TOWARD A UNIVERSAL SYSTEM OF PSYCHOTHERAPY

It would appear that any attempt at integration in psychotherapy, or the development of a single universal system, must be based on the common elements of the major existing theories or systems. The following is an attempt to do this.

There are three major elements of psychotherapy: (1) goals or objectives; (2) the process in the client; and (3) the therapist and client conditions necessary for client progress. Mahrer's (1967) edited book, *The Goals of Psychotherapy*, revealed the almost endless number and variety of goals considered by the contributors. Parloff's (1967) contribution suggested a way of dealing with the problem. He proposed two levels of goals—mediating and ultimate. He notes that while there may be great differences in mediating goals, "differences in the stated ultimate goals will in all likelihood be small" (p. 9).

Parloff's suggestion is the basis for the present discussion. Three, rather than two, levels of goals are considered, and the definitions of ultimate and mediating goals are different. The three levels are (1) the ultimate goal, (2) mediating or mediating goals, and (3) the immediate goal. The last consists of the therapist and client conditions necessary for therapy to occur.

**Goals**

**The Ultimate Goal.** The ultimate goal concerns the kind of person we want the client to become as a result of psychotherapy. It should be apparent that the kind of person we want the client to be is the kind of person we would like all persons to be. It is related to the question of what is the purpose of life, a question with which philosophers have been concerned since Aristotle.

There have been many suggested goals. Jahoda (1958) proposed the concept of positive mental health, but it has been impossible to define it clearly. Concepts of adjustment raise the question of Adjustment to what? White's (1959) concept of competence raises the question of Competence for what? Psychological effectiveness involves the same problem. All require a higher-level criterion.

There are a number of terms or concepts that appear to transcend this limitation and to constitute an acceptable criterion. These include *self-realization, self-enhancement, the fully-functioning person* of Rogers, and *self-actualization*. This last term appears to be widely and commonly used, and is adopted here.
The definition of the self-actualizing person derives from the work of Maslow (1956). He formulated a general definition of self-actualizing people as being characterized by

“the full use and exploitation of talents, capacities, potentialities, etc. Such people seem to be fulfilling themselves and to be doing the best that they are capable of doing. They are people who have developed or are developing the full stature of which they are capable.” (pp. 161-162)

Selecting a group of people, living and dead, who seemed to represent self-actualizing people, he attempted to find what these people had in common and that differentiated them from ordinary people. Fourteen characteristics emerged:

1. More efficient perception of reality and more comfortable relations with it.
2. Acceptance of self, others, and nature.
3. Spontaneity; lack of rigid conformity.
4. Problem-centeredness: sense of duty, responsibility.
5. Detachment; need for privacy.
6. Autonomy, independence of culture and environment.
7. Continued freshness of appreciation.
8. Mystic experiences; oceanic feelings.
9. Gemeinschaftsgefühl; empathy, sympathy, compassion for all human beings.
10. Deep interpersonal relations with others.
11. Democratic character structure; respect for others.
12. Discernment of means and ends
13. Philosophical, unhostile sense of humor.
14. Creativeness. (For more detail, see Maslow [1956] and Patterson [1985a].)

There have been some objections to the concept of self-actualization. These derive, it appears, from misconceptions or misunderstandings of the nature of self-actualization and of self-actualizing persons. One such objection is that self-actualization consists of a collection of traits that are the same for all persons, resulting in standard, identical behaviors. But what is actualized are varying individual potentials. As Maslow (1956) noted, "self-actualization is actualization of a self, and no two selves are altogether alike" (p. 192).

A second, and opposite, misconception is that a self-actualizing person is antisocial, or at least, asocial. Maddi (1973a, 1973b) took this position. Williamson (1950, 1958, 1963, 1965) also made this criticism. Smith (1973) appeared to see self-actualization as including undesirable, or antisocial behaviors, and thus unacceptable. And White (1973) appeared to view self-actualization as selfish: "I ask readers," he wrote, "to observe carefully whether or not self-actualization, in its current use by psychological counselors and others, is being made to imply anything more than adolescent preoccupation with oneself and one's impulses" (White, 1973, p. 69). And Janet Spence, in her presidential address to the American Psychological Association (Spence, 1985) spoke as follows of the youth of the 1960s and early 1970s:
“Although some were led to careers that were expressions of idealism, others turned their backs on the work ethic or substituted as a goal for material success self-actualization and "doing your own thing." . . . Although the pursuit of self-actualization was stimulated by rejection of materialistic goals, it represents another facet of unbridled materialism.” (pp. 1289-1290)

These criticisms appear to confuse the concept of self-actualization with selfishness and self-centeredness, and identify it with the characteristics of the "me" generation of the 1970s, the "culture of narcissism" (cf. Amitai Etzioni [1982], Christopher Lasch [1979] and Tom Wolfe [1976]). It is also perhaps influenced by the human potential movement, which no doubt, in many of its manifestations, promoted extreme individualism and self-centeredness.

Rogers answered these criticisms when he noted that individuals live in a society of others, and can become actualized only in interaction with others. They need others, and the affiliation, communication, and positive regard of others (Rogers, 1959, 1961).

Self-actualization as the goal of psychotherapy has some significant implications, as discussed below.

1. Self-actualization constitutes a criterion in the sense that it is not vulnerable to the question: For what? Self-actualization avoids the problems of an adjustment model, which include in addition to the question: Adjustment to what? the questions of conformity and social control (Halleck, 1971).

2. Self-actualization as a goal avoids the problems of the medical model and its illness-health dilemma. The goal involves more than the elimination of pathology and the achievement of some undefined (and undefinable) level of mental health or "normality." It is not a negative concept, such as the absence of disturbance, disorder, or "mental illness." It is a positive goal.

3. Self-actualization eliminates the conflict or dichotomy between intrapersonal and interpersonal. It includes the whole person in a society of other persons.

4. The goal is a process, not a static condition to be achieved once and for all. It is the development of self-actualizing persons, a continuing process. An adequate goal for persons must be an ideal that is ever more closely approximated but never completely achieved.

5. Self-actualization as a goal is not limited to psychotherapy, or to the treatment of disturbed individuals. It is the goal of life, for all persons, all of whom are, to some degree, dissatisfied with themselves, unhappy, unfulfilled, and not fully using their capabilities or potentials. Thus, self-actualization should be the goal of society and all of its institutions--education, marriage and the family, political, social and economic systems--all of which exist for the benefit of individuals. As a matter of fact, psychotherapy has come into existence as a way in which society provides special
assistance to those whose progress toward self-actualization has been blocked, interrupted, or impeded in some way, mainly by the lack of good human relationships.

6. There is another aspect of self-actualization that is particularly significant. Goals are related to or are the obverse of drives or motives. Thus, when we talk about the goal of life, we become involved in purpose, needs, drives or motives, since goals are influenced by, indeed determined by, needs. Self-actualization is the basic motivation of all human beings, indeed of all living organisms. Goldstein (1939), one of the earliest writers to adopt the term self-actualization, stated that "an organism is governed by a tendency to actualize, as much as possible, its nature in the world" (p. 196). The goal, then, is not an abstract, theoretical, philosophical, ethical, or religious goal, but derives from the biological nature of the organism.

7. Since the drive toward self-actualization is biologically based, it is neither time-bound nor culture-bound. It is thus a universal goal. And as a universal goal not only for psychotherapy but for life, it provides a criterion for the evaluation of cultures. Maslow (1971), influenced by the anthropologist Ruth Benedict, wrote: "I proceed on the assumption that the ... immediate goal of any society which is trying to improve itself, is the self-actualization of all individuals" (p. 213). [More extended discussion can be found in Patterson (1985a).]

8. This formulation of the ultimate goal of psychotherapy resolves the problem of who selects the goal—the therapist or the client. Neither the therapist nor the client chooses this goal. It is a given; it is implicit in the nature of the individual as a living organism. It is the nature of the organism, a characteristic of Rogers' actualizing tendency, to grow, to develop, to strive to actualize its potentials, to become what it is capable of becoming—to be more self-actualizing.

9. Finally, the concept of self-actualization provides a solution to the problem of organizing needs in some hierarchy. All specific drives, including those in Maslow's (1970) hierarchy, are subservient to the drive toward self-actualization. All specific needs are organized and assume temporary priority in terms of their relevance to the basic drive toward self-actualization (Patterson, 1985a).

**Mediate Goals.** Mediate goals are the usual goals considered by psychotherapists. They include the specific and concrete goals of behavior therapists. Contributors to Mahrer's (1967) book focused on this level of goals, including such things as reduction of symptoms; reduction of anxiety, of psychological pain and suffering, and of hostility; and elimination of unadaptive habits and acquisition of adaptive habits. Other mediate goals include good marital and family relationships; vocational and career success and satisfaction; educational achievement, including study skills and good study habits; and development of potentials in art, music, athletics, etc.

The ultimate goal is a common goal, applicable to all individuals. Mediate goals provide for, or allow for, individual differences. People have differing, and multiple potentials; they actualize themselves in differing ways.
A number of implications of the separation of goals into ultimate and mediate become apparent:

1. While the ultimate goal is universal, applying across time and cultures, mediate goals vary with individuals, time and cultures. It is here that client choices and decisions operate.

2. Mediate goals may be considered as mediating goals, between the immediate goal and the ultimate goal. That is, they are steps toward the ultimate goal. In some instances they may overlap with aspects of the ultimate goal-the development of self-understanding, self-esteem, or self-acceptance, for example.

3. The ultimate goal provides a criterion for the acceptability of mediate goals, something that is lacking, or implicit, in behavior therapy.

4. While mediate goals may be considered as subgoals, or steps toward the ultimate goal, they may also be seen as byproducts of the ultimate goal. Self-actualizing persons normally and naturally seek to achieve the mediate goals on their own, or seek and obtain the necessary assistance, such as tutoring, instruction, information, education and training, or reeducation, to achieve them. As byproducts, they are not necessarily goals to be directly achieved or specifically sought. Thus, in psychotherapy, they need not be determined or defined in advance, but are developed by the client during, or even following, the therapy process. It appears that it may be sufficient, in some cases, to provide the conditions leading to the development of self-actualizing persons; thus, as individuals become more self-actualizing, they develop, pursue, and achieve their own more-specific goals.

5. It is apparent that many of the mediate goals are the objectives of other helping processes, of education, reeducation, and skill training.

**The Immediate Goal.** The mediating goals of Parloff (1967) are aspects of the psychotherapy process, the initiating and continuing of which is the immediate goal in the present model or system. The therapy process and its elements have been described in many ways, in the various theories of psychotherapy. Parloff (1967) included the following specific goals: making the unconscious conscious; recall of the repressed; deconditioning; counterconditioning; strengthening or weakening of the superego; development and analysis of the transference neurosis; promoting increased insight; and increasing self-acceptance. There is little, if any, evidence that many of these goals lead to desirable therapy outcomes, particularly to increased self-actualization.

Essential to the therapy process is client activity of some sort. The client activity involving self-exploration, or intrapersonal exploration, appears to be universally present in successful psychotherapy. It includes some of the mediating goals mentioned by Parloff, such as developing awareness of unconscious (or preconscious) material (self-awareness).

The process of self-exploration is complex, involving several aspects or stages, as discussed below.
1. **Self-disclosure.** Before clients can explore themselves, they must disclose, or reveal, themselves, including their negative thoughts, feelings, problems, failures, inadequacies, etc. These are the reasons clients come for therapy, their "problems," and it is necessary to state or define the "problem" before it can be dealt with. Self-disclosure, or self-exposure, requires that clients be open and honest, or genuine.

2. **Self-exploration** consists of clients working with the disclosed material, exploring what and who they really are. The process may be slow, and not a smooth or continuous one. There is resistance to looking at and facing up to one's undesirable aspects.


4. With self-discovery comes **self-understanding and self-acceptance.** Clients become aware of failures to actualize themselves and their potentials. They see the discrepancies between their actual selves and their ideal selves. They begin to reduce the discrepancies, modifying their actual or ideal selves, or both. A realistic **self-concept** is developed, a self-concept more congruent with experience. Clients are able to accept themselves as they are, and to commit themselves to becoming more like they want to be. [See Patterson (1985a) and Rogers (1961), for fuller discussions of the therapy process in the client.]

Questions have been raised about self-disclosure and self-exploration by writers about cross-cultural therapy. Persons in other cultures (as well as the poor in our own culture [Goldstein, 1973]), it is said, cannot, or do not, engage in self-disclosure or self-exploration (or "introspection"). Pedersen, for example, referring to American Indian clients, wrote: "A counselor who expects clients to verbalize their feelings is not likely to have much success with Native American clients" (Pedersen, 1976, p. 26). Sue (1981) referred to "certain groups (Asian Americans, Native Americans, etc.) that dictate against self-disclosure to strangers" (p. 48). He noted "the belief in the desirability of self-disclosure by many mental health practitioners" (p. 38). Yet, paradoxically, he also referred to self-disclosure as an "essential" condition that is "particularly crucial to the process and goals of counseling" (Sue, 1981, p. 48).

That is the problem. If self-exploration is essential for progress in psychotherapy (and this is supported by the research), then it cannot be abandoned, as some suggest, with the therapist taking an active, directing, leading, or structured approach. But client reluctance or difficulty in self-disclosure is a social, not a purely cultural, characteristic. People (in general, not only Asians) do not disclose to strangers, social superiors, or experts, including professionals. Yet, paradoxically, people sometimes tell things to strangers (as well to therapists) that they would not tell to families or friends. Chinese persons with whom the senior author has talked make it clear that they self-disclose among their families and friends. The reluctance or difficulty in self-disclosing among certain clients is not a reason for abandoning psychotherapy (for which it is a necessary condition), but for providing the conditions which make client self-disclosure possible.
The Conditions

**Therapist Conditions.** How does the therapist make it possible for the client to engage in activities necessary for therapeutic progress? He/she does so by providing certain conditions. Three major conditions have been identified and defined (Rogers, 1957) and are now supported by considerable research (Patterson, 1984, 1985a).

1. **Empathic understanding** is more than a knowledge of the client based on information about the client. It is an understanding of the client from his/her frame of reference. The therapist enters the client's world and views things as he/she does. Rogers (1961) defined empathy as "an accurate, empathic understanding of the client's world as seen from the inside. To sense the client's private world as if it were your own, but without losing the 'as if' quality--this is empathy" (p. 284). The client permits the therapist to enter his/her world by engaging in self-disclosure.

2. **Respect** includes the unconditional positive regard of Rogers. It involves a genuine interest in the client, a warmth, caring, and concern, even compassion. It involves a trust in the client, a confidence that the client is capable of taking responsibility for him/herself, including during the therapy process, and can make choices and decisions, and resolve problems. It involves recognizing that these are rights of the client.

3. **Therapeutic genuineness, or congruence,** to use Rogers' term, includes authenticity, transparency (to use existentialist terms), and honesty. Therapy is a real relationship; the therapist is not playing a role, maintaining a professional facade, or operating as an objective expert. Genuineness must be a therapeutic genuineness. Without this modifier, genuineness can become an excuse for therapists to engage in behaviors that are harmful to clients.

4. There is another element, that may be more at the technique level than a condition, that we believe has the status of a necessary element in the therapist's behavior: Concreteness or specificity in responding to client productions. This is the opposite of abstractions, labels, generalizations or interpretations, all of which, rather than encouraging client self-exploration, stifle or extinguish it.

These conditions may be summed up, we think, in the concept of love, in the sense of agape. They are part of all the great world religions and philosophies. Lao Tzu, a Chinese philosopher of the fifth century B.C. wrote a poem titled *Leader,* which applies when *therapist* is substituted for *Leader* and *clients* is substituted for people.

*A Leader (Therapist)*

A leader is best when people hardly know he exists;
Not so good when people obey and acclaim him;
Worst when they despise him.

But of a good leader who talks little,
When his work is done, his aim fulfilled,
They will say, "We did it ourselves."

The less a leader does and says, The happier his people;  
The more he struts and brags, The sorrier his people.

Therefore a sensible man says:  
If I keep from meddling with people, they take care of themselves.  
If I keep from preaching at people they improve themselves.  
If I keep from imposing on people, they become themselves.

**Client Conditions.** Psychotherapy is, of course, a two-way process, a relationship, and it takes two to form a relationship. There are two conditions that must be present in the client before the process of therapy can begin; these were considered earlier (see pp. 498-499).

**Characteristics of the System**

The characteristics of this system--therapist conditions, client conditions, and goals--are presented in Table 1. Some characteristics of this system of psychotherapy that are worth noting include the following.

I. Note the similarities in the Conditions, the Process, and the Goals. All include empathy, respect, and genuineness or honesty. The conditions are also the goal.

II. The client, in becoming more self-actualizing becomes a therapeutic influence on others, contributing to their self-actualizing progress.

III. The conditions operate in a number of ways, consistent with our understanding of the learning or change process.

1. The conditions create a nonthreatening environment, in which the client can feel safe in self-disclosing and self-exploring. Threat, as is well known, is inimical to learning. The warm, accepting atmosphere provided by the therapist contributes to desensitizing the client's anxieties and fears in human relating and to lowering inhibitions about self-disclosure.
2. The process is not a straight-line progression, but is like the typical learning process or curve, with plateaus or even regressions. The client evidences the approach-avoidance conflict, progressing up to the point at which internal threat or anxiety becomes too great, then retreating or "resting" until the anxiety is reduced. Nor is the process one in which separate problems are worked on until each is resolved. All problems interrelate, and the client grapples with one for a while, then may move on to another, and another, and then return to each in an alternating or spiraling process.
3. The conditions provide an environment for self-discovery learning. While discovery learning is not always possible or desirable in other areas, it is the most relevant and most effective method for learning about oneself.
(4) The conditions are the most effective reinforcers of the desired client behavior, or self-exploration. More broadly, love is the most potent reinforcer of desirable human behavior.

(5) The conditions also operate through modeling. The client becomes more like the therapist in the therapy process. It follows that the therapist, to be a model, must be at a higher level of the conditions, and of the self-actualizing process, than the client.

(6) The conditions, when offered at a high level by the therapist, include the expectation by the therapist of change in the client. Expectations have a powerful effect on the behavior of others.

(7) The therapist conditions free the actualizing tendency in the client, so that he/she can become a more self-actualizing person.

IV. The conditions are the specific treatment for the lack or inadequacy of the conditions in the past and/or present life of the client. This lack is the source of most functional emotional disturbances, and of failures in the self-actualizing of human beings.

V. The conditions constitute, or include, the major basic, general, enduring, and universal values of life. They are necessary for the survival of a society or culture. Society could not exist if these conditions were not present in its members at a minimal level. They are the conditions necessary for human beings to live together and to survive as a society. Skinner (1953) wrote: "If a science of behavior can discover those conditions of life which make for the ultimate strength of men, it may provide a set of 'moral values' which, because they are independent of the history and culture of any one group, may be generally accepted" (p. 445). We have those values (Patterson, 1966a).

VI. Thus, this system of psychotherapy, incorporating the goal of living, and the conditions for achieving this goal, is a universal system, neither time- nor culture-bound. It is the process that is universal; the content will vary not only with society, culture, race, sex, age, etc., but with each individual client.

**CONCLUSION**

In Chapter 15, we came to the conclusion that over the past decade or two, divergent approaches to psychotherapy have been developed. One stream, or extreme, was earlier represented by behavior therapy but now appears to be represented by cognitive therapy.

In both approaches, the therapist is an expert who controls and directs the therapy process, ideally in a planned manner toward preconceived specific goals; the attitude is that the therapist knows best. The other stream, in its extreme form, is represented by existential psychotherapy. With its lack of structure or techniques, it tends to be rather vague and mysterious. The therapist is hardly an expert; rather, the therapist is a fellow traveler on a road for which neither he/she nor the client has a map or even a clear idea of the destination.
In this chapter, we have presented an alternative, somewhat middle-ground approach. It is based on the convergence of many theorists, researchers, and practitioners toward recognizing that the essence of psychotherapy is the relationship between the therapist and the client. If the therapist is an expert, he/she is an expert in human relationships—an expertise that the therapist does not and cannot retain for himself/herself but shares with nonprofessionals. Indeed, the therapist's goal, in effect, is to help the client become more expert in interpersonal relationships, which usually is the source of the client's difficulties. It is a sad commentary on our society that so many people must seek and pay for a good personal relationship, designated as psychotherapy, and that other people have to be educated and trained to provide such a relationship. The development of psychotherapy as a means of meeting the need of a large number of people for a good relationship institutionalizes the process as a profession, but with the recognition that psychotherapists do not have a monopoly on facilitative interpersonal relationships, psychotherapy will no longer be recognized as a profession. It may be that for some time the direct teaching of good interpersonal relationships may continue as a professional activity.

The nature of the placebo in psychotherapy is considered. While it probably cannot be eliminated from the therapy relationship, the therapist variables can be either maximized, as in placebo therapy, or minimized.

Discussing integration in psychotherapy, Garfield (1982) wrote that “one important step in the desired direction [toward integration in psychotherapy] is to delineate and to operationalize clearly some of the common variables which seem to play a role in most psychotherapies, and, perhaps, to regard them as a basis for a clearer delineation of psychotherapeutic principles and procedures. This may not be popular, but I think it will be worth the effort.” (p. 620)

This chapter is an effort in that direction, closing with a proposal for a universal system of psychotherapy. The focus is on three variables that, although recognized by many writers as common elements, have not been given the importance they deserve, for reasons that have been suggested. Empathic understanding, respect or warmth, and therapeutic genuineness are specific variables whose effectiveness has been overwhelmingly demonstrated in hundreds of research studies. They cannot be ignored; they constitute the heart of any systematic approach to psychotherapy. We are still far from the recognition that a universal system of psychotherapy is either possible or desirable and from the days of schools of psychotherapy.

REFERENCES


