INTRODUCTION TO GROUP THERAPY

21. (T) (F) Group offered the individual an arena for the first time to explore and express what he or she really thought and felt without societal inhibitions.

Wender

22. (T) (F) Wender felt that psychoanalysis lent itself well to group psychotherapy.
23. (T) (F) In his groups, Wender began each session with a lecture format.
24. (T) (F) He felt that by the nature of the group format, a patient had the opportunity to re-create his or her family of origin.
25. (T) (F) In a group, the patient could develop a healthier ego ideal.

Moreno

26. (T) (F) Moreno’s concept of catharsis was developed from Plato’s perception of watching an audience during a play.
27. (T) (F) Spontaneity meant having a response of equality in relation to dealing effectively with changes in one’s life.
28. (T) (F) Disequilibrium in an individual did not affect other people.
29. (T) (F) Role reversal and role-playing were not considered important techniques in psychodrama.

Bion

30. (T) (F) The main focus of interest for Bion was the individual in a group.
31. (T) (F) His initial monograph indicated a disciplined and structured approach to motivating behavioral change.
32. (T) (F) The community and its ability to heal itself inadvertently led to its members being healed.
33. (T) (F) Groups operated on two levels: an overt, goal-directed level and an assumption level, centered around three distinct beliefs.

Chapter 2

The History of Group Therapy, Part II: 1951 and Beyond

DREIKURS

Group therapy promulgates man’s search for equality. (Dreikurs, 1951)

Rudolph Dreikurs, eminent psychiatrist, and pupil and former collaborator with Alfred Adler, brought a most humanistic approach to the understanding of being human into the arena of group therapy. Historically, he extended the work of Adler in relation to education, child guidance, and group psychotherapy. His writings appear to be concerned for the individual in society, as he believed that the crux of emotional difficulty is sociological in origin and nature. His concept of group psychotherapy as the only group in existence that values the individual’s shortcomings and deficits is quite a profound perception and approach. In other groups, the individual is accepted and included because of his or her accomplishments and abilities, whereas a deficit is considered a liability and the basis for exclusion. This is not the case for group psychotherapy in Dreikurs’ opinion. In fact, individuals are valued for who they are and not what they have accomplished. In many cases, this acceptance is based on one’s human existence and is probably an entirely new experience for many people entering a group environment. Dreikurs’ insight relates to the concept that each point on a circle is equal, but in this case the parity is because one is human. He believed that every group must have a set of values, and in group psychotherapy these values are very different than in any other type of group. For example, the fact that an individual exists and participates on a continuous basis in the group confers a degree of status merely by ongoing commitment. He likens this to the relationship of members in a tribe in which the individual’s value
or worth is not in question. By mere physical presence in the tribe, the individual is of equal value to any other individual in the community.

Dreikurs felt that self-disclosure and being real were most necessary. They are of great value in group psychotherapy, whereas deception and emotional self-restraint are not considered positive values, as they are in other kinds of groups. In group psychotherapy they are considered behaviors of low self-esteem. Group psychotherapy, indeed, was a very different sociological phenomenon for Dreikurs. Because of his Adlerian affiliation, he perceived the role of the group leader quite differently than what was previously seen. He felt that the concept of the detached group leader who did not respond or answer questions because it would gratify the patient was in fact not creating a democratic learning environment but rather an autocratic environment, and thus reinforced the leader’s sense of authority. He felt that a group leader needed to have the ability to function as an equal and to be as human as the members of the group even though he or she had more psychological knowledge. Obviously, this requires a leader to feel secure and not to hide behind a designated role in the group. Dreikurs’s contribution to group psychotherapy will remain timeless as long as therapists value the equality of the human condition with its many deficiencies, while taking the risk of appearing human and imperfect in their search for their own equality.

Foulkes

Group analysis is a powerful therapy. It is stimulating as a theory and can be prolific as a source for gathering information.

(Foulkes, 1957)

Foulkes approached the use of group psychotherapy through reconciling the topographical theory of psychoanalysis (see Glossary) with its concomitant components and group as a whole with its Gestalt interpretations. He felt that psychoanalysis was an individualistic form of psychotherapy and chose to call his own work “group analysis.” He felt that, in principle, groups represented a transference arena, but unlike individual psychotherapy, where the transference was focused on the analyst, group transferences were focused on both the members and the analyst. In his perception, the theory of group analysis focused not on the individual per se, as in psychoanalysis, but on the individual in a sociologic perspective. Humans do not generally live in isolation, and personality development arises out of interrelations with the family and community. As a result, the family or community can be represented by the group-analysis paradigm, in which the focus of psychotherapy is asymmetrically balanced toward the group as a whole rather than seeking to understand in totality the individualistic world of each group member. Foulkes related that every event, whether it involved one or two people, had the effect of a group-as-a-whole encounter because each person in the group was affected. Interestingly, he used the Gestalt symbolization of foreground, figure, and background to explain these interactions by stating that the interaction itself was the foreground but occurring in the group was an existing underlying phenomenon attributed to the background. In some sense this interpretation could be correlated with the psychoanalytic concepts of manifest and latent content. The manifest content could be the dialogue and the latent content could be that which is unsaid but felt on an unconscious level.

Foulkes, in his observations, introduced a series of concepts of group interaction that leaders observe when leading groups:

1. A mirror reaction is when an individual sees himself or herself in another group member. This realization of seeing oneself in the behavior of another can be a very liberating experience. Clients who come for help often feel alone and unique in their distress. According to Foulkes, this experienced isolation is the individual’s lack of effective communication of distress to the theoretical support environment—family and community. When it can be observed that the individual’s feelings are not so very different from another’s, an attenuation of this sense of isolation occurs.

2. Occupation is the primary reason for people to come together for a purpose as a group. In instances other than group analysis, there is a clear reason why people have gathered. In group analysis, this is not necessarily the case. In the aforementioned gathering, “occupation” refers to the coming together for a specific reason with boundaries that are not to be transgressed, but in group analysis, this would be considered a defensive screen against intimacy.

3. Translation means making the unconscious conscious. In individual psychoanalysis, this is done between the analyst and the
patient, but in group analysis it occurs between the member and the group. Foulkes felt that it was the process of communication, not the communication itself, that was of greatest importance in group analysis. As clinical supervisors, we often teach students of psychology that when working with clients it is important to listen to the tone of what they say more closely than to their words. A group leader in Foulkes’s paradigm tends to be active, involved, and, in keeping with Gestalt psychotherapy, as much a part of the group as the members. Similar to Bion in influence, Foulkes’s applications to group are more prevalent in Europe and countries outside of the United States, such as Israel and Australia. Why this is the case could be another area of historical investigation.

**CORSINI AND ROSENBERG**

The nature of the dynamics that leads to successful therapy is the central issue of psychotherapy. (Corsini and Rosenberg, 1955)

Corsini’s contribution not only to psychology but to group therapy was multifaceted. His orientation was Adlerian and he believed from his studies with Oreikurs that group was of great value for change. Corsini and Rosenberg felt that there existed a paucity of agreement in the many psychological paradigms about what variables were necessary for psychological change and effective therapy due to the use of different terminologies. In fact, these semantic differences often caused restrictions, limiting the orderly development of psychology. In brief, what they set out to do was to gather information from 300 writers about what is necessary for successful group therapy. Their methodology had an Adlerian essence, as it approached the work of these writers with complete acceptance of their perceptions. After the data were compiled, ten mechanisms were isolated and specified. Of the ten, nine were labeled and the tenth was left as miscellaneous for dynamics that did not dovetail as well with the other categories. The nine other categories were altruism, universalization, intellectualization, reality testing, transference, interaction, spectator therapy, ventilation (the release of emotions), and acceptance.

Irvin Yalom’s book *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* (1975) presents a similar dynamic for psychological change and effective group therapy. Corsini and Rosenberg’s efforts in the taxonomy of the underlying psychological factors inherent in successful group therapy have certainly illuminated and clarified the classifications that reconciled the many diverse perceptions of differing psychological modalities.

**SLAVSON**

Do group dynamics arise in therapy groups? (Slavson, 1957)

S. R. Slavson is considered to be the father of group therapy in America and the founder of the *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*. His contribution to the literature on group therapy is legendary and the partial summary presented as follows is from one of his many provocative monographs (Slavson, 1957). This particular monograph has been included in the historical section of this book because of its search for empirical data, the profound questions it addresses, and its timeliness.

Slavson questioned and promoted the perceptions of the therapist to discriminate between perceiving the group as a unitary entity or specifically focusing upon the individual. The validations of these discriminations would in all probability determine whether group therapy will develop as a science and as a therapeutic tool due to eventual empirical findings. He also questioned the efficacy of group in relation to the patients’ perceptions of their positive adjustment, i.e., did the patients improve merely because they adjusted to the group environment; did the group actually affect them positively due to the relationships that had been established; or did improvements develop and personalities change because during the group experience there was a release of anxiety which ultimately led to insight, thus creating the emergence of new positive self images?

Slavson defined the generic term *group* as a voluntary meeting of three or more individuals in a face-to-face relation under the auspices of leadership. These individuals are goal directed and the experience may or may not necessarily provide growth. In a therapy group the therapist does not take on the role of leadership per se but is an integral and indispensable part of the process. Rather, this person theoret-
ically becomes a recipient of libidinal and transferential feelings with the possibility of being an object of dependency for the group members. Positive, negative, and ambivalent feelings are then elicited from the group members to the object of the therapist due to the role he or she has undertaken. Unlike other groups, therapy groups specifically address issues that have inhibited group members from enjoying life and human relationships. According to Slavson (1957), the individual in group therapy is specifically there for his or her own particular goals and the goal of the group as a whole is not of interest or aim. There may be a commonality in purpose of the group members, e.g., growth and change, but not necessarily a commonality in mirror issues. Slavson felt that the typical group dynamics of a generic group, e.g., social, political, educational, business, would be absent in a therapy group because the therapy group is not goal directed as its primary function. According to Slavson, the synergy that is present in other groups is not a factor in a therapy group and would, in effect, be counterproductive to the therapeutic process. He believed that the cement or bond that holds a therapy group together is anxiety. The attenuation of this anxiety becomes a goal of the individual members. As it lessens, the individual is in the process of change. Unlike other theorists, Slavson felt that cohesion should be avoided in a therapy group; for cohesion to develop, the group members would have to relinquish their individual egos and superegos for the service of the group as a whole. This concept has been repeated by other theorists. In contradiction to this, a therapy group encourages its members to retain their individuality in order for growth to occur. Slavson distinguished group therapy as a very different and special type of group that provides a distinct environment where the individual is foremost, in comparison to other groups where the group is foremost to the individual.

BERNE

The superego, ego, and id are psychic agencies. The Parent, Adult, and Child are not synonymous with these agencies but rather they are unto themselves complete ego states. (Berne, 1958)

Eric Berne is included in this list of contributors to group therapy because his transactional analysis moved away from psychoanalysis as an individual therapy overlaid upon group therapy toward a modality that stands on its own in relation to group dynamics. His transmutation from structural analysis into transactional analysis represented another new paradigm for inclusion in the group psychotherapy arena. His underlying analysis of the individual in a group environment was similar to Harry Stack Sullivan’s interpersonal theory of psychiatry in which an individual cannot be seen and understood in isolation but only in relation to others. He perceived that three particular ego states are active in each individual no matter the nature of the interpersonal transaction. He chose to label these ego states parent, adult, and child.

The adult ego state is one in which the individual is inclined to deal effectively and is oriented in current reality. The individual objectively processes information in interpersonal relationships. The parent ego state is a form of modeling in which the individual introjects from either parent a particular behavioral style in his or her interactions with others, often containing either the positive, nurturing manifestation or the critical, negative manifestation of the parent. This ego state contains the many “shoulds and oughts” as presented by the parents in the structure for living. On the other hand, the child ego state is one in which the individual’s emotional expression and spontaneous acts are seen. The child ego state has two components: (1) the natural child—the child that is open to exploration and fun but without the acculturation of society; and (2) the adapted child—the child who has learned through interpersonal interactions to accommodate the expectations of others.

In this we can see Sullivan’s definition of self as a reflection of the approbations of important people in one’s early life. Berne’s supposition was that conflict arose in an interpersonal relationship when one individual was relating from one ego state such as adult and the other person was relating back in a different ego state such as parent. He labeled this “crossed transaction” and felt that it was the crux of most misunderstandings in human relationships. Berne used these three states as an explanation of problem resolution for his patients in group therapy. He felt that group therapy, with its multiple interactions, was realistically more effective in clarifying interpersonal relationships than individual psychotherapy was.
The most significant social invention of this century is perhaps the encounter group. (Rogers, 1967)

The encounter group phenomenon evolved in America when great sociological change and movement toward authenticity occurred. From post-World War II to the late 1950s and early 1960s, a period of conformity and conservatism took place in America. At that time, events and people tended to be seen in a dichotomy of either good or bad or black and white. As in astrophysics, with the concept of the “big bang,” a sociological phenomenon was exploding among the youth of America. Crew cuts and penny loafers for men gave way to long hair and bare feet. Nudity, sexual exploration, and drug experimentation were summed up in the slogan “sex, drugs, and rock ’n’ roll.” It was the era of Timothy Leary and others at Harvard who encouraged students to “turn on, tune in, and drop out,” to the dismay of many parents. The 1960s and 1970s was the most creative and exploratory time of the twentieth century. Because the zeitgeist, the spirit of the time, was evident, the encounter group found its place and roots in American society and American psychology.

Carl Rogers, teacher and psychologist, experimented with student-centered teaching as a viable method to enhance student learning. He believed that allowing the free expression of personal feelings from students not only increased their learning potential but created personal change. He began experimenting with groups on an intensive short-term basis, which he later termed encounter groups. Rogers found that in this time-limited intensive environment, which was minimally structured, individuals would attenuate their defenses and relate with feeling to others in the group.

Rogers was a pioneer in generating data from these encounter groups. Through naturalistic observation he found that a similar process of group formation and functioning was evident in the many encounter groups he had run:

1. Milling around. A rather lost and confused group feeling emerged because participants were not sure how to respond in this loosely structured environment.
2. Resistance to personal expression or exploration. A sense of ambivalence initially arose when some members began to disclose issues of a personal nature.
3. Description of past feelings. Group members began to discuss feelings about nongroup relationships.
4. Expression of negative feelings. The initial here-and-now feelings toward other group members had generally begun with negative perceptions.
5. Expression and exploration of personally meaningful material. The individual began to significantly reveal himself or herself.
6. The expression of immediate interpersonal feelings in the group. Again, here-and-now feelings were expressed to other group members, but they now took on both positive and negative feelings.
7. The development of a healing capacity in the group. Group members began to help one another.
8. Self-acceptance and the beginning of change. This appeared to be the necessary ingredient.
9. The cracking of facades. As the group moved along, members’ defensive styles were no longer tolerated and were addressed.
10. The individual receives feedback. A group participant learned how others perceived him or her; if members provided this feedback in a caring way, it could be very constructive for the individual member.
11. Confrontation. An in-your-face leveling with another individual. This could be both positive and negative.
12. The helping relationships outside the group session. Group members spent time with one another outside of the session, offering assistance.
13. The basic encounter. Individuals had the experience of getting much closer to one another than they had in ordinary life.
14. The expression of positive feelings and closeness. Warmth and closeness continued to develop out of the initial honesty of disclosing both positive and negative feelings toward one another.
15. **Behavior changes in the group.** Individuals became more sensitive to one another. Although Rogers strongly felt that the encounter group was a very positive modality for behavioral change, he saw that there were disadvantages. Some individuals did not have the ego strength to benefit from the intensity of this type of experience; in fact, it could be harmful to the integrity of their psychological well-being. Also, because of the time-limited nature of this event, there was little, if any, follow-up. Often, the feelings and changes that manifested themselves in the group members disappeared over a short period of time. Rogers felt that further investigation into the phenomenon of the encounter group was necessary and continued to believe that it was a rehumanizing of human relationships and of great importance in a society that reinforced the suppression of feelings.

**YALOM AND LIEBERMAN**

Pain was likely to be reaped for those who came believing in miracles. (Yalom and Lieberman, 1971)

Yalom and Lieberman's research into the casualties of encounter groups is included here out of chronological sequence because it dovetails rather nicely with Rogers' positive perception of the effectiveness of the encounter group movement. In a well-designed study, although limited to undergraduate college students at Stanford University, Yalom and Lieberman sought to determine the possible negative effects of being a participant in an encounter group. They had found that more than a few isolated cases were beginning to show up in the literature in relation to the adverse effects of the time-limited intensive experience of this particular modality. Over 9.4 percent of 170 participants in this study had developed severe enough negative reactions to be considered casualties of the experience. Interestingly, the least effective predictor of a negative effect for a participant was the group leaders themselves. The members of the group had greater predictive capabilities in relation to probable negative experiences of their fellow group members. The severity of the casualties depended upon the particular type of encounter group to which the participants were randomly assigned. The more traumatized participants were in groups in which the leader was highly charismatic, confronting, and challenging, with intrusive and aggressive behavior. The least negative effects of the encounter group experience were seen with leaders who were positively reinforcing. These leaders created a trusting, warm environment in which the individual participants could proceed at their own pace. Those individuals who invested in a magical belief that salvation was at hand by going through the encounter group were highly susceptible to having a negative experience. Perhaps client preparation and explanation of the type of group they would be entering would have helped in avoiding possible adverse effects.

**RIOCH**

In the real world, people got the leaders that they deserved. (Rioch, 1970)

Margaret Rioch is included in this overview because the approach she and her committee designed for understanding group dynamics is quite interesting. Working from Bion's group-as-a-whole format, Rioch chose to focus primarily on group leadership, authority, and member responsibility. Rioch formulated that analyzing a group with the observation of a modernistic empirical reductionistic rationale provided little understanding of the dynamics of group leadership. To understand group leadership, attention must shift from the individual to the group as a whole. Interestingly, there is a variable that is strongly discouraged in the design of Rioch's methodology. This variable, which is basic to the majority of psychotherapy groups, is the participants' emotionality. The emotionality and the individual are not the focus of interest; rather, the focus is the struggle of the group to either survive or destroy itself. It was proposed that how a group functions in its quest to survive will determine the type of leadership it will encourage. As far as the individual group member is concerned, in Rioch's study, it is believed that a common goal could and would unite the group for its survival. Each participant, however, had a different contribution. In this sense, the goal or the larger picture for survival, the group, outweighs the individual's narcissistic needs, and being part of the group provides a fulfilling experience for the participant. The results of this study elic-
HORWITZ

An interpretation is not made without taking into consideration the individual and the group. (Horwitz, 1977)

Leonard Horwitz's concentration was on reconciling the holistic and individualistic approaches to interpretation as they related to group dynamics. He felt that working from a deductive paradigm in which only underlying group universalization themes were interpreted did not, in effect, take into account individual differences and the unique behavioral manifestations of patients in group therapy. He proposed that interpretation would be more effectively accomplished if the group leader observed the group and its members from the paradigm of inductive reasoning. In this sense, the therapist went from the particular, the individual's disclosure, to the universal, the underlying theme of the entire group. Because a common underlying principle of attention was not always evident in each session, it was very possible that the group leader would primarily focus attention on the individual participant, thus providing interpretation in the absence of a group theme. Unlike the holistic approach, which focuses solely on the individual as a whole, the group-centered approach was more flexible and integratively accepting of individual differences.

ORMONT

A benefit of group therapy is providing a laboratory situation in which the individual may experiment through his worst moments before experiencing them in life. (Ormont, 1992)

Louis Ormont is included in this encapsulated historical overview for many reasons. Although his name is not as well known as those of previous researchers, he has contributed greatly to group psychotherapy through his many well-written and effective monographs. He has the distinction of having one of the largest group therapy practices in the world and over the past forty years has personally influenced over 2,500 group therapists through his classes, workshops, and training groups (Brook, 2001). His belief in and loyalty to the effectiveness of group psychotherapy is quite evident in his many written works. Group, in Ormont's opinion, is a microcosm of reality and the ideal place to solve interpersonal problems. Ormont strongly suggests that in this microcosm, the individual will re-create the behavioral patterns that are evident outside of the group arena. Because of this re-creation, the individual has the opportunity for awareness and personal change. In an interesting, individualistic, and group-as-a-whole perception, it is his belief that we are treating not only the individual but the group. By treating the group, we are using all the members as a cast of characters in an ongoing general story with individual subplots. As the individual becomes healthier, so does the group; as the group becomes healthier, so does the individual. The group moves forward almost as a living organism with its own personal identity.

According to Ormont, the surest way for a group to fail is when a therapist turns the group into individual psychotherapy sessions. An effective group is an emotional group in which interpersonal relatedness is emotionally connected. He writes, "It matters less who is speaking than who is feeling the import of what is being said" (Ormont, 1992, p. 5). For change to occur, the individual must have an emotional connection to the material being presented. The group leader must create what Ormont has called "bridges between patients" as a connection in which one individual can reach another through communication. This is highly unusual for most patients, as it requires them to reveal their inner lives, a task not easily accomplished when these types of disclosures have been negatively perceived by society.

REVIEW

Please answer true (T) or false (F) to the following questions.

Dreikurs

1. (T) (F) Dreikurs extended the work of Adler in relation to education, child guidance, and group psychotherapy.
2. (T) (F) His concept of group psychotherapy as the only group in existence that values the individual’s shortcomings and deficits is quite a profound perception and approach.
3. (T) (F) He felt that the concept of detached group leaders who did not respond or answer questions because it was a gratification of the patient was in fact not creating a democratic learning environment but rather creating an autocratic environment and thus reinforcing the leader’s sense of authority.

**Foulkes**

4. (T) (F) Foulkes approached group psychotherapy through reconciling the topographical theory of psychoanalysis with its concomitant components and group as a whole with its Gestalt interpretations.
5. (T) (F) He felt that humans live in isolation and personality develops out of this isolation.
6. (T) (F) When an individual sees himself or herself in another group member, this is called a mirror reaction.
7. (T) (F) Foulkes felt that the communication was more important in group than the process of the communication.

**Corsini and Rosenberg**

8. (T) (F) Corsini and Rosenberg suggested that the paucity of agreement among professionals, in relation to the different variables for change in group therapy, was due to the use of different terminology.
9. (T) (F) Their methodology was to approach the different authors writing on group therapy with very strict and rigid requirements.
10. (T) (F) Corsini and Rosenberg’s research can be seen in Yalom’s later work on the variables for psychological change in group therapy.

**Slavson**

11. (T) (F) Slavson was considered the father of group therapy around the world.
12. (T) (F) He felt that in a therapy group, there was a commonality in purpose of the group members and a commonality in mirror issues.
13. (T) (F) Slavson strongly supported cohesion in a therapy group.

**Berne**

14. (T) (F) Berne’s transactional analysis moved away from psychoanalysis as an individual therapy overlaid upon group therapy.
15. (T) (F) His underlying analysis of the individual in a group environment was similar to Sullivan’s interpersonal theory of psychiatry, in which the individual cannot be understood in isolation.
16. (T) (F) The ego state that contains many of the “shoulds and oughts” is the adult ego state.
17. (T) (F) Crossed transactions occur when two people come to understand each other.

**Rogers**

18. (T) (F) Zeitgeist means “the spirit of the time.”
19. (T) (F) Rogers initially introduced the concept of student-centered learning, in which he found that permitting students free expression of their personal feelings increased their learning and potential for personal change.
20. (T) (F) The expression of negative feelings toward other group members generally began early in the group.
21. (T) (F) Rogers did not believe that the encounter group format would rehumanize human relationships.

**Yalom and Lieberman**

22. (T) (F) Yalom and Lieberman sought to determine the possible negative effects of being a participant in an encounter group.
23. (T) (F) The least effective predictor for perceiving a negative effect in an encounter group participant was the group leader.
24. (T) (F) The more traumatized participants were in groups in which the group leader was highly charismatic, confronting, and challenging, with intrusive and aggressive behaviors.

*Rioch*

25. (T) (F) Rioch’s attention focused primarily on the group member.
26. (T) (F) One variable was strongly discouraged in the design of this study: the emotionality of the group member.
27. (T) (F) The results of this study elicited the perception that, in the real world, “people get the leaders that they deserve.”

*Horwitz*

28. (T) (F) He felt that deductive reasoning, which interpreted only universal themes in the group, did not take into account individual differences.
29. (T) (F) Every group, according to Horwitz, had an underlying theme.
30. (T) (F) The group-centered approach had greater flexibility and integratively accepted individual differences.

*Ormont*

31. (T) (F) The group, for Ormont, represented a microcosm of reality and an ideal place to solve interpersonal problems.
32. (T) (F) By treating the group, we are using all the members as a cast of characters in an ongoing, general story with individual subplots.
33. (T) (F) According to Ormont, a group is destined to succeed when the group therapist turns the group into individual psychotherapy.
34. (T) (F) For change to occur, the individual must have an emotional connection to the material being presented.