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A term now in regular use to describe the zeitgeist or spirit of our age is 'post-modernist'. The essence of post-modernism is a decline in the belief of purist approaches to understanding physical, biological and social phenomena. This has permeated the whole field of human endeavour in disciplines as wide ranging as medicine, chemistry, architecture, art and politics. In the latter field, for example, the traditional boundaries between left and right have been largely obscured. Where once there was a belief in purist solutions, now there is only doubt and a resort to a more flexible and pragmatic approach to understanding the world in which we live.

Counselling and psychotherapy are not immune from this tendency. A domain which has always been prone to doctrinal differences and separatist tendencies is now increasingly coming to accept that there is little evidence that any one therapeutic method is superior to all others for all types of problems and all types of clients or patients. This has led to a growing interest in flexibility of response and bringing together ideas from disparate schools. The terms integrative and eclectic have come to be used increasingly to describe this process.

This development has been reflected in the appearance of a number of major American texts and accompanied by a growing British literature on the subject, in addition to the establishment first of an International Society for the Exploration of Psychotherapy Integration and its British branch, the British Institute of Integrative Psychotherapy.

Inherent within these developments is the idea that change is a constantly occurring process. Thus the accounts in this book are to be understood as a statement of the field at the present time. Some of the approaches discussed are now well established and likely to be around for the foreseeable future, while others are still in an active phase of development. This diversity reflects the nature of the field.

The chapters are divided into three parts. Part I, Introduction, offers a detailed account of the history and origins of the growth of integration and eclecticism. This incorporates an extensive review of both the British and American literature and traces the development of a variety of the key models. The key issues in the eclectic/integrative approach are introduced and discussed.

Part II, Therapeutic Approaches, offers detailed discussion of some of the key therapies encompassed within the subject of integration/
eclecticism. Inevitably, the choice is selective. It is not possible to include every approach. Nevertheless we think that the section incorporates a range of approaches from those which are well established to others which are still struggling towards greater institutional support. We leave it to the reader to decide which approach falls into which category.

In Part II the authors were asked to do the following:

• Discuss the origins of the approach, who developed the theory, when and where.
• Describe the major central concepts and if these derived from more than one tradition, how these are reconciled.
• Explain the basic assumptions about human nature and individual development.
• Explain how psychological disturbance is acquired and perpetuated and how the individual may move from psychological disturbance to psychological health.
• Identify the goal of the therapeutic method.
• Describe how the theory is related to the practice, including a discussion of the change process and the therapeutic relationship.
• Describe the format of a typical session.
• Give some account of indications and contraindications of who would find the approach helpful or unhelpful and the type of problems which are most amenable to being treated by the approach.
• Offer a case study describing the application of the approach in practice.
• Look at wider implications in relation to the range of settings and modalities in which the approach can be used.
• Speculate on future developments.

In Part III, Issues, there are chapters focusing on training, supervision and multicultural issues, in addition to discussions on what integration might mean at a more individual level.

Our hope is that the book will offer a comprehensive account of what is meant by integration/eclecticism, explain the key issues and ideas and demonstrate how they are represented in practice in the UK.
In this chapter the historical developments of the movement towards eclecticism and integration in the field of counselling/psychotherapy will be traced from 1930 through to the first half of the 1990s. Publications relating to eclecticism/integration will be referred to and those that seem to have had some significant effect on the movement will be briefly reviewed. The main events in the development of the movement, and the work of some of the influential figures, will all be highlighted. Some more specific issues related to eclecticism and integration, together with an overview of research, will be dealt with in the next chapter.

Setting the scene

While psychotherapy as a discrete discipline has a relatively short history of little more than one hundred years (Freedheim, 1992), the role of the psychotherapist reaches back across the ages to the earliest days of human existence (Ehrenwald, 1976). In this more general, non-specific sense the history of counselling and psychotherapy is interwoven with the history of the way in which human beings have managed, and have been managed by, the psyche. Its central concern can be considered to be the making whole of the inner being or soul (Bettelheim, 1983), and as such the history of psychotherapy is the history of that age-old endeavour.

In the much narrower sense of a movement or discipline, psychotherapy has a short history. In a preface to the most comprehensive recent...
Early history: schools and segregation

The early history of psychotherapy and counselling is dominated by the development of different schools, each one eager to present its case against the others and each with its own language, which only those committed to its ideas would be likely to understand. The resulting cacophony has been likened by Messer (1987) to the Tower of Babel. A separatist, denominational spirit prevailed in which theory, mainly in the form of dogmatics and lacking any substantial research base, was propounded within an adversarial culture, characterized by Larson (1980) as 'dogma eat dogma'. Perls's (1969) unedifying description of psychoanalysis as 'crap' and the more sophisticated but no less vitriolic attacks on psychoanalysis by prominent behaviourists (e.g. Eysenck, 1960; Wolpe and Rachman, 1960) serve as examples of the ethos of this period. In assigning such attitudes to an earlier period, however, it is not intended to imply that the field is currently beyond them. Disputes between orientations remain, which even now may take the form of ridicule rather than reasoned debate, as evidenced by Clarke's caricature of the work of Ellis (Clarke, 1990).

Kuhn's (1970) description of a discipline prior to the development of a shared paradigm, which gives definition to the field and around which an identifiable community is built, offers a remarkably accurate picture of this period.
The early development of eclectic attitudes: the movement towards desegregation 1930–1960

Even within the adversarial climate described above, another attitudinal strand can be traced. A body of therapists working at grass-roots level was beginning to recognize elements in approaches other than their own that needed to be heard. This diverse and ill-defined group has been termed a ‘therapeutic underground’ (Goldfried and Davison, 1976; Wachtel, 1977) to which belonged all who, while outwardly and publicly espousing a single orientation, were prepared, in the privacy of their own study and practice, to open themselves to influences from other approaches.

There is no way of knowing the numbers involved but evidence for the existence of such a group is drawn from the way in which, every now and then, a plea to colleagues to consider the possibilities of rapprochement and even integration would be made first by one and then another. Voices were raised intermittently, and at first were generally unheeded, but they were there. As early as 1932 a voice sounding an eclectic/integrative note was raised by French (1933) in an address delivered to a meeting of the American Psychiatric Association. It was an attempt to persuade colleagues of the similarities he considered to exist between two seemingly incompatible sets of concepts, namely Freudian psychoanalysis and Pavlovian conditioning. The address was published in the following year together with some of the reactions, some sympathetic but mostly hostile, to this attempt at rapprochement. Essentially French was seeking to translate the concepts of one orientation into the language of the other. Given that Pavlov acknowledged the possibility of associations existing outside of awareness (Pavlov, 1927), it seemed not an unreasonable task to attempt by someone with goodwill towards another way of ‘seeing’. Few had the same goodwill, however, and though Kubie (1934) continued the task in the following year, and Shoben (1949) took it up again some time later, by far the greatest efforts of the theorists of this time were devoted to establishing and developing their own orientations as ‘superior’ systems. Nevertheless, French had begun what was later to become a major focus for those concerned to bring the orientations closer together, namely the integration of psychoanalysis with behaviourism.

Another attempt at rapprochement, and from a different perspective to that of French, was made by Rosenzweig in 1936. This could be described as a basic common factors approach, with Rosenzweig pointing to some commonalities across orientations. He focused on the importance of the personality of the therapist, whatever his theoretical orientation, and on the usefulness of any kind of intervention, behavioural or dynamic, that contributed to a new perspective on the problem. The point of entry into the dysfunctional system, whether it be at the point of problematic behaviour or of emotional distress arising out of internal conflict, is not of primary importance since change in any one
aspect of human functioning is bound to exert a synergistic influence on all other aspects.

The 'common factors' theme emerged again four years later at a meeting of a group of psychotherapists held informally during a conference of the American Orthopsychiatric Association. As described by Watson (1940) this meeting was for the purpose of exploring the therapeutic factors that the members held in common with each other. Following the discussion Watson drew the conclusion that agreement between them was 'greater in practice than in theory' (p. 708). This seems to imply that what was later to be described as 'technical eclecticism' was already in operation at some level by this time.

In 1950 Fiedler (1950a, 1950b) published his findings from a study showing that less experienced therapists tended to hold much more tenaciously to theoretical allegiances than did their more experienced counterparts, and that experienced therapists from different orientations were closer to each other than they were to inexperienced colleagues within their own orientation.

In the same year Dollard and Miller (1950) published their widely acclaimed Personality and Psychotherapy. This work has an enduring quality and is still in print. To some extent it informed the latter work of Wachtel in this area and deserves some more detailed attention here.

J. Dollard and N.E. Miller Personality and Psychotherapy, An Analysis in Terms of Learning, Thinking and Culture (1950)

This work represents a major attempt at bringing together concepts from psychoanalysis and behavioural theory, and thus continues the task begun 17 years earlier by French. It goes beyond French, however, in that it is more than an attempt at translation; rather it seeks to demonstrate the possibility of an integration of a number of concepts from these two diverse orientations. In particular it focuses on the learned nature of the neuroses, involving the learning of repression, unconscious conflicts and symptoms. Therapy involves new learning which can take place under certain conditions and includes a proper selection of patients who are able to learn, the use of free association, transference, labelling (in the sense of teaching patients to think about new topics), teaching discrimination between the roles of the past and of the present, and a concentration on the gains that can be obtained from the restoration of the 'higher mental processes'. Though the therapeutic process, as Dollard and Miller describe it, remains largely psychoanalytic, the therapist is seen as 'a special kind of teacher' and some behavioural procedures are introduced, particularly the use of homework assignments and techniques for the reinforcement of desired behaviours.

Dollard and Miller’s project was funded by the Institute of Human Relations at the University of Yale and, although the book was published in 1950, work on it had begun before the involvement of the USA in World
War II. Originally it took the form of lectures to classes and discussions with colleagues. Since this implies an early interest among a wider group of people than just the two authors heading the project, it supplies further support for the existence of an ‘underground’ group of therapists prepared to reach across orientational boundaries at a time when conflict between the orientations was rife.

Gathering momentum: the eclectic movement in the 1960s and 1970s

*The 1960s: the ‘underground’ begins to emerge*

Momentum in the movement towards the desegregation of the orientations, began to grow in the 1960s. ‘Schoolism’ was still rife, but even so a surprising number of practitioners were prepared to identify themselves as eclectic when surveyed (see Chapter 2). Clearly, there was a realization among many that the segregation of the therapies was both unhelpful and unrealistic. The increasing volume of psychotherapeutic literature meant that a reservoir of therapeutic interests and ideas was being created, into which flowed contributions from all the major approaches. A ‘back-flow’ from the reservoir into the various contributing streams was beginning to occur. While those theoreticians bathing in the purist waters some way upstream remained unaffected, it was becoming more evident that considerable numbers in each ‘orientational tributary’ were beginning to be influenced by the back-flow. If the theorists were unable, or unwilling, to seek integration at their level, a growing number of ‘artful’ therapists from both the psychodynamic and behavioural orientations were blending together techniques at the level of practice (London, 1964).

*Psychodynamicists and behaviourists*

For those concerned with the integration of the therapies the main efforts continued to be directed towards effecting some kind of marriage between psychoanalysis and behaviour therapy. If a ‘marriage’ was a rather optimistic metaphor at this stage of development, then, perhaps, at least a genial and mutually beneficial co-habitation could be hoped for.

Throughout the 1960s a steady growth of interest in taking up the challenge of bringing about some kind of integration between these two still disparate orientations can be detected in the literature (e.g. Alexander, 1963; Marmor, 1964; Marks and Gelder, 1966; Wolf, 1966; Weitzman, 1967; Bergin, 1968; Brady, 1968; Kraft, 1969).

In 1966, in a study of the respective merits of insight therapy and the use of desensitization, Paul (1966) argued that the central concern in any approach to therapy should be: ‘What treatment, by whom, is most effective for this individual, with that specific problem, under which set of circumstances?’ This compound question has been repeatedly asked in
the counselling and psychotherapy literature and is an important focus of the integrative project today.

The humanists

The 1960s saw the entry of the humanists into the eclectic/integrative debate. In 1951 Carl Rogers had written somewhat dismissively of eclecticism and in favour of adherence to a single school of thought. At that time he considered the insufficient objective evidence available to theorists made the development of markedly different hypotheses inevitable. Any attempt at reconciling them through compromise would result in 'a superficial eclecticism which does not increase objectivity and which leads nowhere' (Rogers, 1951: 8).

By the early 1960s, however, Rogers (1963) recognized that the psychotherapeutic domain was in chaos because of the growing number of conflicting approaches entering the fray, some of which did not fit into any recognizable mainstream orientation. Acknowledging that the hitherto self-contained orientations in which therapists had conducted their endeavours were breaking down in the realm of practice, he considered that the time was now right for the inevitable limitations of single orientations to yield to a more rigorous and direct process of observation of what actually transpires in the course of therapy. In many respects Rogers was ahead of the field in this direction, in that he was not advocating simply melding existing theoretical approaches, but rather that closer attention should be given to research allowing new insights into the process of therapy to emerge.

In 1965 Rogers made the now famous teaching film with Shostrom, Perls and Ellis (Shostrom, 1965) in which the three psychotherapies (Client-Centred, Gestalt and Rational Emotive Therapy) were demonstrated with a single client (Gloria). This was not in any way an attempt at integrating the therapies. Rather it sought to demonstrate the differences in the approaches taken by each therapist. However, it does represent, in pluralistic fashion, a readiness on behalf of each therapist to see the others' approaches as valid in their own right simply by virtue of appearing together in the same film under the same general title. It is perhaps a little ironic that the client herself engaged in some therapeutic integrating in her final summary of her experience by pointing out that the overall process had been beneficial to her, having begun with the empathic warmth of Rogers, continued with the challenging techniques of Perls and finished with the more action-oriented approach of Ellis - a process later to be built into an influential eclectic framework by Egan (1975).

In the second half of the decade another humanist, C.H. Patterson (1967), focused on the points of convergence and divergence between the different therapeutic approaches. Sloane (1969) added client-centred therapy to a review of the convergent paths of behaviour therapy and psychotherapy, arguing that a major factor common to all three therapeutic approaches was the principles of learning.
Two influential figures in the eclectic movement in the 1960s: J. Frank and A.A. Lazarus

J. FRANK AND A COMMON FACTORS APPROACH  
Jerome Frank published *Persuasion and Healing* in 1961, a work described by Arkowitz (1992: 277) as 'one of the most influential early writings on common factors'. Exploring much more widely than the realm of psychotherapy, Frank looked at the process of change as it can be observed in forms of primitive healing, placebo effects in medicine, brainwashing, religious conversion and faith healing in a number of different cultures. He considered that the prime influences in effecting change in individuals are emotional arousal, an increase in self-esteem, the raising of hope and an expectation of change, the facilitation of some new ways of seeing the problem, and some focused activity in which to engage. These, he suggests, are factors common in some form, either explicitly or implicitly, to all approaches to psychotherapy.

A.A. LAZARUS AND TECHNICAL ECLECTICISM  
The term 'technical eclecticism' was introduced by Lazarus in 1967. Though still working within the behavioural orientation at this time, Lazarus became dissatisfied with what he called 'narrow-band behaviour therapy' and sought to incorporate into his repertoire of techniques some procedures that were considered to be outside the boundaries of traditional behaviour therapy (Lazarus, 1981). This expanded version of behaviour therapy he later referred to as 'broad-spectrum behaviour therapy' (Lazarus, 1971). Clearly these were steps on the way to an even more broadly eclectic position. But it was not until the mid-1970s that the technically eclectic approach of Multimodal Behaviour Therapy was presented in published form to the therapeutic community (Lazarus, 1976), and later still that the even more fully technically eclectic Multimodal Therapy (1981) was introduced.

The 1970s: eclectics/integrationists 'coming out'

Surveys in the 1970s

A number of surveys of therapists were conducted in the 1970s, which for the most part showed a growing trend among therapists to describe their theoretical orientation as eclectic/integrative. These surveys will be reviewed in the following chapter.

Psychodynamic and behavioural integration in the 1970s: a continuing theme

The momentum towards the search for integration continued to increase throughout the 1970s. The number of publications with an eclectic/integrative concern grew steadily, with the main focus of interest remaining on the psychoanalytic/psychodynamic and behavioural orientations. Moreover,
other factors were coming into play as socio-economic influences were being brought to bear on psychotherapists. In particular, third-party funding was throwing greater emphasis on accountability and effectiveness, and therapists were having to consider the use of briefer forms of therapy (London, 1983; Garfield and Bergin, 1986; VandenBos et al., 1992).

In some respects these issues were more pertinent to the psychodynamic therapists whose work with clients/patients was usually spread over many sessions and often over many years. Messer (1986) and Arkowitz (1992) suggest that the response to this pressure had the side effect of moving some psychodynamic approaches more in the behavioural direction. Malan (1976) introduced the concept of focused treatment and goal setting in a brief psychodynamic approach; Blanck and Blanck (1976) argued that there should be a place in the psychodynamic approach for a greater appreciation by therapists of the adaptive efforts made by clients/patients in coping with their problems. Shengold (1979), in working with the victims of child abuse, sought to pay more attention than was usual in the psychodynamic tradition to the effects of actual events on people's lives.

On the behavioural side, behaviour therapists like Lazarus were beginning to feel the impact of cognitive therapy as developed by Ellis, in the form of rational-emotive therapy, and by Beck, whose work on depression was by now attracting considerable interest (Beck, 1967). Arnkoff and Glass (1992) note the rapid growth in the 1970s of the number of therapists of all orientations interested in cognitive interventions. They suggest that one reason for this interest was a growing dissatisfaction among behaviour therapists 'with techniques that did not target the internal dialogue that they saw their clients engaging in and that seemed to maintain maladaptive behaviour' (p. 659). This interest shown by behaviour therapists in cognitive interventions moved them a little closer to the more recent developments in the psychodynamic therapies and thus increased the potential for integration. Interestingly, Arnkoff and Glass (1992), following Dobson and Block (1988), suggest that cognitive techniques were also drawing attention from many psychoanalytically trained therapists who were dissatisfied with the primacy awarded to the unconscious, with the emphasis on history rather than on current behaviour, and with the long-term nature of psychoanalytic therapy. This growing interest on both sides of the psychoanalytic behavioural divide provided cognitive therapy with a potentially pivotal role in the process of integration. This integrative potential of cognitive learning methods for bringing together 'internalism' (Freudian and neo-Freudian; humanistic and existential approaches) and 'behaviourism' (from Watson to Skinner), was noted by Rimm and Masters (1979).

Some contributions to the psychodynamic behavioural integration debate in the 1970s

Marmor (1971) argued that all psychotherapy is basically a learning process and that the psychodynamically oriented approaches and the
behavioural approaches ‘simply represent different teaching techniques’ (p. 26). While he acknowledges that the different techniques are based on differences in goals and differences of assumptions about the nature of psychotherapy, he considers that the common factor between the two orientations is to be found in the basic processes involved in learning.

Birk and Brinkley-Birk (1974) presented a case for complementarity between the two orientations, with psychodynamic therapy providing insight and behaviour therapy contributing the actual procedures for effecting change.

Sloane et al. (1975), in a study on the activities of psychodynamic and behavioural therapists, found some remarkable similarities between the two groups. Both groups demonstrated comparable degrees of warmth and acceptance towards their clients, both facilitated comparable degrees of depth of self-exploration in their clients and both used interpretative and clarifying statements to the same extent.

Feldman (1979) presented a conceptual model of some of the intrapsychic and interpersonal forces that stimulate and maintain repetitive, non-productive marital conflict behaviour, in which he sought to integrate concepts derived from psychoanalytic and social learning theory within a family systems framework.

An integrative landmark in the 1970s: Paul Wachtel and cyclical dynamics

*Psychoanalysis and Behaviour Therapy: Toward an Integration* was published by Wachtel in 1977. It is described by Arkowitz (1992: 267) as ‘the most comprehensive and successful attempt to integrate behavioural and psychodynamic approaches and one of the most influential books in the entire field of psychotherapy integration’. Wachtel (1977) confessed that, ironically, the book had its origins in his desire as a psychoanalytical therapist to put behaviour therapists ‘in their place’. Being convinced that ‘behaviour therapy was foolish, superficial, and possibly even immoral’ (p. xvii), he decided to take the opportunity offered him to write a paper for a symposium (that, in the end, was never held) attacking the dangers of behaviour therapy. This led him to consider in depth for the first time what behaviour therapy really involved. The result was a very serious contribution on the integration of the two approaches.

The two main themes underlying the arguments in the book are described by Wachtel as, first, ‘in order to help, we must help’ (p. xviii, original emphasis). He is critical of the stance of minimal intervention which characterizes much of the clinical practice in the psychoanalytic tradition, and probably in the humanist and existential traditions as well. The second underlying theme is the need to develop a theory of personality that ‘substitutes for the traditional psychoanalytic imagery (e.g. “archaeological” layering, superficial surfaces that mask deep and genuine
inner cores) a conception of cyclical events that confirm themselves by a complex set of feedback processes in which the co-operation of other people is essential' (p. xviii).

The psychoanalytic approaches that Wachtel considered to be most favourable to his purpose of integrating the two orientations were the interpersonal approaches of Sullivan, Horney and Erikson. These, he believes, allow room for the current interpersonal context of the individual to be worked with in therapy and provide better opportunities for more therapist activity. He continues to emphasize the psychoanalytical concepts of the unconscious, dynamic conflict and the importance of meanings and fantasies in the inner world in influencing interactions with the outer world. To these, however, he adds a concern with the present environmental context in which problematical behaviour takes place, the importance of present as well as past interpersonal influences, and an emphasis on the use of active interventions by the therapist in working together with the patient/client towards identified goals.

Although it is in a later work that Wachtel uses the term ‘cyclical dynamics’ (1987), the concept is a central feature here. Early patterns are reproduced in present interpersonal contexts with the effect of pulling in ‘accomplices’ who are ‘prompted’ to respond in a way that confirms the pattern and ensures that a further cycle follows. Thus ‘rather than having been locked in, in the past, by intrapsychic structuring, the pattern seems from this perspective to be continually being formed, but generally in a way that keeps it quite consistent through the years’ (p. 53). It follows that if the pattern is being continually re-formed, it can be interrupted with appropriate interventions. Interpretations aimed at facilitating insight into origins and current motivations are one form of intervention with which Wachtel is in full agreement, but he considers it to be essential to be more active since ‘such interpretative efforts may be undermined if they are not combined with efforts aimed more directly at bringing about new behaviour in day-to-day situations’ (p. 71).

Widening the eclectic/integrative scene in the 1970s: the humanistic and cognitive therapies

HUMANISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS A humanistic perspective on integration was offered by a number of writers during the 1970s. Truax and Mitchell (1971) focused on the fact that whatever the theoretical orientation of the therapist every process of therapy has an interpersonal dimension. They stress the importance of the part played by the personal characteristics of the therapist in the process of change and suggest that this is a factor needing research across the orientations.

Martin (1972) sought to bring together a view of learning theory with a client-centred approach. Thoresen (1973) suggested that behavioural techniques could serve humanistic ends, since the philosophy underpinning
the behavioural approach was not essentially different from that underpinning the humanistic therapies. It is worth noting that this is a clear departure from the position taken up by Rogers who considered that it was precisely at the level of philosophy that the two approaches were mutually exclusive (Rogers, 1980).

Appelbaum (1976), writing from a psychoanalytic perspective, expressed the view that Gestalt therapy could be usefully added to a psychoanalytic approach and later widened his interest to other aspects of the humanistic therapies (1979).

Areas of potential integration between behaviourism and humanism were explored by contributors from each orientation in a volume edited by Wandersman et al. in 1976. In the same year Lazarus published *Multimodal Behavior Therapy* (1976) which not only provided a framework for behavioural and cognitive elements, but also included some elements from the more humanistic approaches (e.g. Gestalt). This was also a theme taken up by Davison (1978) when, addressing members of the Association for the Advancement of Behaviour Therapy, he advocated that behaviour therapists should consider the possibility of using some humanistic procedures to enhance their clinical work.

**COGNITIVE THERAPY AND INTEGRATION**

Though, in a formal sense, the cognitive approaches were the most recent of therapies, by the mid-1970s they were already finding their way into the integration debate, as noted above. The juxtaposition of three orientations in a question posed by Arkowitz, which serves as the title of a paper (1978): 'Are Psychoanalytic Therapists Beginning to Practice Cognitive Behavior Therapy or is Behavior Therapy Turning Analytic?' shows that by the end of the 1970s the issues of integration could not be discussed without some recognition of the part to be played by cognitive therapy.

*Gerard Egan and The Skilled Helper: an eclectic framework*

The first edition of *The Skilled Helper* was published in 1975. Egan began from an essentially humanistic position and then moved progressively towards a more action-oriented form of helping. His work, described as a problem management approach, is basically an eclectic framework into which is built concepts from psychology and sociology as well as from the major therapies. The counselling process is presented as having three main stages: Exploration, Understanding and Action (later to be retitled: Present Scenario, Preferred Scenario, and Getting There), with each stage having a set of skills appropriate to the process. The elements of insight and action can be readily identified in the approach, especially in its early form. The book, however, has gone through five editions and the approach has become more refined and more action oriented with each edition. Egan's approach has been a major influence on training programmes for counsellors, particularly in the UK.
Other contributions to the integration debate in the 1970s

Some contributors to the debate called not so much for an integration of existing orientations as for a new orientation altogether. For example, Feather and Rhoads (1972a, 1972b), though beginning with a view to exploring the integration of behaviour and psychoanalytic therapy, argue that in the end these diverse ways of understanding psychological and emotional disorder probably serve only to indicate a lack of very much real understanding at all. They emphasize the importance of continuing to search for a more all-embracing theory of psychotherapy which will go beyond a mere merging of what already exists.

Others had a more pluralistic perspective, acknowledging the usefulness of all the therapies. Hunt (1976) serves as an example of this, arguing that rather than merging therapies in order to reduce their number, they should each be seen as contributing to a fuller understanding of human beings, rather like laser beams operating together to produce a hologram.

Developing an identity: the 1980s and 1990s

Rapprochement, eclecticism and integration in counselling and psychotherapy became central themes in the 1980s and early 1990s, and it was during this period that the eclectic and integration movement emerged with an identity in its own right.

Surveys of therapists in the 1980s and 1990s

The number of surveys of therapists which included a section on theoretical orientation increased from four in the 1970s to 14 in the 1980s. Interest was still largely focused on clinical psychologists, but a number of surveys drew samples from other bodies of practitioners. These will be reviewed more fully in the following chapter, but it should be noted here that overall the surveys show the number of therapists reporting themselves to be eclectic/integrative continuing to rise during this period.

Increasing numbers of publications

In addition to the surveys carried out, the number of publications with an eclectic/integrative interest multiplied. There were over 200 publications related to the integration of counselling and psychotherapy between 1980 and 1992, and many more if extended references and parts of publications are included (Hollanders, 1996). Only a few of what may be considered to be the main contributions will be mentioned here.

Integration of psychoanalytic and behaviour therapy: an incomplete project

Interest in the integration of these two orientations continued throughout
the 1980s and 1990s. Marmor and Woods (1980) edited a volume on The Interface between the Psychodynamic and Behavioural Therapies in which it was argued that neither approach can encompass all that is needed in addressing the human condition. In many respects this sets out the case for a more pluralistic approach rather than for an integration of the orientations into one superordinate theory of therapy. This theme was subsequently illustrated by Cohen and Pope (1980) who presented a case study in which a client/patient underwent therapy with a psychoanalytic therapist and a behavioural therapist concurrently. Each therapist cooperated fully with the other and significant progress was considered to have been made.

The subject of resistance in the therapeutic process was explored by Wachtel (1982) from an integrative perspective by seeking to elicit the experience of established therapists from different orientations in the hope that a common understanding of the problem may emerge. Other contributions concerned with the psychoanalytic/behavioural dimensions of integration included Rhoads (1981), Arkowitz and Messer (1984) and Messer (1986).

Clearly, the task of integrating the concepts of psychoanalysis and behaviour therapy has not yet been achieved to any extent that convinces all within these two diverse orientations of the validity of the project. Moreover, there are indications that many of those committed to integration in psychotherapy and counselling are now looking in directions which take them beyond the bounds of an integration of existing 'pure form' approaches (see Chapter 2).

The humanistic and cognitive therapies

The humanistic and cognitive therapies continued to make their respective voices heard in the debate in the 1980s and 1990s. The relationship between psychoanalytic concepts and Gestalt practice as a basis for rapprochement between the two approaches was the subject of a paper by Nielsen (1980). One year later Arnkoff (1981) explored the possibility of using the Gestalt technique of the empty chair within a cognitive therapy framework. He considered that the resulting progress made by clients was greater than would have been expected using cognitive techniques alone. In the following year a fuller discussion of the overlaps between cognitive therapy and humanistic therapy was presented by Bohart (1982).

An attempt at the integration of cognitive-behavioural therapy with the interpersonal psychoanalytic approaches was illustrated by Anchin (1982), and Horowitz (1988) produced what he described as 'a new synthesis' of the more recent forms of psychoanalysis, including ego psychology (e.g. Hartman, 1964), self-psychology (e.g. Kohut, 1984) and object relations theory (e.g. Winnicott, 1965), with new developments in cognitive psychology (e.g. Baars, 1986).

In 1991 Kahn focused on the relationship between client and therapist
within the humanistic and psychoanalytic traditions. He presented the work of Kohut as a point at which the psychoanalytic concepts developed by Freud and later by Gill could meet the humanistic approach developed by Rogers. He described what he considered an integration of the work of Freud, Gill, Kohut and Rogers would mean in terms of the therapeutic relationship. He concluded in a truly integrative fashion:

At the moment of the existential encounter between therapist and client, the client’s whole world is present. All of the client’s significant past relationships, all their most basic hopes and fears, are there and are focused upon the therapist. If we can make it possible for them to become aware of their world coming to rest in us, and if we can be there, fully there, to receive their awareness and respond to it, the relationship cannot help but become therapeutic. (Kahn, 1991: 160)

An attempt to bring together object relations theory with Gestalt techniques was made in 1996 by Glickauf-Hughes et al., coming to the conclusion that ‘therapeutic gains are most likely to be noted where gestalt techniques are used in tandem with techniques recommended by Object relations theorists (Kohut, 1977; Winnicott, 1965) such as empathy with the client’s feelings and attunement to their needs’ (p. 67).

Common factors

What has become known as the common factors approach to integration emerged as a major focus during the 1980s. This was spurred on by research that seemed to show the equivalence of outcomes among the mainstream approaches (Luborsky et al., 1975; Smith et al., 1980; Landsman and Dawes, 1982; Stiles et al., 1986). If no therapy is superior to any other in terms of the overall outcomes achieved, then whatever is effective can be found in all. Karasu (1986), who identified more than 400 different approaches to psychotherapy, also identified three common factors shared by all approaches: affective experiencing, cognitive mastery and behavioural reformulation.

Goldfried (1982) sought to identify ‘converging themes’ from the psychoanalytic, behavioural and humanistic orientations, focusing particularly on trends in practice as described by therapists from the different approaches. This work has an historical perspective, being largely reprinted articles grouped in a sequence that is intended to show the development of interest in rapprochement and integration since the 1930s, with an overview of the period provided by Goldfried and Padawar (1982).

Others have looked for the agents of effective change in the therapeutic relationship formed between the client and the counsellor/therapist (e.g. Bordin, 1979; Clarkson, 1990). Among these lines Friedman (1985), greatly influenced by the work of Buber (1937), focused on the nature of the dialogue in the different orientations as the healing agent. Called by Friedman the ‘dialogue of touchstones’, it is possible that the ‘I – Thou’ moments in
therapy which produce deep personal insight can take place in any therapeutic process regardless of the theoretical orientation of the therapist, though the theoretical framework in which therapy takes place may influence the way in which such moments are used.

**Developing eclectic/integrative approaches**

An area of interest that grew rapidly during this period was the development of eclectic/integrative therapies that drew from the major orientations but were approaches in their own right. Lazarus's Multimodal Therapy (Lazarus, 1981, 1986), Garfield's Eclectic Therapy (Garfield, 1980), and later his brief therapy (Garfield, 1989), Beutler's systemic approach to eclectic therapy (Beutler, 1983) and Andrews (1988, 1989, 1991) 'self-confirmation model' are all examples of the eclectic approaches being developed at this time. These tended to be much more empirical in nature than the mainstream theoretical orientations.

In 1989 Mahrer published what Norcross, who had been invited to write the Foreword, described as 'a new and incisive book' (p. 11). Six strategies for integrating the psychotherapies were considered in some depth:

- the integrative development of substantive new theories of psychotherapy;
- the integration of concretely specific operating procedures;
- the integration of therapeutic vocabularies;
- the integrative super-framework;
- the integration of commonalities across approaches;

Mahrer recommended that the first two strategies, together with a limited version of the third, should be pursued and that the rest should be abandoned. Norcross, however, takes issue with the way in which Mahrer describes his last strategy, commenting:

His conceptualisation of the sixth strategy – Diagnose-the-Problem and Prescribe-the-Treatment – is off the mark. This meaning of integration, for me, is Understand-the-Person and Orient-Therapy-to-the-Person. We obviously cannot fully appreciate a person solely through DSM-III (DSM-IIIIR), but need to understand a client's phenomenal world and interpersonal drama. This clinical understanding, not discrete diagnoses, can be translated into more prescriptive therapeutic stances and interventions. (Norcross in Mahrer, 1989: 14)

An approach to integration based on the assimilation model began to be developed by Stiles and his colleagues (Stiles et al., 1992) at Miami University in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Since this arose directly out of the British Sheffield Psychotherapy Project (Shapiro and Firth, 1987; Stiles et al., 1990), more detailed reference will be made to it later in this chapter when specifically British contributions will be considered.
Eclectic and integrative handbooks

A major publication was Norcross's *Handbook of Eclectic Psychotherapy* in 1986, and the subsequent companion volume *A Case Book of Eclectic Psychotherapy* in 1987. By collecting together contributions relating to history, philosophy, current trends and developing approaches, Norcross gave eclecticism the shape and standing as an multi-faceted orientation that it had been striving for but had hitherto lacked. Though optimistic in tone the Handbook is nevertheless realistic, providing a critique of the leading approaches (Dryden, 1986) and a careful examination of the complexities of seeking to integrate orientations which have different 'visions of reality' (Messer, 1986).

It is indicative of the developments continuing to take place in this field that a new version of the Handbook was produced in 1992 (Norcross and Goldfried, 1992). This is essentially an update, but its title has now become the *Handbook of Psychotherapy Integration* and of the eight eclectic approaches featured in the 1986 version, only four remain. Lazarus's 'Multimodal Therapy', Beulter's 'Systematic Eclectic Psychotherapy', Garfield's 'Eclectic Psychotherapy' and Prochaska and DiClemente's 'Transtheoretical Approach' are all retained.

Two new approaches in the 1992 Handbook are those developed by Beitman (1992) and Wachtel and McKinney (1992). There are also two new sections in the 1992 version of the Handbook: 'Integrative Psychotherapies for Specific Disorders' and 'Integrative Treatment Modalities'. Both represent some significantly new directions being taken by the eclectic/integration movement in recent times. The former is indicative of the trend away from theoretical orientations and towards effective 'treatments' for particular problems. This may involve the production of 'treatment manuals' that do not regard the dogmatic boundaries of the individual approaches. The latter is indicative of the movement towards the integration of psychotherapy and counselling with other disciplines in 'treatment planning', most notably pharmacotherapy and applied psychology research.

A second major Handbook was that of Stricker and Gold (1993): *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychotherapy Integration* which includes sections on 'the integration of traditional and nontraditional approaches', and 'psychotherapy integration with specific populations'.

Integration reflected in the journals

Psychotherapy and counselling related journals grew rapidly in number in the 1980s and early 1990s. Not only were many of them making space for papers on topics related to rapprochement, eclecticism and integration (e.g. *Psychotherapy*, 29, 1, an issue devoted to the future of psychotherapy included papers on psychotherapy integration (Goldfried and Castonguay, 1992) and technical eclecticism (Lazarus, 1992)), but some were also devoting special issues to exploring the theme in depth (e.g. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, special issue, 1980; *Behavior Therapy*, special issue, 1982; *British
Journal of Clinical Psychology, special issue, 1983). The British Journal of Guidance and Counselling devoted most of a 1989 issue (17, 3) to eclecticism and integration, but it may be indicative of the lack of development in this direction among British counsellors/therapists that all but one of the main contributors came from the USA. The developments in the UK will be returned to later. Although the Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly, first published in 1987, was concerned with a particular approach, one of its declared intentions was to explore the possibility of the integration of cognitive therapy with other therapeutic approaches. The first journal to be specifically devoted to the exploration and study of eclecticism in psychotherapy was the International Journal of Eclectic Psychotherapy, published in 1985. Significantly, it was renamed in 1987 to become the Journal of Integrative and Eclectic Psychotherapy. An important new journal, the Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, is referred to below in connection with the formation of the Society For The Exploration of Psychotherapy Integration (SEPI).

Networks and associations

The growth of interest in eclecticism and integration, together with the recognition that such interest is respectable, at least among a good proportion of the psychotherapeutic population, led to more open discussion between practitioners with a desire to foster a network of interested parties. Goldfried and Newman (1992) refer to a two-day conference that took place in 1981, attended by Garfield, Goldfried, Horowitz, Imber, Kendall, Strupp, Wachtel and Wolfe. The conference had as its agreed primary objective the initiation of a dialogue between these therapists of different orientations who, nevertheless, had an interest in rapprochement and possible integration. Working at the level of practice as well as theory, they agreed that if it was possible actual clinical material would be discussed from different perspectives.

About the same time, the International Academy of Eclectic Psychotherapists was formed 'to bring psychotherapy into a new era, through closer collaboration of eminent professionals of diverse expertise' (Dryden, 1984: 362).

International conferences sponsored by well-established professional associations also began to focus on the theme of rapprochement (e.g. the World Congress of the Adler Society held in Vienna in 1982 was given over to the consideration of contributions from representatives of different orientations).

In 1986, recognizing the need for urgent research to be carried out into the development of integration in psychotherapy, the Affective and Anxiety Disorders Branch of the Division of Clinical Research at the American National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) invited 14 eminent integrationist therapists to a two-day workshop. Their task was 'to consider the key issues associated with psychotherapy integration in order to
advise the NIMH on guidelines for launching a program to stimulate relevant empirical research' (Wolfe and Goldfried, 1988: 448). A report on the recommendations and conclusions from the workshop stated:

Some sort of desegregation is needed to break down the barriers between schools of therapy and to identify both the robust principles of change that cut across orientations as well as the unique contributions that each particular approach may offer. Only then will it be possible to compile research findings that, although they may originate from a given orientation, are not irrevocably embedded in that particular school of thought. These findings, in turn, may ultimately be used to construct a new conceptual system close enough to the research data and clinical observations to be used for selecting the interventions that are most likely to be effective with various clinical problems. (Wolfe and Goldfried, 1988: 451)

Here common factors, elements unique to each orientation and research data are all envisaged as coming together in the creation of a new, more comprehensive form of therapy. There is an acknowledgement in the report, however, that this is still only a very distant prospect.

The most significant event in the development of a professional identity for those who were concerned to pursue integration through exploration of the issues with other therapists was the formation of the Society for the Exploration of Psychotherapy Integration (SEPI). The first newsletter of the society was produced in 1983 and in 1991 it published the first issue of its official journal, the *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*. The journal continues to contain the newsletter which serves to pass information between groups of therapists. The directory of the society's membership for 1990–91 contained 537 names, and although 465 of them were from the USA there was an international membership of 72 from 14 countries outside the USA, including 10 from the UK. In 1991 the first international conference of SEPI to be convened outside the USA was held in London.

Much of the preceding outline of historical developments has focused on the American scene. That is where the modern integrative movement had its origins, and where the main developments have taken place. Nevertheless, there has been a steady growth of interest in eclecticism and integration in the UK, and some significant contributions have come from British practitioners. We now turn our attention to reviewing briefly a number of British contributions to the debate (some of these will be covered in more detail later in this book).

**Eclecticism and integration: British contributions**

Pilgrim (1990) tentatively suggests that one of the reasons for the development of eclecticism in Britain was that British psychologists/therapists were acculturated generally not to theorize too much: 'At the risk of over-
generalizing about my own culture, the British tend to treat emotionality and elaborate intellectual theorising with equal suspicion' (p. 7).

Clearly this is an over-generalization and falls into the trap of thinking of eclecticism as a refuge for the theoretically 'woolly’ practitioner. While it has to be acknowledged that this may be so in some (perhaps many) instances, it does not take sufficiently into account those therapists who allowed their theory to be guided by practice, and who thus found that not every client in every situation fitted well into a single theoretical position. This is a long way from a lack of concern for theory. Rather, it implies a theoretical integrity which is flexible instead of dogmatic, and which places greater value on open-ended exploration of the integration of theory and practice, than on defending some cherished but closed theoretical position. It is the concern for theory that is grounded in, arises out of, and feeds back into practice, that has been the motivation behind many of the British contributions to integration.

**Heron’s six-category intervention**

Although Heron’s (1982) six-category intervention analysis has not been formulated into a specific approach, it does provide an eclectic framework. Based on the work of Blake and Moulton (1972), Heron suggests there are six basic intervention categories: prescriptive, informative, confronting, cathartic, catalytic and supportive. The first three are grouped under the heading of ‘authoritative’ and the last three are termed ‘facilitative’. These categories are not the property of any one approach, but rather are likely to be found in most approaches in some form. The truly skilful practitioner (whatever her theoretical orientation), will be proficient at working within each of these categories, and will be able to move ‘elegantly and cleanly’ from one to another as the situation requires. Moreover, she will know which category she is working in at any point in the process, and be able to give an explanation of the rationale behind the practice.

**Hobson’s conversation therapy**

Although the Conversational Model, developed by Hobson (1985), is not usually included in the integrative literature, it does, nevertheless, have a strong eclectic ethos. Hobson himself had a Jungian training, and this is evident in his approach, but he also draws on object-relations theory, the existential philosophy of Buber (1937), cognitive psychology, systems theory, and the work of Rogers (1951). In addition to this, his use of philosophy, literature and poetry (another form of integration) is a prominent feature of his presentation of his work. Moreover, Hobson expressly endorses eclecticism:

In the present state of knowledge no one of very many theories can be sufficient. In doing his best to assess what methods are appropriate for what patients, with what therapists, in what situations, a psychotherapist needs to use different frameworks. This eclectic approach calls for a paragon with wide theoretical
knowledge, long experience, and a clarity and flexibility of intellect as well as sensitive feeling... The Conversational Model can be elaborated in many ways using different theoretical principles incarnated in varied personal styles. (Hobson, 1985: 209)

Hobson’s model has been used in a number of research projects. Most notably it was the relationship-oriented approach used in the influential Sheffield Psychotherapy Project (see below).

Arising out of the Sheffield project, an attempt was made to adapt Hobson’s approach to a brief therapy format involving just two sessions, plus one follow-up session (Barkham, 1989; Barkham and Hobson, 1989). Some research currently being carried out in the School of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences at the University of Manchester is also making use of Hobson’s approach, with some adaptations from Ryle’s Cognitive Analytic Therapy. This is basically an outcome study using randomized control trials seeking to assess the effectiveness of this form of therapy with patients who have previously been considered unsuitable for psychotherapeutic treatment (e.g. treatment resistant outpatients).

In the light of its use in such projects it is surprising that the approach does not receive more attention in the eclectic/integrative literature.

**Dyne and eclectic endeavours**

Dyne (1985), another British contributor to the debate, sees eclecticism as an attitude leading to engagement in a process rather than as a position. According to Dyne, the eclectic attitude will manifest its ‘life and value’ through an active involvement in a number of ‘easily identifiable and related endeavours’ (p. 121). Each endeavour has the quality of a search, a seeking out of that which deepens and broadens vision and enables the seeker to move closer to a more integrated and unified field of knowledge and practice. The search, however, will not result in finding a position in which the seeker may rest, relieved of any necessity for further endeavour. Rather, the one who possesses a truly eclectic attitude will be engaged in an unending process of experimentation with ‘ideas and techniques in order to understand, investigate, question, support, extend and develop the state of knowledge in the field’ (p. 122).

Dyne (1985) identifies three related endeavours in which the eclectic will be engaged.

First is the search in any direction that ‘seems likely to yield information, concepts, suggestions and paradigms that may cast useful light on the nature of human beings’ (p. 121). He cites Freud, Rank, Adler, Jung and Fromm as examples of those who have been truly eclectic in this multi-disciplinary sense.

The second endeavour of eclecticism is to seek to establish inner coherence in related areas of concern, and to ‘uncover fundamental structures and lines of inter-connectedness that underpin the whole field’ (p. 121). In