

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

It was one of those cloudy, late summer days and autumn was looming in the draughty hospital corridors. I waited for a moment alone with him to pose my pressing question. I had not done as well as I had expected in my oral examination at the end of my first year of psychology training and I was at a loss how to remedy the situation.

“Where did I go wrong? What must I do differently?” I asked hesitantly.

“It’s all a matter of self-presentation,” he said.

“But what is it that I must change?”

“It is not something you must change. It is something you must add.”

I did not understand what the magic ingredient was that I needed to add, but I knew that it would not be wise to press him further for an answer. He turned on his heel and walked away purposefully. I stood watching him in the weathered hallway where dried leaves and an assortment of sweets wrappers were swirling forlornly in the gusty breeze. I suddenly felt cold and quite alone, but I was intrigued. He had deftly painted my dilemma a different shade of grey. He had brought me to the edge of the forest and provided a rudimentary map to the treasure. It was up to me to find my own path.

This was not the first time I had been confronted with my own limitations in these famed hallways. A few months earlier we had had our customary weekly meeting with Ricky, our supervisor, in our little makeshift office in the maternity ward, prior to seeing our allocated clients. That morning he looked more serious than usual as he peered at us over his glasses. He had observed some repetitive patterns during our therapeutic sessions, and wanted to discuss them. His criticism was respectful, as always, but he did not mince his words:

“You have a problem with your boundaries.”

He cited numerous examples of my inability to finish sessions on time and allowing clients to take control of the therapy session. His observation was so astute that I could not be offended. I looked down at my hands in embarrassment. My lack

of assertion and habit of presenting myself as a “nice” person in order to be accepted was made painfully visible.

My grade one teacher seemed to have had a rosier view of her student. She described me in my school report as an “endearing, well-behaved child who stole her heart”. At the time it seemed like a very sweet compliment, but in retrospect it meant no more than that she approved of my behaviour. I wondered why she had made no mention of my qualities as a person. Throughout my life, being sensible, self-sufficient and well behaved seemed to have been the qualities that endeared me to people. I was like water: a bit bland, but quite useful and adaptable to any container. Although I had strong opinions and beliefs, I had learnt to be a no-self in the presence of others as a survival mechanism.

Now this ghost had returned to haunt me. During my first year of training I had mastered enough of the basic therapeutic skills to achieve a reasonable degree of comfort and efficacy during therapy sessions. However, my continued growth and development as a person and a therapist were being stunted by my constricted definition of self. My thoughts wandered back to the views a friend had expressed a few years ago on the tools available to a therapist. He’d said, with some exasperation: “You know, a doctor has a variety of instruments, tests and medication to assist him in healing his patients but a therapist has only one tool – himself!” (B.C. Van der Walt, personal communication, 1994).

The implication was that there was a close relationship between the successful outcome of therapy and the inherent qualities and abilities of the therapist. Personal growth and development should therefore be as important to a therapist as keeping abreast of the latest medical technology and drugs is to a medical doctor. Unfortunately, the remedy for delayed personal development is not dispensed upon presentation of a prescription at a pharmacy.

Towards the end of my second (and final) year at Unisa I had developed an ease and confidence with regard to my therapeutic skills, but I still had a nagging question at the back of my mind. I had differentiated to a certain extent, but still felt a bit like a box of Christmas decorations without a Christmas tree. I lacked integration of self. During a group supervision session I posed my question:

“Is there a central factor within the self that forms the core and serves to integrate the multitude of components of the self into a unified whole”?

Ricky looked at me, saying nothing. I was unsure whether he had not understood my question or whether he did not know the answer. Hawking (1998, p. ix) believes that children don't know enough yet not to ask the important questions. Perhaps ignorant students do the same to their supervisors. I was hesitant to repeat my question and Ricky did not answer me – or so I thought. Only much later would I understand the significance of his silence.

After much deliberation I came to the conclusion that to be successful as a psychology student and as a therapist, I would have to become more versatile by augmenting and expanding my sense of self. A better circumscribed, well-defined self would give me more distinction and could help me present my qualities more adequately in social systems. Integrating the various components of the self would be essential to be congruent across multiple contexts. Growth and development of the self of the therapist became a possible theme for my dissertation, but I did not know what to call this process. At first I played with the idea of exploring how personal and professional identities are shaped, but Ricky suggested the term “Differentiation of self”. It sounded appropriate, but I was not entirely sure what it meant. I consulted a variety of dictionaries and psychology publications to form a clearer picture of the concept of differentiation and to construct a workable definition as a framework for my dissertation. My initial mental picture of the concept of differentiation was of a multifaceted, diversified and distinctive sense of self that would facilitate individuation of the person. Differentiation of self became an important developmental goal during my three years of training, as I thought it would lead to a richer mosaic of self that would refine my therapeutic abilities and make my life experiences more meaningful. I also believed that a more differentiated therapist would be able to nurture differentiation in her clients and would provide them with more options for the resolution of problems in their own lives.

It was only after the end of my internship that I became aware of the negative consequences of differentiation. My experience was that the pursuit of differentiation could also lead to isolation, self-doubt, alienation and eventual loss of a sense of self. When I presented my ambivalence regarding differentiation of self to Ricky, he

commented that differentiation seems to be a double-edged sword. This was an apt description of the paradox of differentiation: At low levels of differentiation the sense of an individuated self is sacrificed in favour of a group identity and at high levels of differentiation the sense of self may be lost due to isolation and estrangement from social systems.

The realisation that differentiation has a sting in its tail came as an unwelcome surprise and I wondered whether other students had experienced the same phenomenon. Upon inquiry it seemed that most students viewed their psychotherapy training as a “crash course” in their overall personal development, which had affected their personal relationships to varying degrees. Observing other newly qualified therapists trying to establish private practices and struggling against the ravages of early onset therapist burnout caused me great concern. It made me wonder whether additional elements could be incorporated into training programmes to make this transition from trainee to registered therapist a bit smoother and to give therapists greater resilience during their professional careers. At Unisa as well as at the internship facility, the cord is cut very abruptly once the required course work has been completed. The newly qualified therapist might be hesitant to approach supervisors for assistance after the period of formal study has ended, as such a request could be viewed as inappropriate. Appropriate role models and mentors are important elements in the further development of the qualified therapist, but unfortunately they are in short supply. In addition, if the supervisors also have private practices they could be ambivalent about giving assistance to newly qualified therapists who are competing for the same client base. The receptionist at a large psychology practice once remarked to me that all psychologists are divorced, chain-smoking atheists. It painted a very bleak picture of the psychological health of the members of my future profession and I wondered, with sadness, what happened to psychologists during their careers that they became so cynical and disconnected from themselves and others, and why they seemed to lose their sense of self and their passion for life.

My observations of the negative effects of differentiation of self in my own life as well as in the lives of colleagues made me even more determined to explore the concept in greater depth. I still believed that differentiation was a worthwhile

pursuit as it had enriched my life tremendously, and I believed that successful negotiation of this paradox would once again lead to transformation and advancement to the next developmental level. We were asked in one of our psychology classes how we would like to be remembered. My answer was that I wanted to be remembered as a remarkable person. According to Makins et al. (1993, pp. 1131-1132), the word “remarkable” means worthy of note or attention, unusual, striking or extraordinary. In other words, I wanted to be valued for my diversity and distinctiveness; hence my quest for differentiation of self.

#### Definition of Differentiation

Differentiation is derived from the root word “differ” and is based on the Latin word *differre*, which means to scatter, put off or be different. “Differ” is constructed from the components *dis*, – meaning apart, and *ferre*, – to bear (Makins et al., 1993, p. 361). The antonyms of differentiation are “association, assimilation, connection, linkage and confusion” (Makins et al., 1993, p. 766; O’Neil, 2002, p. 165). It can therefore be concluded that the term “differentiation” implies “differentness” and “separateness” from the norm.

Differentiation involves a change by which what was generalised or homogeneous becomes specialised or heterogeneous (Davidson, Seaton & Simpson, 1994). It is defined as the act, process or result of differentiating (Makins et al., 1993). To differentiate is to bring about a difference or become different or dissimilar during the process of growth or development (Makins et al., 1993; Pearsall, 2002). To be different is to be partly or completely unlike another person or to be unusual (Makins et al., 1993). In other words, differentiation involves a series of actions during various developmental stages that produce a higher level of complexity and distinctiveness (Allen, 2001). In order to differentiate between people on the basis of individual characteristics, it is necessary to “discern, discriminate, demarcate and distinguish” difference (Mackie et al., 2002, pp. 258, 274). This involves the ability to perceive and understand difference, to mark boundaries or limits and make a distinction between individuals (Davidson, 2002; Makins et al., 1993). “Particularisation, severalisation and specification” enhance

recognition of detail and variety as well as describing difference (Davidson, 2002, p. 9; Makins et al., 1993).

The process of differentiation proceeds through consecutive phases of growth and development where modification or change take place (Mackie et al., 2002). Adaptation and adjustment to changes are required for successful transformation in order to proceed to the next phase. The process of conversion which accompanies passing from one phase to another involves the exchange or substitution of attributes for something of equivalent value, without the loss of inherent qualities (Mackie et al., 2002; Makins et al., 1993). Thus differentiation can be viewed as a sequential metamorphosis. This continuous process of growth and development brings about an increased level of complexity, variation and diversification that results in a multifaceted individual (Allen, 2001; Kirkpatrick, 1997). It also involves delimitation and divergence, which imply a division, separateness from other people and solitude (Kirkpatrick, 1997; Mackie et al., 2002; Makins et al., 1993). The acquired heterogeneity and difference promote a more clearly defined and refined self, distinctiveness, individualisation and differentiation (Davidson, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 1997; Mackie et al., 2002; Makins et al., 1993).

It can be inferred from the above that differentiation leads to individuation and distinctiveness, which demarcate the uniqueness of the individual, but that these gains may come at the price of loss of connectedness and a sense of belonging to social systems. On the other hand, the advantage of a lack of differentiation is the incorporation into a group identity and a sense of meaningful relatedness, but at the risk of confusion and possible loss of a sense of self. This illustrates the paradox or double-edged sword of the quest for differentiation – you win some and you lose some either way. The task is to ensure that the gains and losses balance out during the metamorphosis.

In conclusion, differentiation is an active process that occurs as an integrated part of a person's growth and development in the context of a broader social system that can facilitate or stunt this individuation. The implications for the training of a

therapist are that the supervisor must have an appreciation for the diverse qualities of individual students and the trainee therapist must be able to utilise the training context in order to differentiate and develop a unique therapeutic style. A therapist with a multifaceted self might also have a wider therapeutic repertoire and be able to promote differentiation in her clients.

From the perspective of psychological theory, differentiation is viewed as the inherent need of each individual for self-expression and separation and is intertwined with the need of the family system to maintain cohesiveness over time (Andolfi, Angelo, Menghi & Nicolò-Corigliano, 1983, p. 4). An important developmental task for each person is to achieve a balance between the need to belong and the need for differentiation and individuation in order to function as an autonomous adult in society.

#### Basic Concepts of Differentiation

According to Bowen (1988), the level of differentiation or undifferentiation indicates a person's position on a separateness-connectedness continuum and is a multigenerational phenomenon. Undifferentiation indicates either dysfunctional connectedness (fusion) to the family of origin or dysfunctional separateness (emotional cut-off) and is characterised by emotional reactivity. A higher level of differentiation is characterised by cognitive or intellectual goal-directed functioning and a higher level of the integration of self (Bowen, 1988).

Andolfi et al. (1983, p. 4) take the view that a family group that is sufficiently cohesive and can successfully handle increasing diversity among its members, facilitates progressive differentiation until individuals can separate and create their own family systems. In order to find a personal space, achieve differentiation and develop one's own, distinct identity, each person will expand the self and set boundaries through interaction with others (p. 5). These authors maintain, further, that the repertoire of the self is broadened as the person enacts new roles within a variety of interpersonal relationship contexts. This enables the person to express differentiated aspects of the self within various subsystems without losing continuity (Menghi, in Andolfi et al., 1983, p. 5).

Gergen (1991) holds that we are constantly cast into specific roles or identities by our social environment, while at the same time each of us contains multiple self-concepts in various stages of development. This, he says, is the phenomenon referred to by Weinstein as “altercasting”. He goes on to explain that cues from others reinforce some of these self-concepts and reduce the prominence of others. According to the principles of association learning, the presence of certain people allows differential views of self to surface, because we react with the “self” learnt in the presence of others. We also learn to maximise our benefits in social relations by skilful self-presentation.

Gergen (1991, p. 7) argues that the self is qualitative, as it consists of different “people” or selves (multiplicity) which vary according to the different contexts of information. He uses the term “social saturation” (p. 16), which is associated with the relinquishment of the assumption that a true or knowable self may be identified; and the term “multiphrenia” or multiplicitous being, which is the fragmenting and populating of self-experience. He proposes (p. 17) that as we moved from romanticism to modernism and the postmodern world, the idea of an independent self was replaced by the notion of a self that is expressed in terms of the relationships in which it is embedded. He also points out the negative consequences of the modernist belief in truth and progress and the freedom provided by postmodern pluralism for the self and for world culture (p. 19). However, he also cautions against the isolation, loneliness and anomie that accompany individualism (p. 241). This illustrates the double-edged sword of differentiation in the age of technology. Gergen believes that it is the technology of social saturation and the shift toward postmodern relatedness on which self-renewal and global wellbeing will depend (p. 17).

#### Implications of Differentiation

A sense of belonging to a family system is essential for successful differentiation, as it provides a supportive, encouraging sounding board for trying out new roles during the maturation process. The family also allows its young members to test interpersonal boundaries within a safe context so that they may become capable of taking calculated risks as adults. It also allows them to engage and

disengage in close personal relationships without a loss of self. The implication is that if you do not have a sense of belonging it is difficult to differentiate. It is difficult to say goodbye if you do not say hello. The result would be a pseudo-differentiation where the person may live independently from the family of origin, while repeating the same dysfunctional patterns in her own family, work and social life.

At lower levels of differentiation, interpersonal harmony and social relationships are the primary focus rather than goal-directed activities based on personal beliefs. These less differentiated people are dependent on the evaluation of others for their self-esteem and are more vulnerable to stress, have a higher incidence of dysfunction and recover from it much more slowly (Bowen, 1988). Differentiation is an important factor in self-conception and in differentiating the world, and can have important implications for the individual's wellbeing. Differentiation acts as a buffer against the damaging effects of social punishment, for instance distress experienced by failure or criticism (Gergen, 1971).

There is a connection between differentiation of self and the role of the psychotherapist, in that during therapy the psychotherapist creates contexts of differentiation. Differentiation of the client depends on the level of differentiation of the therapist. Similarly, the level of differentiation of the trainee depends on the level of trainer differentiation. Therefore, it is helpful to approach supervision from a developmental perspective, where a training context of differentiation is established and independence is granted as the student acquires the necessary knowledge and skills.

#### Differentiation as a Recursive Double-Description

Bateson (1980, 1987) confirms my premise that interrelated patterns can be abstracted from a variety of scientific and abstract epistemologies regarding differentiation. He believes that by juxtaposing multiple descriptions, we add an additional dimension that provides depth to our understanding of a concept (Bateson, 1980). Therefore, interrelated themes from different perspectives of the same question may provide richer descriptions of growth and development. Developmental processes involve incremental steps of adaptation to change, where new information

is successively added to previous experience in a recursive, spiral pattern. The process commences from a position of systemic undifferentiation, connectedness or dependency and proceeds through repetitive cycles, which allows for progressive differentiation, separation or autonomy. Theories of differentiation (Andolfi, 1980; Andolfi et al., 1983; Andolfi & Menghi, 1980; Bowen, 1988; Gergen, 1971, 1991), a description of the stages of human development (Louw, 1995) and a developmental model for supervising therapists (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1988; Stoltenberg, McNeill & Delworth, 1998; Stoltenberg, Pierce & McNeil, 1987) are therefore included in Chapter 2 to describe the core principles of this developmental process.

Bateson (1980, p. 103) states that “a mind is an aggregate of interacting parts” and “without differentiation of parts, there can be no differentiation of events or functioning”. The implication is that both differentiation and integration are required for a system to function effectively. Interaction between the parts of a system is triggered by difference (p. 104). According to Bateson, “information consists of differences that make a difference” (p. 110), which indicates that perception of difference serves as information and is fundamental to change. Complex clusters of information create patterns of change (Bateson, 1980).

As Bateson (1980, p. 122) puts it, “the map is not the territory”. This indicates that perception of difference is encoded during mental processes as a symbolic representation of messages from the external world. Therefore, our perceptions of the world and the meaning we attach to communication are subjective. The effect of temporal contextual shaping of information on learning and change must also be considered. In other words, says Bateson, patterns and sequences learnt in the past will influence our subsequent perceptions and responses. He views evolution or learning as a natural unfolding of the innate qualities within a person as well as exploration and change in response to the environment.

In Chapters 3 to 7 of this dissertation my own story of growth, development and differentiation is used to illustrate these repetitive patterns of knowing and being in the world and the effect of these on my responses to the psychology training programme. Bateson (1980, p. 37) cautions us that “science probes; it does not

prove". The conclusions and recommendations that resulted from my probing are discussed in Chapter 8 of the dissertation.

Inherent in the description and classification of these information-encoding processes is a hierarchy of logical types. Bateson (1980) says that confusion of logical typing can lead to double-binds or paradoxes, and he believes that relationship is always a product of double description and that context adds meaning to communication (pp. 27, 146). In Chapters 3 to 6 of this dissertation, I explore my relationships in the contexts of my childhood years, university and work, psychotherapy training, and the period following my formal psychotherapy training. In Chapter 7, a summary of connecting themes and patterns abstracted from these contexts is embedded in the theoretical models of differentiation and development, discussed in Chapter 2. The mind is capable of choice and purpose by means of its self-corrective options when it encounters these double descriptions, but failure to do so could lead to what Bateson (1980) refers to as schismogenesis and systemic breakdown instead of growth and development. He maintains that due to the recursive structure of the system, change inevitably leads back to the place from where it started. Recognition of a change in logical typing or class distinction is required at this point. A syntax change from difference within the self (first order connection) and difference within the self and other (second order connection) must occur to include difference between the self and other in different contexts over time (third order connection). In other words, says Bateson (1980, p.17), change must be compared with change to gain an understanding of the shape and pattern of difference or the pattern of patterns of connection. Making this class distinction, he argues, provides the bridge to the next level of discourse or level of development.

Bateson (1987) maintains that double-binds or paradoxes are a fundamental and pervasive characteristic of large systems and not merely a human artifact. He believes that perhaps every organism struggles to bridge all the logical levels of a message and that these messages must somehow be collapsed, but that language complicates rather than simplifies this effort (p. 197). He speculates that perhaps double-binds are necessary for the learning process as dealing with paradoxical situations require considerable adaptive efforts. The title of my dissertation hints at the paradoxes encountered during my own process of differentiation and change.

However, bearing in mind that each person has a unique experience of the training process, this dissertation explores some possible constructive options for resolving the paradoxes or for deploying the double-edged sword of differentiation. My level of success or failure in solving these double-bind riddles and the consequences for my personal and professional life are explored in Chapters 3 to 6 and summarised in Chapter 7 of the dissertation.

Bateson (1980, p. 55) reminds us that “nothing will come of nothing” as an illustration of the law of conservation of energy. Energy cannot be created or lost, as there is a continuous interchange of matter and energy. Mental processes require collateral energy, which indicates an interdependence of two interacting energy systems. The one energy system acts as facilitator of the flow of information, but does not control the flow or utilisation of information. Bateson maintains that the recipient creates a meaningful context for the information and must be ready to apply it to her own journey of discovery. In other words, in the psychology training context the supervisor can impart information, but it is up to the student to utilise it effectively. The skill to respond to a message within a relationship, says Bateson, occurs within a reciprocal, co-evolutionary context of growth and differentiation. This indicates that not only does the supervisor facilitate differentiation in the student, but the relationship also stimulates development and change in the supervisor. The interactiveness of my relationships with my supervisors during the psychology training programme is explored in Chapter 5 and referred to in the summary in Chapter 7 of this dissertation.

Bateson (1980) argues further that the system learns and builds up negentropy by storing information in the form of energy. An optimum quantity of information is, he says, required for adequate growth and development; too little constitutes deprivation and too much is toxic. “Sometimes small is beautiful” (Bateson, 1980, p.65), which indicates that tolerance to change and optimum development requires system boundaries. Uncontrolled growth, says Bateson, leads to instability and breakdown. The issue of boundaries was a constant pebble in my shoe throughout the psychology training period and subsequently, and this theme is woven through all the chapters of the dissertation. According to Bateson, after a period of acquiring information, a state of supersaturation is reached and knowledge

crystallises out. Following the phase of integration, the person is ready to advance to the next level of development. Gradually the mind becomes saturated with the expanding possibilities of differentiation and a period of regeneration and renewal is required. The concept of the balance of energy within systems and the oscillations between input (gaining energy or information) and output (producing matter or applying knowledge) resonated with my own experiences during progressive developmental stages and motivated me to include (in Chapter 7) the ideas of Fouché (1999) on Enerology, which deals with the science and awareness of energy. I describe the metaphorical representation of the repetitive processes of knowledge-saturation of the mind and crystallisation or integration of knowledge to gain a higher level of understanding and therapeutic efficacy with each successive developmental level in Chapter 8 of the dissertation.

According to Bateson (1980, p. 13), we are part of a living world and are united with other similar systems to make larger wholes. He says (1980, 1987) that the mind is a reflection of parts of the natural world and that the individual mind is a subsystem of some larger and more complex mind. He is convinced that the universe is generalised and spiritual rather than unique and materialistic, as scientific “evidence” would predict (1980, p. 14). He feels that aesthetic unity correlates with the concept of systemic integration and holistic perception (1987, p. 199). The pattern of the pattern, which connects similar relations between parts, constitutes a metapattern that bridges the interfaces of these various subsystems (1980, 1987). Bateson (1987, pp. 19, 142) explores our understanding of the connections between different kinds of mental subsystems, such as between persons, human communities and ecosystems, and how this understanding forms the basis of our concept of an immanent mind or perhaps a “god”. He calls this connection a sacred unity (1980, p. 29), and views the sacred as “the integrated fabric of mental process that envelops all our lives” (1987, p. 200). He investigates the interwoven regularities in this pervasive and determinant system and describes these regularities as a “unity in which we make our home” (1987, p. 142). In order to add the notions of aesthetics and sacredness to my exploration of differentiation, I have included some descriptions that are more philosophical and abstract, such as the creation of the universe (Hawking, 1998, 2001; Zohar & Marshall, 2001) and the Lotus of Self

(Zohar & Marshall, 2001) with the models of differentiation in Chapter 2. In Chapter 7, a parable of the Zen understanding of enlightenment (Zohar & Marshall, 2001) is used as a symbolic illustration of the six developmental phases of a psychologist.

Bateson (1980, p. 233) states that both rigour (discipline) and imagination (creativity) are essential components of mental processes. He uses the double description of natural history (ethnography and biology) plus the formal abstract thought of aesthetics and the sacred to explore interrelated systems (1987). He feels that the mind is dualistic in nature and that a measure of “statesmanship” is required to combine these in order to achieve synchrony or harmony in our knowledge (1987). Like Bateson (1980, p. 228) who included facets such as aesthetics and the sacred in his description of differentiation, I also believe that by adding a spiritual component to my dissertation I have not added another question, but instead expanded the original question. Each time we add a related piece to the question, says Bateson (1980), we gain more clues as to the kind of answer we could expect as information generates further information.

Bateson (1980) says that sharing stories, which provide a context for our experience, connects all minds and illustrates interactive patterns through time. A possible explanation of the shape and pattern of difference could grow from a description of our universe of knowledge. He makes the interesting observation that “the purpose of exploration is not to discover whether exploration is a good thing, but to discover information about the explored” (1980, p. 138). He concludes that “therefore, exploration is self-validating, irrespective of the outcome” (p. 153). I hope that my story will provide interconnectedness with larger minds and that even though my path of exploration was filled with bumps and potholes, the journey may nevertheless provide meaningful knowledge. I trust that my level of “statesmanship” will shape a harmonious unity of the diverse viewpoints of the scientific and abstract world on the paradoxes encountered during the growth and developmental processes of psychotherapy training and the resulting differentiation and integration of the self. In Bateson’s (1987, p. 200) words, “the richest knowledge of the tree includes both myth and botany”. To make a tree grow, a good deal of practical knowledge, “green fingers”, perseverance, hope and a pinch of faith would seem to be in order. The

same strategy may also, perhaps, prove useful during the storms encountered on the road to becoming a psychologist.

### Summary of Chapters

Chapter 2 contains a double-description of models of differentiation, growth and development from two bodies of knowledge: psychological and metaphysical. These models provide an integrated framework for re-searching my own story of differentiation through various developmental stages from child to psychologist in Chapters 3 to 6. In Chapter 7 the themes and patterns abstracted from the preceding six chapters are utilised to expand the developmental model for psychotherapist training (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987, 1988; Stoltenberg et al., 1987; 1998). The conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 8 regarding the paradoxical nature of differentiation during various stages of growth and development serve a dual purpose: first, to provide recommendations for supervisors and trainee psychologists on how to facilitate this process during the formal training period; and second, for qualified psychologists, to stimulate their own continued differentiation and integration of self by identifying new “training contexts”. My initial hypothesis at the beginning of this exploration would be: If we can make the healers whole, what constitutes the whole could be healed.