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ABSTRACT: It is time to put an end to the separation in training programs between individual and family therapy. Competent therapists should be able to think at an intrapsychic and circular level concurrently. Training programs should maintain their current major focus and develop their minor area of expertise sufficiently so that their graduates can practice both individual and family therapy and choose whichever modality is more appropriate to the case at the time. Bridge concepts, essential differences, and some integrative approaches in individual and marriage and family therapy are discussed.
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Individual and family therapy, growing out of different paradigms, have developed along parallel, separate lines. However, there has been a growing movement toward integrating the two approaches in the last 15 years so that each might benefit from the other's perspective (Pinsof, 1983; Feldman & Pinsof, 1982; Wachtel & Wachtel, 1986; Feldman, 1982; Mallouk (1982); Bentovim & Kinston, 1991). This has accelerated recently into the area of illness, especially psychiatric illness, where thinking multifactorially and intervening at several different levels is a necessity. Psychodynamic psychotherapy
has borrowed its concepts of individual development from psycho-
analysis but has modified and shortened its treatment approach.
Family therapy has borrowed its concepts from general systems and
communication theory and has adapted them to human functioning.

It is this author's thesis that it is time to put an end to the sep-
aration between the two fields and move toward a process of integra-
tion. Both fields are now mature enough to recognize the complexity
of human functioning, to think in terms of both the linear and the
circular modes of psychological development, and to leave room for
the biological component of human dysfunction and illness. Since we
need to be more efficient therapists in this day of shrinking resources
and since each paradigm can enrich the other, it is time that training
programs in both individual and family therapy become more inte-
grated.

Does this mean that individual and marriage and family therapy
training programs should give up their distinctive focus? Not at all. It
means that while each training program focuses on its major area of
expertise it must further develop its minor area sufficiently so that its
graduates can practice both, and choose whichever one is more appro-
priate to the case at the time. It means that systems oriented training
programs need to put greater emphasis on personality development
and psychopathology while individual training programs need to ex-
and their focus on context and circularity, taking into account the
effect of the individual on the system. Not only does this make profes-
sional sense, since human beings need to be understood as individ-
uals in relationships, but it also makes economic sense. There are
relatively few therapists who can fill their practices today by doing
exclusively individual or marriage and family therapy. Therapists
who are able to do both are not only better able to fill their practices,
but they also are preferred by third party payers (Personal communi-
cation by the director of an Employee Assistance Program).

The development of relationally based psychoanalytic theories
(Bacal & Newman, 1991; Mitchell, 1988; Slipp, 1984; Stolorow, 1992)
has brought analytically oriented individual psychotherapy closer to
the multi-person paradigm of family therapy. By the same token, fam-
ily therapists have become increasingly aware of the need to under-
stand the individual in the system (Nichols, 1987) and have been con-
cerned about the possible marginalization of family therapy
conceptually and professionally if it continues along a completely se-
parate developmental path (Shields, Wynne, McDaniel, & Gawinski,
1994).