ARTICLE · 2007

UKAPI and the Integrative Project

Michael Soth

A reflection on the UK Association for Psychological Integration (UKAPI) and the broader 'integrative project' in psychotherapy — exploring what genuine integration means, how it differs from eclecticism, and the particular challenges which arise when practitioners from different traditions attempt to find common ground without sacrificing the distinctive insights of each.

KEY THEMES

— What genuine integration means vs eclecticism

— The UKAPI project and its ambitions

— Conflicts between traditions as clinically illuminating

— Integration without loss of distinctiveness

— The integrative paradox: containing contradictions

Eclecticism vs Integration

There is an important distinction between eclecticism and integration in psychotherapy. Eclecticism — drawing techniques and ideas from multiple traditions as seems useful in the moment — is common and often clinically valuable. But it is different from genuine integration, which requires a more fundamental rethinking of what each tradition contributes and how those contributions relate to each other.

Eclectic practice can leave its underlying paradigmatic contradictions unexamined. The person-centred therapist who occasionally uses a Gestalt technique, the cognitive-behavioural therapist who incorporates mindfulness, the psychoanalytic therapist who draws on attachment theory — none of these are necessarily integrating in the deeper sense. They may be enriching their practice without questioning the fundamental assumptions which organise it.

Genuine integration, as I understand it, requires engaging with the contradictions between traditions — not to resolve them into a seamless synthesis, but to use them as clinically illuminating tensions. The different theories about what therapy is and how it works are not merely different perspectives on the same reality; they may be genuinely incompatible. Holding these incompatibilities in productive tension, rather than reducing them to a lowest common denominator, is what I mean by the integrative project.

The UKAPI Project

The UK Association for Psychological Integration represents one attempt to create a professional infrastructure which can hold the diversity of integrative approaches without imposing a single framework. This is a genuine achievement — the field is diverse enough that any single model would inevitably exclude important approaches — and it creates a space in which practitioners can engage across their differences.

But the project also faces characteristic challenges. How do you create enough common ground for meaningful dialogue without imposing a false consensus? How do you honour the distinctiveness of each tradition without allowing that distinctiveness to become a barrier to learning from other traditions? How do you maintain rigorous standards without those standards themselves becoming a new orthodoxy?

These are not problems to be solved but tensions to be lived with — and they are, I believe, productive tensions. The very difficulty of the integrative project reflects the complexity of what it is trying to hold.

Integration as Ongoing Practice

For the individual practitioner, integration is not a theoretical position one arrives at and then holds. It is an ongoing practice — a continuous engagement with the edges of one's own approach, a willingness to be challenged by what one does not know or cannot yet integrate, a capacity to remain curious about the traditions one has not fully assimilated.

This ongoing practice requires a particular quality of professional humility: the recognition that no single tradition has all the answers, that the most challenging clinical situations are often precisely those which expose the limits of one's own framework, and that the client's presenting difficulty may be shaped in ways which require conceptual resources not available in one's primary training.

It also requires what I would call integrative courage: the willingness to engage with traditions which challenge one's fundamental assumptions, to sit with the discomfort of paradigmatic contradiction, and to allow the tensions between different ways of understanding to become genuinely generative rather than simply confusing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Clarkson, P. (1995) The Therapeutic Relationship. London: Whurr

— Norcross, J. & Goldfried, M. (eds.) (1992) Handbook of Psychotherapy Integration. New York: Basic Books

— Soth, M. (2007) From humanistic holism via the integrative project towards integral-relational body psychotherapy. In L. Hartley (ed.) Contemporary Body Psychotherapy. Routledge

— Wilber, K. (2000) Integral Psychology. Shambhala

Published at soth.co.uk · © 2007 Michael Soth · All rights reserved