentation because she/he has worn the "lucky" clothes, or negative by not getting stuck in an elevator. In softball, players may put their hats on backwards to extend a rally. She/he expects that some external force that has no connection, let alone necessary connection, to the desired result will intervene to assist in achieving that result—by the very fact that the result has happened (or, as the case may be, has not happened) previously. In reality, people tend to hang on to what they think works, such as carrying around a lucky rabbit's foot or finding a four-leaf clover. There is a pervasive, although perhaps implicit, underlining expectation that is the foundation of a superstition. Absent that expectation that the desired result will be either accomplished or at least because of the superstition, there would be no reason to engage in the superstitious behavior or thought pattern.

Superstitions are emblematic of the tension between expectation and reality. The ability to do away with superstitions would be a paradigm shift to rationality, but that does not mean, as we discuss below, that they do not have some benefit. For example, there is the athlete who has a particular pregame or routine prior to stepping up to home plate. The athlete who engages in his ritual expects that he will achieve something positive as a result. But will she/he actually perform better? What happens when reality intercedes and overrides the superstition? The routine changes when the batter slumps, and the new routine maintains when he hits well, until perhaps the next slump.

Triskaidekaphobia is a primary example. It is not only the fear of the number 13, but is the "…the irrational fear of the number 13" (triskaidekaphobia.info 2014, p. 1). At the outset, we ask whether there can be a rational fear of the number 13, or any number or the false attribution of a specific number as having lucky qualities, such as the number 7 with triple 7 being three times as good. Slot machine manufacturers feed into the subliminal notions of superstition. It is one thing to fear something tangible or that is founded in a tangible action, such as a barking Doberman Pinscher as it sprints toward you with its teeth showing after you climb over the fence to retrieve a lost ball. But is it rational to fear a symbol or a concept, one

that was instigated, if not imposed, by society, i.e., some other person's or people's "belief," and passed down through centuries?

Why the number 13? It has possible historical roots: "Some attribute it to the Bible, where the Last Supper was attended by 13 people, and some speculated that the 13th person at the table was Judas Iscariot, who later betrayed Jesus. However, there is no reference to support this theory. Another belief is that the phobia of number 13 is caused by it being an irrational number and 12 being the number of perfection. There are 12 months in a year, 12 zodiacs, 12 hours in a clock, and there were 12 tribes of Israel…." (triskaidekaphobia.info 2014, p. 1). The purposeful absence of Floor #13, resulting from triskaidekaphobia, exemplifies the issue (in which case those denizens on the "14th floor" are, in reality, on the 13th floor, but it is apparently the number, not the reality that matters). The roots of fear of Friday the 13th go far back. Roach (2004) stated:

> Dossey traces the fear of 13 to a Norse myth about 12 gods having a dinner party at Valhalla, their heaven. In walked the uninvited 13th guest, the mischievous Loki. Once there, Loki arranged, the blind god of darkness, to shoot Balder the Beautiful, the god of joy and gladness, with a mistletoe-tipped arrow. "Bolder died and the whole Earth got dark. The whole Earth mourned. It was a bad, unlucky day," said Dossey. (p. 1)
> As for Friday, it is well known among Christians as the day Jesus was crucified. Some biblical scholars believe Eve tempted Adam with the forbidden fruit on Friday. Perhaps most significant is a belief that Abel was slain by Cain on Friday the 13th. (Roach 2004, p. 2)

Whatever the cause of triskaidekaphobia, its implications are real and severe. "It's been estimated that [U.S.] $ 800 or $ 900 million is lost in business on this day because people will not fly or do business they would normally do" (Roach 2004, p. 1). Let us pause to consider the loss of such an extraordinary amount of economic activity and what that signifies about paradigmatic thinking. Add to that the following observation:

> Of the more than 300 million people in the United States, an estimated 10.5 million suffer from obsessive–compulsive behavior, and about a quarter of them have phobias related to superstitions that cause them to change their lifestyle or engage in avoidance behaviors says Karen Cassiday (clinical director and owner of the Anxiety & Agoraphobia Treatment Center in Chicago)
> In addition, 21 million Americans suffer from generalized anxiety disorder…. Of this group, Cassiday estimates a whopping 75 %–85 % may be superstitious. (Kawamoto 2012, p. 1)

Superstitions, as a way of thinking, have very serious deleterious consequences. The behavior has no apparent casual connection to the result (and is thus defined as "irrational"). The behavior, which is apparently widespread, can properly be, but not necessarily be, characterized as maladaptive. Nevertheless, superstitious behavior has an apparent significant effect on, and acknowledgment and acceptance by, society. But, after all, a result by way of action (or inaction as the case may be) is the underlying predicate for superstitions in the first place.

In the authors' view, Stevie Wonder's song "Superstition" encapsulates the concept of superstitious paradigmatic thinking. The essence is the line: "When you believe in things that you don't understand…." (Wonder 1973). There are many things that we "don't understand," and may never understand. It is the human condition to expect to understand and then create paradigms to compensate when we do not

or cannot. Moltner wrote, "We are taught 'rationally'. People are preoccupied by what can be proven. But science, even logic, cannot always disprove … there is not always an answer to everything" (Kreuter 2013a, p. 161).

However, do superstitious paradigms necessarily constitute maladaptive thinking? Let us return to the baseball player who has a certain long-used, pregame ritual. Postulate that he is having a breakout season, so he maintains the pregame ritual throughout the season. And the season ends up being his best. There can be no evidence that the pregame ritual, which occurs a certain amount of time before he plays up to 162 games, had any casual effect on his physical play. Or can there be? Did the ritual have a salutary effect on his mental state—which is arguably a, if not the, foundation of his physical play? Did he become more relaxed, more comfortable within himself, more confident which in turn was reflected in his play? Consider this issue when we discuss confidence and its effect below. Is there, or might there be, in that situation, a casual connection after all? Or is that just an attempt to rationalize? Some professional players will not shave their hair once the playoffs begin until they either win or lose.

Contrast that to triskaidekaphobia. It may be argued that avoidance with the number 13, analogously to the ballplayer's pregame ritual, provides a person with comfort. But comfort to what end? Is the comfort that a ball player achieves any more or less "rational" than the comfort that a person who has triskaidekaphobia achieves? How does the tremendous economic loss factor into the equation? Should we be analyzing, in this instance, paradigmatic thinking on a macro-level instead of an individual level? Mr. Wonder sang that "Superstition ain't the way." But it is the paradigm, the way, for many a person in many a situation. There is a distinction between an objective, "logical," connection and a potential causal connection.

On the other hand, the number 13 has not had a deleterious effect on the careers of certain sports figures. "In honor of Friday the 13th, the most unlucky day on the calendar, ESPNW takes a look at the athletes past and present who have proudly sported the number" (Rykoff 2011, p. 1). She lists, among others, Wilt Chamberlain (who, Ms. Rykoff observes, was an All-Star, you guessed it, 13 times and the authors daresay one of the greatest basketball players of all time), Alex Rodriguez (the authors would be hard-pressed to conclude that his current issues were caused by the number 13 on his jersey), and Dan Marino and Kurt Warner (both of NFL fame).

In more extreme circumstances, however, superstitions become flawed coping mechanisms that have become a false foundation to action or reaction: "One of the mind's most fundamental approaches in dealing with the unknown and the uncontrollable is the belief in pure magic" (Serban 1982 p. 51). Serban (1982) opined:

> People like to believe that every event is produced by a specific cause either self-evident or beyond their knowledge—yet possibly discoverable. This approach represents a great relief to the mind and provides a sense of confidence in mastering situations. The more logical, rational, and scientific man's thought has become, the more need there is to explain the unexplainable. But because science is unable to penetrate the ultimate mystery of life and nature, people continue to rely on their own beliefs.
>
> Two sets of magical beliefs are used in the attempt to adapt to reality: those that protect an individual against unknown dangers, and those that rescue him when he is overcome by danger.

> Most magical beliefs are recognized as superstitions. Superstitions, as magical safeguards against the hazardous character of life, can become an integral part of a person's daily life. (p. 51)

Serban (1982) further opined:

> Some people never succeed in making this transition [from "mythical, prelogical thought to casual, logical thought"], either because social reinforcement supports their mythical beliefs or because they are simply reluctant or unable to cope logically or realistically with particular areas of life for which they do not have explanations. (p. 54)

Or, the authors would reiterate, fear: "[t]he phobic individual simply attempts to avoid the anxiety-provoking situation" (Serban 1982, p. 73). Thus, one irony is the person who adopts a superstition may well recognize that it is not rational, but continues the superstitious paradigm despite that realization because, as we observed above, it "works" or because she/he perceives that it will ward off an undesired, if not dangerous, result.

Faith as a Paradigm

Faith is also a paradigm. Compare to the definition of superstition, the definition of faith. "…the Bible defines faith as 'being sure of what we hope for and certain of what we do not'" (Hebrews 11:1). Thus, in the biblical vernacular, faith is a *channel of living trust*—an assurance—that stretches from man to God. In other words, "it is the object of faith that renders faith faithful" (Christian Research Institute 2010, p. 1). The commonality between superstitions and faith is the lack of proof upon which each rests.

What then is the difference, or where is the line drawn between "magical thinking" (Serban 1982, p. 11), superstitions, and faith? Is it akin to beauty in that it is in the mind of the beholder? "The difference between faith and superstition is that the first uses reason to go as far as it can, and then makes the jump; the second shuns reason entirely—which is why superstition is not the ally, but the enemy, of true religion" (Harris 1953, p. 1). Gibson (2009) writes:

> The difference between superstitions and religion is not only the difference between meaning and randomness, and between faith and anxiety, but also the difference between belief in a personal, benevolent God and fear of a pitiless Mother Nature, waiting to be appeased—or exploited—by mumbo jumbo. "Superstition" by definition "stands beyond" us, whereas religion is part of the human experience and interacts with it.
>
> Superstition offers the illusion of control by manipulating nature or revealing her occult intent. If the spells are recited properly, all should be well. It's a big "if," however. Religion gives the promise, rather than the illusion, of hope. God does not always respond as we would like; loved ones die, livelihoods are lost. Mystery is deepened and hopefully, with faith, leads to peace rather than disillusionment. Accidental similarities between religion and magic should not lead anyone to confuse the difference in their content. Nor should the focus on witchcraft in places like Africa blind the rest of us to the lures of superstition that continue to cloud our own beliefs. (p. 2)

One of the authors spoke about this topic with a friend, John (a pseudonym). He believes that, at the bottom, the difference lies in the "depth of conviction" (Personal communication, John December 21, 2013). Faith: "purpose and meaning gives depth to the individual." Once one gives away the control to ones faith, she/he can find inner peace. But for the authors, regardless of faith, or perhaps thanks to it, one still must find one's own purpose. States John: "I have found 'inner peace and that's where I'm resigned'" (Personal communication, John 2013). With faith, one cannot prove, or disprove. Superstitions are provable, or disprovable, and sometimes even quantifiable, but faith is neither. He views superstition as the suspension of reality, an inability to see reality. Faith, on the other hand, is "a submission to belief when common sense tells us otherwise." That is potential of faith, but how does that specific aspect differ from superstitions? My faith, John states, teaches not to know everything but to accept. Acceptance—what a basic but challenging paradigm. But don't people accept superstitions? Or is it the depth of conviction that creates the distinction? Its foundation in reality, but its conflict with desire if not need, is a critical paradigm. States John, with faith one has been taught all one can, considered as much as one can, and nevertheless accepted what one cannot prove. No scientist, no one, can come up with the spiritual side because it cannot be seen. But to the authors that is the beauty—because it does not have to be proven, nor necessarily, as stated by John, even understood intellectually.

A distinction must be made between spirituality and faith as not necessarily the same as religion. Structures are products of man, the spirit is for "mine and mine alone," John posits. He continues that it is not for anyone to give or take the spiritual, because one cannot. We suggest that men and objects can help, but we agree that no one can give or take. A spirit cannot be rectified like a car part or a broken bone. It can heal and change with assistance, but ultimately one must prevail for one self, if not necessarily on one's own.

Superstition, to John, is an unaccepted casual connection. The authors agree, at least in part. We suggest that the difference lies in the words "false concept of causation" that characterizes superstition. Faith, to John, is an "accepted connection." Faith is supernatural and metaphysical. Faith relates to the intangible, the unknowable, the untouchable. Superstition is the here and now (read temporal), superstition is "in the natural."[1]

Faith is generally viewed as an attempt to achieve a positive moral purpose, while superstition is viewed as a means of warding off negative consequences or bringing primarily material benefit. Superstition is connected with "bad luck," while faith embodies the higher moral ground and the spiritual side. But there are gradations of faith. Not only in the level of belief but also in the moral ground that it occupies. Cults are generally considered to be a warped form of faith, with concomitant negative connotations, because they are not within the mainstream thinking of what society accepts as religion. In a cult, believers may be swayed by a charismatic leader

[1] John further posits that "science" is also acceptance: For example, 2 + 2 equals 4, does it not? But it is man who defined 2 + 2. Galileo can teach a man anything, but man must find it within him or herself to accept it (or not).

out of a search for something to grab hold of or champion. It is societal values that inform the determination of what a cult is. This is not to place a judgment value on the societal determination. Rather, it is to say that such exists and is influential in terms of what is "acceptable" and what is not.

Societal Influences

This brings into play the effect of societal mores on an individual's paradigms. The impact of societal mores on an individual's paradigmatic thinking thus invokes another aspect of Kuhn. More specifically, the concept of societal mores, what is "accepted" and what is "outside the mainstream" fits directly into the theme of certain of the shifts that we discuss. We discussed how we have adapted Kuhn's theory of paradigms from a societal perspective to the study of individual patterns of thought. However, as the concepts of superstition, religion, and cults demonstrate, there is, in many instances, a component, often strong, of current societal mores that can impact upon the individual's paradigmatic thinking. Here, we observe how the shift in societal mores impacts on the individual's paradigm.

For example, we will discuss a person's shift from heterosexual to homosexual. One of the poignant points that he makes is that being gay was considered taboo and there was not a strong cultural support system. In *United States v. Windsor,* __ U.S. ___, 133 S. Ct. 2675, 186 L Ed. 808 (June 26, 2013), the US Supreme Court, by a 5–4 vote, found a section of the federal Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional. For the purposes of this book, the focal point is the effect of that decision on the public mores. In his dissent, Chief Justice Roberts referred to "…. Congress's decision to retain the definition of marriage [between a man and a woman] that, *at that point,* had been adopted by every State in our Nation, and every nation in the world" 133 S.Ct. at 2696 (emphasis added). "That point" was 1996, not even 20 years ago. The opinion specifically leaves to the individual states to decide whether to adopt same-sex marriage and the benefits and obligations that go along with it: "The significance of state responsibilities for the definition and regulation of marriage dates to the Nation's beginning; for when the constitution was adopted the common understanding was that the domestic relations of husband and wife and parent and child were matters reserved to the States…." 133 S.Ct. at 2680 (from the syllabus, quotation omitted). Societal mores will thus again play roles in this instance in each state's decision. In turn, each state's decision will be the product of the influences of the citizens and institutions of each state on the legislature and the governor who has and will make the decisions arising from that case.

> State legislatures have been deeply involved in the public debates about how to define marriage and whether the official recognition of "marriage" should be extended to same-sex couples. Eighteen states and the District of Columbia currently have laws that allow same-sex marriages.
>
> A federal judge in Utah ruled in December 2013 that the state's ban on same-sex marriage is unconstitutional. The New Mexico Supreme Court ruled in December 2013 that same-sex couples in the state are allowed to marry. The Hawaii and Illinois legislatures

> adopted same-sex marriage legislation in November 2013. In October in New Jersey, the State Supreme Court refused to delay a State District Court decision requiring the state to recognize same-sex marriages and the governor announced that the state would drop its appeal, so that New Jersey now allows same-sex marriages.
> New Mexico and Utah's court rulings make it nine states where same-sex marriages were made legal this year, joining Hawaii, Illinois, Delaware, Minnesota, and Rhode Island (all through legislation) and California and New Jersey (through court decisions). (National Conference of State Legislatures 2013, p. 1)

On January 6, 2014, the Supreme Court "ordered a temporary stop to same-sex marriages in Utah" (Kendall 2014, p. A3). On March 22, 2014, the US Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit stayed an order of a Michigan federal District Court that allowed same-sex marriage in Michigan until the appeals court could decide whether to grant an injunction pending an appeal of that order (Eligon and Eckholm 2014, p. 1). The state's positions are quickly evolving. The federal government has also stepped in. On Friday, January 10, 2014, the US Attorney General Eric Holder stated:

> I am confirming today that, for purposes of federal law, these marriages will be recognized as lawful and considered eligible for all relevant federal benefits on the same terms as other same-sex marriages. These families should not be asked to endure uncertainty regarding their status as the litigation unfolds. (Savage and Healy 2014, p. 1)

Notice too that the change in nomenclature from "gay" to "same sex." We should ask whether that is in accord with evolving societal mores. Query also whether there is an analogy to the nomenclature change from Miss or Mrs., pursuant to which a woman could be identified as married or unmarried, to Ms. which, like a man, would not identify a woman as married or unmarried, with evolving concepts of equality of women.

The Mechanism of the Paradigm Shift

Another critical aspect of this analysis is the shift itself—the shift to positive thinking and action away from maladaptive or negative thought. In this context, we speak of shift with reference to how permanent it is or whether it could be attenuated. Once the shift has been achieved the goal is met, but it must then be maintained. Maintenance is as much a part of the shift as obtaining the goal itself. Is an incentive necessary to maintain the shift? Or has the shift become the new norm? The goal and its achievement become an integral part of life, on a daily basis, but sometimes it requires a fight against sliding back. The "incentive" normally takes the form of the internal feeling of success by moving toward or obtaining a goal. Although the cliché: "Never say never" is, for good reason, apropos in the world in which we live, there are shifts that are as close to hermetically sealed as possible. And then there are the shifts that must be affirmatively, consciously maintained lest one lapse back into maladaptive thinking. It normally takes a reasonable period of time adopting a new thought process for it to sink in as a permanent change. Time not only heals all

http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-06816-9

Treatment and Management of Maladaptive Schemas

Kreuter, E.A.; Moltner, K.M.

2014, LVI, 227 p. 17 illus., 4 illus. in color., Hardcover
ISBN: 978-3-319-06816-9