Group Counseling: C.H. Patterson—A Personalized View

Nicholas A. Vacc

Nicholas A. Vacc is a professor of counselor education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

C.H. Patterson, a leader in the field of counseling, was interviewed about the profession and, in particular, group counseling. The interview provides a personalized view of significant events in his professional career and important issues involving group counseling.

Dr. Patterson shared with me a perception of caring and sensitivity as the essence for an effective therapeutic relationship. *Nil Moore, doctoral student, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, August 1988.*

C.H. Patterson, who is currently a Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Emeritus Professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, is known by his students as an educator, but not an ordinary educator. How many educators have been awarded two Fulbrights, are past presidents of the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, the Division of Counseling Psychology (American Psychological Association) are a fellow in three divisions of APA, and have a robust list of publications that began in 1941. For over three decades, C. H. Patterson has been a moving force in counselor education and psychology. He has had an influence on many students of counseling either directly, as with Nil Moore, or indirectly through his more than 165 articles and 13 books. He has brought much to the profession by providing practitioners and researchers with issues to examine and substantial information on counseling. C.H. Patterson has helped shape the profession of counseling. How did that evolve? What are his reflections about group counseling during his professional career? How does he view the interaction between individual and group theory? What does he predict as the future for group counseling? The interview with C.H. Patterson that follows presents his answers to these and several other questions.

N.V.: *Please talk about what influenced you to enter the counseling field.*

C.H.P.: Well, as I think back on how I got involved in counseling, it's rather vague at this point because it's been a long period of time. Actually, I went back to school with the intention of going into the ministry, but my undergraduate work at the University of Chicago led me into other fields. I got interested in the social sciences, sociology, and social psychology, and finished with a degree in sociology in 1938. The depression was still going on and I couldn't get a job. During my undergraduate work I had worked with a man who was a postdoctoral research assistant in the University of Chicago College of Education, involving the development of a battery of mental ability tests. He left at the same time that I got my degree, but the project hadn't been completely finished. So, after my degree, I stayed on at the university and worked on preparing this test battery for publication along with continuing my work as a busboy, which I had done for 4 years. In December of that year, he came up from where he was working as a psychologist (actually, he was in psychophysiology) at the Fels Research Institute for Research

in Child Development at Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, to check out my completion of the work on this battery of mental tests. He learned that I didn't have a job and said, "You know, there's a position open at the Fels Research Institute. Would you be interested?" I said, "Sure, I'd be interested," so in a couple of weeks, I went down for an interview and I was offered the job. The title of the position was Research Assistant in Psychology with the rank of instructor in the college. I didn't care what they called me, I needed a job. So that's how I became a psychologist, just by taking a job with that title.

N.V.: *Let's talk about your early training. Was it primarily research work? What were the factors that shaped the early days of your career?*

C.H.P.: I worked for 3 years at the Fels Research Institute, interviewing parents when they brought their children in for a physical and psychological checkup. While my main job was interviewing parents and collecting data on the home background and home life of the children, I thought it would be interesting to find out something about the personality of the parents. So I administered the Bernreuter Personality Inventory to the parents and collected other kinds of research data, and, as a result, published a number of articles. I realized that, if I was going to go anywhere, I needed more education. So I applied to a number of universities for graduate work. I remember Columbia was one of them (Jersild was there then), and Iowa was another. Iowa had a Child Welfare research station with Kurt Lewin. But, I ended up in Minnesota with John Anderson and Florence Goodenough and did my master's work in child psychology. At the end of my first year I had completed all requirements for the degree except the thesis, but that was in 1941 and 1942. Well, you know what happened then.

Then war came on and I figured I was going to get in some way or another. So I thought I would take the opportunity that offered itself to enlist in the Air Force for a specific position as Research Assistant of Psychology (I guess that is what it was called) with a program that was just being developed by John Flanagan and others that involved the testing of cadets. These were young men with 2 years of college who were enlisting in the Air Force hoping to become pilots. The tests that were administered were 3 hours of individual paper-and-pencil tests, and 1 ½ hours of six different apparatus tests; I was involved in administering the apparatus tests. As a result of these tests, the cadets were classified as pilots, bombardiers, or navigators. If they didn't qualify for any of those positions, they may have become gunners. (I don't know whether any of them actually became cooks or not.) I enlisted as a private, but by the end of a year I was a staff sergeant.

Then the Army realized that it needed, or thought it needed, clinical psychologists and began a program of commissioning clinical psychologists. So I applied, was commissioned as a clinical psychologist, and was sent for a 5-week training program. They called it a refresher program, but it was more. Some of those who were commissioned were rat psychologists (some people from the University of Iowa, for example) and in 5 weeks they became clinical psychologists. So, that's where I became a clinical psychologist, and, as a result, found myself in 1945 on the way to the Philippines with a group of psychologists and psychiatrists who were being stationed in general hospitals around Manila. We didn't know it at the time, but we were there to follow up a planned invasion for Japan. Actually, while we were there, the atom bomb was dropped and the war ended.

I came back in early 1947, was discharged, and applied for a position as a clinical psychologist in the Veterans Administration. After a wait of several months, I received an offer to go to a mental health center in Des Moines, Iowa, to another position somewhere (I don't remember where), or to a Veterans Administration Hospital in upper New York state. I chose the last because I was living with my wife's family in upper New York state at the time and thought it would be close to her family. Also, it was close to Rochester and I thought I would be able to enroll for doctoral work at the University of Rochester. That didn't pan out. The manager of the hospital wouldn't give us released time for taking courses at the university even though we would work evenings; he didn't want to allow that.

Then another program came along. You see, new programs came along at various points when I was interested or ready or in the right position. The new program was for Personal Counselors in the Veterans Administration to work with Vocational Advisors. The VA recognized that veterans who were in education and training programs had problems and needed counseling. I was able to get in at the beginning of that program because a friend of mine was in the Minneapolis VA office in the vocational advisement division and wanted me to join him in Minneapolis. So I did, and as a result came in contact with Carl Rogers because these positions involved a short-term training program at the University of Chicago with Rogers and his staff. Therefore, on my way to Minneapolis I stopped off for several weeks at the University of Chicago and became involved in Rogers's program. That was my first exposure to what was called non-directive counseling, or non-directive therapy, which I embraced; it was 1947. So for the past 41 years, I have been committed consistently to this theory in counseling.

From Chicago, I went to-Minneapolis and for 10 years worked as a Personal Counselor. In about 1950 or 1951, the title was changed to Counseling Psychologist, one of the first positions to use that title. I got in at the bottom, you might say, of counseling psychology. During this time, I enrolled at the University of Minnesota in a doctoral program in the Department Educational Psychology in the counselor education program with Gilbert Wrenn, who became my advisor. Seven years later, in 1955, I got my Ph.D. By that time, I had five children who were in the audience, but probably too young to understand what was going on. And I stuck this out because I wanted to get into academia. I don't know why, I just had the feeling that I would like to work on a nice small college campus. I had the picture of a nice little college town or campus with these white buildings—you know, small, small college. Well, it didn't work out quite that way—another thing just happened.

It happened that the federal government at that time was recognizing the need for rehabilitation counselors. It seems that without my realizing it, I was involved in rehabilitation counseling because the VA program was under a department of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education. While I had been doing therapy for 10 years, I was also doing rehabilitation. So these new positions opened up and I thought "Gee, this is the place for me to get into academia in a field that I know something about." It happened that there was a position opening at the University of Illinois. I applied for it and was appointed as an Associate Professor of Education in the spring 1956. 1 went there to head up the program in rehabilitation counseling that developed into a program in rehabilitation psychology at the doctoral level and a program of counselor education, in general. At that time, the university had a small program for school

counselors and I didn't want to become separated from them. In fact, I was able to initiate a program by getting together with the three other people who had been working in counselor education at different places on the campus. The four of us got together in a central location, and I shared the secretary paid for by the vocational rehabilitation administration with them.

N.V.: *You have published a lot and been involved in formulating the profession of counseling. How did that evolve?*

C.H.P.: I became the ex-officio head of the program simply because I was there with a secretary. I was there from 8:00 to 5:00, which are not usual academic hours, because I had worked for 10 years for the federal government, where you work from 8:00 to 5:00. So I continued that habit and was there to answer the phone and to see students and applicants when they came in. After a few years, our program became a division; one of the first divisions in the Department of Educational Psychology. I think they used to refer to us as the Division of Counseling and Guidance. Then it became Counselor Education, and later on the Division of Counseling Psychology. At the time I went there, I was the fourth full-time staff member, but in a few years the program grew to 10 to 12 full-time staff members--it was a large school counseling program with specialized courses in elementary school counseling, secondary school counseling, some seminars in personnel work in higher education, rehabilitation counseling, and rehabilitation psychology. When mental health counseling became popular, we added that to our program. So we had a large program that essentially was based on generic courses in counseling with special courses for each of the specialties.

N.V.: *Was it during your work for the VA or your work at Illinois that you started to get involved with group counseling?*

C.H.P.: That's interesting, because I'd never heard of group work or group counseling in the VA—there was no such thing at that time. This was up to 1955 or 1956 anyhow. I'm not sure what happened after that. I'm sure that groups began to develop. There was a course in group counseling at the University of Illinois. It may have been called "group guidance," but actually I discovered it was group counseling. The course was initiated by Walt Lifton, who had been the first full-time person in counselor education when he came from New York University, I believe, in 1950 or 1951. The one thing I realized after a few years was that this was not the usual course in counselor education programs in group guidance. It was really a course in group counseling and, I think, probably the first course in group counseling, as distinguished from group guidance, at any university in this country. So my interest developed through this group counseling course. Several of the faculty members—Walt Lifton, of course, Merle Ohlsen, who has long been known as one of the leading figures in group counseling, myself, and Henry Kaczkowski who joined us later—were interested in group counseling. The program at the University of Illinois became recognized nationally as having a good group counseling component, and that led, in 1966 I believe, to a short-term workshop in group counseling for employment service counselors.

The United States Employment Service, which felt that employment service counselors should have some training in group counseling, selected three universities in the country. One was Columbia, as I remember, and the University of Illinois was selected in the midwest. I don't

recall what university was in the southwest or west. We were all asked to provide a 4-week workshop for employment service counselors. But, rather than establishing a 4-week workshop during a regular semester, I suggested that we have an intensive 3-week workshop between our spring semester and our summer session when we could devote full time to these students rather than trying to run a workshop at the same time that we were running our regular degree programs. The employment service accepted that, and I planned, developed, and directed the workshop in group counseling in 1966-1967. It lasted for 2 years or 3 years. This workshop involved lectures, group discussions, and group counseling sessions. I, of course, gave some lectures, did some of the group-discussion groups, and also conducted counseling groups. Although the workshops lasted only a couple of years, our program continued to emphasize group counseling. In addition to the basic group counseling course, we had a group practicum and a course on supervision of group counseling--a three-course sequence in this area. The emphasis on group continued as long as I was at the University of Illinois, which was until 1977.

N.V.: *Reflecting back on the three-course sequence, does that still seem to make good sense now as you think about training counselors to do group work?*

C.H.P.: Oh, yes. I don't think I would change anything in the program in counselor education that I developed during that period of time from 1956 to 1977 at the University of Illinois. The basic courses were there. We modified them as needed. We reviewed each of our courses in staff meetings every 2 years so that we would be sure that everything was covered, that we didn't have gaps in our program, and that we didn't have a lot of overlap. I think we had an excellent program in terms of a progression in the area of individual counseling and in the area of group counseling.

N.V.: *The group counseling sequence was a basic group counseling course, practicum, and …?*

C.H.P.: And then, for advanced students, supervision of group counseling. We also, at one time, added a group experience for all of our students in our basic principles of counseling course. I thought that it would be a good idea for each of our students to have a group experience, so we required it as part of the course. The students would meet in small groups. If we had 30 students in the course, we would have four small groups that would meet each week. They would be conducted by one of our faculty members, but this was not part of the teaching load--it was extra work. Our faculty always did a lot more than was expected of them in a regular teaching load. The group experience lasted only 2 or 3 years, as I remember, partly again because everybody was so busy that we just couldn't afford to take this time, when we got no recognition in terms of our teaching load for it. So that part of the program didn't last.

N.V.: *How do you view the interaction between individual and group theory?*

C.H.P.: This is interesting because I think it was in 1969 that *The Counseling Psychologist* was established. I was on the Executive Council of the Division of Counseling Psychology then and supported its establishment when it was proposed by John Whiteley. I was on the Editorial Board from the beginning and for I don't know how many years afterwards. The main format that we had for the journal at that time was to have a major article with responses by other people, and then a rebuttal by the person who wrote the major article. The first issue of the

journal consisted of some papers that Donald Super had written (some talks he had given earlier). I don't know whose idea it was for the second issue, whether it was John Whiteley or somebody else who said "Let's have an article on client-centered therapy." I forget what the title of it was right now ("A Current View of Client-Centered Therapy", or something like that), but I wrote the major article, and various people were invited to make responses. One of the responders was Hobart Mowrer of the Psychology Department at the University of Illinois, who was probably at that time beginning to get involved in what he called "integrity therapy" or "integrity groups" as he later called it. I remember that his article criticized my article by saying that I didn't say anything about group counseling and said or implied that Rogers had abandoned individual therapy and was now involved in group counseling, which was something quite different. Well, I replied by pointing out that Rogers had moved from individual therapy to group therapy or counseling, but that the basic theory and philosophy were the same; that he hadn't abandoned his theory, the client-centered theory of individual counseling, for a new theory of group counseling. And I pointed out that I hadn't dealt with it, but that my point of view of group counseling was just an extension of the basic philosophy, individual counseling to groups, and that these principles and theory applied to groups as well individuals. One of the interesting things, as I look back on this, is that theories of group counseling have developed sort of independently, often by different people than those who have been involved in individual theory. For example, there was some discussion, I remember, at one time, about psychoanalysis and group counseling. The attitude of some psychoanalysts was that its principles don't apply to groups; psychoanalysis doesn't apply to groups. That's a question that really has never been answered. I say that, theoretically, one should follow the other, but I don't recall that there's been any real concern or consideration or examination of this issue in the field.

N.V.: *Group counseling has proliferated, as can be seen by the number of new textbooks. Were there benchmarks, certain points, or "watermark events" that actually encouraged the development of group counseling?*

C.H.P.: No, I can't say that I see anything, any specific incidents or kinds of programs. The group movement really proliferated during the 1960s with all kinds of encounter groups. Of course, Carl Rogers called his approach "the basic encounter group," but there are all kinds of other encounter groups. Besides, group counseling really had two main origins. One was in individual counseling to some extent, certainly with client-centered therapy. The other origin was the T-group movement with Kurt Lewin and other people in Massachusetts and the northeast. Yes, there are at least these two different origins of groups, and there are different kinds of groups. T-groups were training groups that were conducted entirely differently from counseling groups, or the basic encounter group. Because T-groups were to train people in interpersonal contacts, they were set up so that there would be an observer and a discussion of techniques and methods--an analysis of what was happening in the group. It's an entirely different approach than group counseling or therapy. Of course, there were early groups that were pretty much instructional groups with patients, that was back in 1908 in a tuberculosis hospital. It was a didactic or teaching group. There may even be a fourth origin of groups with Moreno's approach to groups. And then there are task-oriented groups.

So, we have these various sources of groups and a proliferation of various kinds of groups. This is particularly evident in the 1960s when there were all kinds of groups. One of the problems in

the field, I think, has been the confusion among these various kinds of groups. It helps me to think of it in terms of what kind of groups there are, and what is the purpose of each kind of group; what are the objectives of these groups. One major division, as I see it, is between a task-oriented group and a counseling or therapy-oriented group. These groups are quite different and have different objectives. I think there's still confusion in the field. Guidance groups tie in here: a kind of a didactic group rather than a counseling or therapy group.

Another thing that happened in the 1960s, I think, was that the group movement went to extremes and there were people getting involved in the field who were often not trained in counseling or psychotherapy. Even the group-dynamics people were not trained as therapists and I think there are dangers in the group processes that are not recognized. I think there was a movement toward "letting it all hang out." These kinds of groups where you "dig in," and uncover peoples' problems, I think, were damaging. This tied in with the "me" philosophy in the 1960s: everybody does their own thing. A person in a group just ignores other people and does whatever he or she feels like doing without concern about its effect on other people, so there can be a lot of damaging things going on in groups. I think this led to some concern for ethics and ethical practices in groups. I became concerned about this and wrote an article on ethics in groups. It was published in *The Counseling Psychologist* in 1972. 1 still use this relatively short article in my teaching because I think it deals with some of the basic ideas and principles of ethics in groups. I think it's not recognized today; my article sort of got buried because many other people were becoming interested in groups, and some organizations like APA were getting involved and coming out with statements on groups. My individual statement, as I say, sort of got lost in this movement.

This reminds me of another problem that developed with groups--what I call the use of techniques, gimmicks, and games in groups. There are so many groups that are run on the basis of the facilitator or the director controlling the group, playing upon it, leading it, directing it, and using specific techniques and actually gimmicks and games in groups. The transactional analysis people have gone, I think, to the extreme in this. Once, at the University of Illinois in the early 1970s, we had a new group of students coming into our program and we wanted them to be exposed to certain experiences. So, early in the fall, they got together in a group that was led by a man who was supposedly an expert in TA, and we videotaped that. I never saw anything--I don't know how to term it--so ridiculous. He was a manipulator. He was manipulating the students who were very gullible and would do anything he asked; they were just performing like puppets on a string. I thought this was a disaster and the students afterwards realized what had been happening to them and didn't feel very good about it. There are a lot of things like this going on in groups. A misconception is that groups need to have a leader and to be directed.

I had a related experience recently at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Their program in counseling is 3 years on a part-time basis. As part of their program, they meet in groups, and the students were involved in this when I was there. I sat in on one of their weekly group meetings and began to be bothered by what they were telling me had been happening. They seemed be following a formula for the group process--going through certain stages. I don't accept dividing any process in discrete stages--it's a continuous process. Dividing it into stages is artificial. When you divide things into stages, you feel compelled to say what stage you are in now and to question when you should be moving out of the stage. What I felt was that these students had

been trying to follow something they had read or a course they had taken that had proposed a theory of groups that involved certain stages. They talked about having gone through the honeymoon stage and the stage of positive responses to each other. They now felt that they should be moving on to the stage of getting out their negative reactions to each other. I'd been observing and listening, and it seemed to me that something was going on in the group that was not good. They told me that one student had been sort of "put on a hot seat," although they didn't use that term, and had been attacked by other members of the group who had supposedly been giving feedback, but negative feedback. This student had been really upset by this one session, even though she felt accepted by all these members of the group. Because I believe it was something that could be very detrimental to her and damaging to the group process, I felt that I had to intervene and point out that they were following a model of a group that was not therapeutic and that could be damaging to certain of the members. I indicated that they were threatening people and people don't develop or progress under threat. My commitment is, and always has been, to the basic encounter group of Carl Rogers. I haven't written a book on group counseling, but I have chapters on group counseling in several of my books.

N.V.: *What do you predict as the future for group counseling in the profession; for example, marriage and-family groups and new approaches?*

C.H.P.: You know, as I think about it now, we don't see the emphasis on groups that was present during the 1960s and 1970s. The focus seems to be on individual therapy, which, as I think of it now, seems to puzzle me a little bit because I think there's a place for groups. Hobart Mowrer, for example, in his integrity groups, felt that everybody should be a member of a small group all of his or her life. That's why he changed his terminology of talking about group therapy (integrity therapy) to integrity groups, because groups would be for normal people. And it seems to me that there should be a very important place for small groups in our lives now because we no longer have memberships in small groups as we used to 20, 40, or 50 years ago. The family is not as closely knit as it used to be, and is not the kind of a group that it used to be 25 years ago. Everybody's doing his or her own thing. There are other groups that people used to belong to, some of which may be relatively large groups, but they did consist of smaller groups such as church groups. And, of course, look at the colleges and universities. Why do we have fraternities and sororities? People want to be members of small groups, not just a student in a large university. So we've had all of these kinds of groups that have developed and are still existing, but they don't offer the close relationships with a small number of other people. They used to be available in what sociologists call "primary groups" in our society. But our society does not have the kinds and number of primary groups that it used to have. The interesting thing is that the focus has moved away from groups because we've become, I think, more individualistic in our society. I think we're moving too far in the direction of individualism--too much emphasis on the individual rather than the group and, of course, that ties in with the cross-cultural idea--the whole idea about the differences between the east and the west. People in the east still belong to close-knit family groups. In China this is particularly true. In Hong Kong it's changing. Hong Kong is a large metropolitan area where the families are smaller now. You don't have the larger families that you have in rural China. This is the way, I think, our society has been moving, and it leaves a gap.

N.V.: *Well, would you suggest that counselors actively promote group counseling?*

C.H.P.: Yes. I suggested this in 1973, in my book on humanistic education. I have a chapter on groups in the school, and one of the points I make is that there should be small groups in our educational system. Now we do talk about Glasser's group meetings and class meetings, but that's different. His groups are a little more cognitively oriented and are larger classroom groups. I'm talking about smaller groups of 8 or 10 students. A classroom of 30 would be broken up into three groups. I've also suggested that all of our teachers should be trained in becoming facilitators of these kinds of groups--basic encounter groups for normal people. The students need this, but I think this has not been picked up. My book, of course, went out of print only a few years after it came out. Humanistic education is not popular now, but I think it may be coming back. I've been very concerned that this book came out and never took hold, one of the reasons being that at the time that I was writing about humanistic education from a person-centered point of view, other people were writing books about gimmicks and classrooms--games and gimmicks as the way to apply humanistic education in the classroom, whereas I was emphasizing the small spontaneous interactions among students and the teacher. That movement didn't last, but I don't think any movement that consists only of games and gimmicks is going to last because it's not very useful.

There are other reasons why humanistic education has declined. Of course one is because the religious right has associated it with secular humanism. But I think there's still a place for humanistic education. I must say I've regretted that my book didn't take hold and I keep thinking, it's still valid. The ideas in there are still useful and what can I do about it? Well, I happened to talk with Dr. William Purkey a few months ago, mentioning that I'm really concerned that it is not available now. He went to his bookcase and picked out his copy of it and said, "Yeah, it's still valid." I thought about that and after a couple of weeks I came back and said, "You know, maybe we can do something about this." He responded very favorably, and so we are now working together on a revision of that book. We're not sure what we're going to call it yet. He's talked about invitational education, which is based on the same principles as the theory of humanistic education that I have developed--so that we are consistent in our theory and our philosophy. We are going to put together my book with some of the things that he's written and hopefully we'll come out with a book that will bring these things to the attention of educators again.

N.V.: *Oftentimes a person's theoretical orientation or preference for a theoretical orientation reflects personal lifestyle. Would you comment on that?*

C.H.P.: Yes. People have commented on the fact that I appear to be--that I practice what I preach. One of the greatest compliments I ever received was from a woman who was in the Veterans Administration many ears ago, who said (this was before we had all this emphasis on genuineness) that I was a genuine person. So there has to be a consistency between what you are and what you do. This is why I think it is so important that therapists have to understand what is the philosophy and the theory behind what they are doing. And do they accept this philosophy? It's not just a philosophy that you practice in a counseling session. It's a philosophy that's a part of your life and it has to be consistent with the whole of your life so that there is an indivisible relationship between you as a person and you as a therapist, counselor, or teacher.

Now, does this mean--this is a question I pose--does this mean that there are any number of different practices or approaches to counseling or psychotherapy, all of which are equally valid because they are consistent with some practitioners' point of view or theory or beliefs? I can't accept this. To me it's illogical to say that there are, as somebody said, some 250 different theories or approaches to counseling or psychotherapy, and that they're all equally effective. You just take your choice, you know, the one that you feel you like best. I can't accept this. I think, as in any area of science, that ultimately there is one most valid, or only one valid method or approach. And for me, I can't see any alternative to the person-centered, the client-centered, approach. Because, if you understand the basic philosophy and theory behind that, you'll recognize that it incorporates and embodies the philosophy of life that permeates every one of the major religions. Every one of the major religious figures in the history of our civilization has developed ideas, and beliefs that are essentially client-centered, person-centered, in nature. This system or theory, then, is consistent with all of the major philosophies. I can't envision somebody developing another theory or system of counseling or psychotherapy that has a philosophy and theory that has support in any of the major philosophers or religious leaders of our civilization.

N.V.: *Well, just shifting slightly, what kind of projects do you have for the future? What holds for your future?*

C.H.P.: This is interesting because the future is always related to the past. About 20, actually just 20 years ago, I began to try to put together what I think we know about counseling and psychotherapy. And, going from that into the broader area of interpersonal relationships, putting together what we know on the basis of experience and research, in terms of interpersonal relationships, into a kind of a model. A theoretical model, not a mathematical model, but a conceptual model of interpersonal relationships. I first developed it briefly and published it in 1970 as a chapter in the book, *Counseling and Guidance in the Twentieth Century,* edited by VanHoose and Pietrofessa. It sort of got buried there, but I've continued to develop it over the period of time, never putting it down in chapter or writing form because I've sort of been modifying it and changing it. I've used it as a lecture in England and Germany, in Turkey and Hong Kong, and in many places in the United States to a variety of groups (nurses, teachers, parents).

These basic principles of human relationships, interpersonal relationships, derive from a philosophy and theory of counseling and psychotherapy. I've developed it a number of ways in detail, but one way in which it's been moving recently is the recognition that this model is applicable not only in our time, in our culture, but that it's applicable in any time, in any culture. So now when I talk about it, I'm talking about a universal system of psychotherapy. I know it's not going to be popular. People are going to reject it. You know, the idea that there can't be any one universal system. It's interesting, the whole movement in cross-cultural counseling or therapy in this country is going in the wrong direction, because what is happening is that everybody is magnifying and emphasizing and focusing on the differences among subgroups, minorities, and cultures, whereas my approach draws upon the basic commonalities of all human beings. The interesting thing is that my approach to cross-cultural therapy is not even referenced in any of the literature that you see now, although I published my first article in 1978 and republished the article in my book in 1985 because I realized that nobody had read it or, if they

had, they were not recognizing it even to criticize it and reference it. So I often feel I'm sort of a minority of one in the whole idea of cross-cultural therapy.

However, when I go to other countries, they recognize it; they accept it. There's a Chinese clinical psychologist at Hong Kong University who wrote an article published in the *American Psychologist* in 1985, in which he pointed out that there are differences between the western civilizations and the eastern civilizations. Psychotherapy has been developed in the western civilizations, and there's a need for psychotherapy in the eastern civilizations, but the essential point he was making is that you can't change the basic approach to apply to another culture if, in doing so, you change or eliminate some of the necessary requirements for therapeutic progress. This is what the people in this country are doing. The people dealing with cross-cultural therapy in this country are people who are dealing with minority groups in this country. They're not really dealing with cross-cultural in the broad sense, internationally. They are magnifying the differences and focusing on these differences. One of the things they are saying is that people in other cultures, in other groups, minority groups, and even the poor as a group, can't participate in psychotherapy as it's now practiced because they cannot do what is required--that is, self-disclose and self-explore. What they're saying is that these people can't take responsibility for themselves; they can't talk about themselves, so you take over as the counselor or therapist, and you find their problems and propose the solutions to their problems because they can't do it themselves. Is there anything more discriminating than saying that poor people can't benefit from counseling or psychotherapy so that you have to have, as one book title puts it, A *Structured Learning Therapy for the Poor?*

And the same is true when you take other cultures. They can't engage in psychotherapy because they can't self-disclose. And then, what this Professor Ho was saying, if that is a requirement for progress of psychotherapy, and research supports this, then you can't abandon it in adapting your approach to other cultures. It's not true that these people can't self-disclose and self-explore. They don't with an authority figure. I was talking to some Chinese students at the University of Georgia a while ago and raised this issue in one of the sessions with a couple of the Chinese students. I said, "You know, people say that Chinese and eastern people can't engage in standard counseling or psychotherapy because they don't disclose." They said, "That's not so. We disclose in our intimate family groups and with people that we feel comfortable with." They don't disclose with people whom they can't identify with, whom they can't trust, and whom they don't know. It takes more time to develop a relationship in which a person can develop trust and not feel threatened so that that person will disclose himself or herself. I've had no problem with people in Turkey and with my students. One of my students is a Turkish woman who said that she had the same experience--that she could work with the peasants in Turkey and be client-centered because she didn't sit on a platform the way many classrooms and offices are built in other cultures and other countries. She just got out from behind a desk and down off the platform and sat in a chair with this person and he would talk with her.

N.V.: *Is it your hope to bring this forth again in a publication?*

C.H.P.: Well, yes. I've been working on a paper that's called "Foundations for a Systematic Eclectic Psychotherapy." The essence of that paper is that the foundations for any systematic eclecticism must include, be based on, or derived from, the basic conditions that are supported by

research as necessary for counseling or psychotherapy. These happen to be the so-called core conditions. Rogers didn't invent them; he discovered them and first named them. Some people think that these are client-centered. If you're not client-centered, you don't do it, you do something else. Client-centered therapy has no monopoly on these conditions; it just happened to discover them, name them, and define them, and did research to support them. These conditions have more support than just about anything else in the whole field of psychology, except perhaps some learning in rats or maybe in college students. So, I developed this paper and it will be published by *Psychotherapy.*

I'm thinking now that I might write up my notes on a universal system of psychotherapy as an essay in honor of Carl Rogers. I've developed it in quite some detail showing how it's consistent with theories of human behavior, the nature of human beings, how it's consistent with what we know about the principles of learning, and how it operates through standard principles of learning; that client-centered therapy is not inconsistent with behavior modification. Behaviorism is one of the ways in which it operates through the therapist as a model, for example, although modeling is not strictly a behavioristic approach. It existed long before behaviorism but they just appropriated it. Also, this approach operates through standard methods and techniques of learning**,** including reinforcement. It's a step-by-step, consistent model. In a sense, I take it backwards from considering what the goal of psychotherapy is and identifying the goal of psychotherapy with the goal of life. The goal of every society and every institution in society is to develop certain kinds of people. What kind of people? The best term that I can find is self-actualizing people. A goal of life is to actualize one's potentials, so this is the goal of psychotherapy--to help people who have been blocked in developing themselves, to become more self-actualizing.

PUBLICATIONS ON GROUPS

During the last four decades, C. H. Patterson has written several works that have addressed group counseling. Some of these publications are listed below:

Patterson, C.H. (1962). Group activities in guidance. In C.H. Patterson (Ed.), *Counseling and guidance in schools: A first course* (pp. 187-206). New York: Harper & Row.

Patterson, C. H. (I 971). Group counseling in the school. In C.H. Patterson (Ed.), *An introduction to counseling in schools* (pp. 179-198). New York: Harper & Row.

Patterson, C.H. (1972). Ethical standards for groups. *The Counseling   Psychologist, 3(3),* 93-101.

Patterson, C.H. (1973). The group relationship in the elementary school. In M. M. Ohlsen (Ed.), *Counseling children in groups: A forum (pp.* 287-306). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Patterson, C.H. (1973). Groups in humanistic education. In C.H. Patterson (Ed.), *Humanistic education* (pp. 191-209). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Patterson, C.H. (1974). Relationship group counseling or psychotherapy. In C.H. Patterson *(Ed.), Relationship counseling and psychotherapy* (pp. 177-197). New York: Harper & Row.

Patterson, C.H. (1975). Groups in the elementary school. In H. Kaczkowski & C.H. Patterson *(Eds.), Counseling and psychology in the elementary school* (pp. 112-161). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Patterson, C.H. (1985). The relationship in group counseling or psychotherapy. In C.H. Patterson (Ed.), *The therapeutic relationship (pp.* 160-180). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole.

Patterson, C.H. (1986). Bibliography through 1985. *Person-Centered Review*, 1, 353-361.