internal family systems therapy criticism

Internal Family Systems Therapy Criticism: A Comprehensive Examination

internal family systems therapy criticism, while a powerful and widely adopted therapeutic modality, is not without its detractors. Like any complex psychological framework, IFS faces scrutiny regarding its theoretical underpinnings, practical application, and potential limitations. This article delves deeply into the various facets of internal family systems therapy criticism, exploring the concerns raised by different professional perspectives. We will examine the critiques concerning its scientific validity, the potential for misinterpretation, the challenges in training and application, and the ongoing debates within the broader psychotherapy community. Understanding these criticisms is crucial for a balanced perspective on IFS and for ensuring its ethical and effective use.

Table of Contents

Introduction to Internal Family Systems Therapy

Internal Family Systems (IFS) therapy, developed by Richard Schwartz, presents a unique model of

the human psyche, conceptualizing it as comprised of multiple "parts" that interact with a core "Self." This Self is understood to be inherently whole, compassionate, and wise. IFS posits that psychological distress arises when these parts, particularly vulnerable "exiles" or protective "managers" and "firefighters," become overwhelmed or disconnected from the Self. The therapeutic process in IFS aims to help individuals access their Self-energy to understand, unburden, and reintegrate these parts, fostering internal harmony and healing.

The model's emphasis on internal multiplicity and the compassionate witnessing of one's internal world has resonated with many therapists and clients, leading to its widespread adoption. However, as with any innovative approach, IFS has attracted critical examination from various quarters of the psychological field. These critiques often stem from differing theoretical paradigms, concerns about empirical validation, and questions regarding the practical implementation of the IFS model. This article aims to provide a thorough overview of these criticisms, offering a balanced perspective for those interested in understanding the full landscape of discourse surrounding Internal Family Systems therapy.

Core Concepts and Potential Criticisms

The fundamental premise of IFS, that the psyche is composed of distinct parts, is a central point of both praise and criticism. While proponents see it as a revolutionary way to understand internal conflict and distress, some critics question the conceptualization of "parts" as discrete entities. This raises questions about the ontological status of these parts and whether they represent literal psychological structures or metaphoric constructs. The risk of reifying these conceptual parts into something overly literal can lead to misinterpretations and potentially hinder therapeutic progress if not handled with nuance.

Furthermore, the concept of the Self, while intended to be universally present and healing, can also be a point of contention. Critics sometimes ask how the Self is objectively identified and differentiated from a particularly dominant or idealized part. The subjective nature of accessing and trusting Self-

energy can be challenging, and concerns are sometimes raised about the potential for oversimplification or the risk of a therapist projecting their own understanding of the Self onto a client. The efficacy and objectivity of identifying and working with the Self are areas that have been explored within the IFS criticism discourse.

The Nature of ''Parts''

One of the most significant areas of internal family systems therapy criticism revolves around the very concept of "parts." Critics often question whether these parts are truly distinct psychological entities or simply different facets of a unified consciousness that are being given a concrete form. The metaphor of parts can be incredibly helpful, but there is a concern that therapists and clients might begin to view these parts as literal, separate beings within the mind, which can lead to fragmentation rather than integration. This can be particularly problematic for individuals with more severe dissociative disorders, where a more cautious approach to internal multiplicity might be warranted.

The categorization of parts into Managers, Firefighters, and Exiles, while functional within the IFS model, has also faced scrutiny. Some psychologists argue that these categories might be too prescriptive and could overlook the unique nuances of an individual's internal landscape. They suggest that rigidly applying these labels might limit the exploration of less common or more complex internal states, potentially missing crucial information about the client's experience. The depth and breadth of the IFS part system is a topic within the broader discussions of internal family systems therapy criticism.

The Role and Accessibility of the Self

The central tenet of IFS is the inherent presence of a "Self" characterized by qualities like curiosity, compassion, courage, and clarity. While this concept is central to the therapeutic process, its accessibility and objective identification have been debated. Critics sometimes question whether the

Self is truly a distinct entity or if it is a manifestation of a healthy, integrated ego state that can be obscured by pathology. The reliance on subjective experience to access the Self can be a challenge, particularly for individuals who have experienced significant trauma and have profound difficulties with self-awareness and regulation.

Furthermore, there are concerns about the potential for therapists to unduly influence a client's perception of their Self. If a therapist is too directive in guiding a client toward identifying their Self, it could lead to the client presenting what they believe the therapist wants to see, rather than a genuine internal experience. This raises important questions about therapist neutrality and the potential for therapeutic bias in the IFS model, a recurring theme in internal family systems therapy criticism.

Theoretical and Philosophical Objections

From a purely theoretical standpoint, some psychological paradigms find the multi-part model of the psyche to be a departure from established frameworks. For instance, psychodynamic theories, which emphasize the unconscious, defense mechanisms, and early object relations, might view the IFS conceptualization of parts as a surface-level representation that doesn't fully address the deep-seated origins of psychological conflict. Similarly, cognitive-behavioral approaches, which focus on observable behaviors and thought patterns, may struggle to integrate the more abstract and experiential nature of IFS.

Philosophically, the idea of an inherently good and whole Self can be seen as optimistic, and some critics question its universality. In cultures or individuals where life experiences have severely damaged the sense of self or instilled deep-seated self-loathing, the immediate accessibility or even belief in a core Self might be a significant hurdle. This philosophical divergence contributes to the ongoing discourse around internal family systems therapy criticism.

Challenges to Established Psychological Theories

Internal Family Systems therapy's departure from some established psychological theories is a significant aspect of its criticism. Traditional psychoanalytic and psychodynamic approaches, for example, often focus on the development of the ego, the impact of early childhood relationships, and the working through of repressed material. IFS, with its emphasis on a pre-existing, untainted Self and the concept of distinct "parts" that are not necessarily rooted in direct trauma memory (though they can be), offers a different perspective. Critics from these schools may argue that IFS does not adequately account for the developmental trajectory of the psyche or the profound impact of early relational dynamics on personality structure.

Moreover, existential and humanistic psychologies, while sharing some common ground with IFS in their focus on self-actualization and inherent human goodness, might also present critiques. Some might question the inherent optimism of the IFS model and whether it sufficiently addresses the fundamental anxieties and limitations of the human condition that are central to existential thought. The specific theoretical framework of IFS, and how it aligns or diverges with other major psychological theories, is a recurring point within internal family systems therapy criticism.

The Concept of an Innate, Unfragmented Self

The IFS model's assertion that a core Self exists within every individual, untouched by trauma or negative experiences, is a powerful tenet but also a source of philosophical debate. Critics may question the empirical evidence for such an innate, unfragmented Self. From a neurobiological perspective, the brain undergoes significant changes due to trauma and stress, leading to altered states of consciousness and emotional regulation. The IFS concept of the Self, as an enduring entity, might be challenged by a more materialist or neurobiological understanding of the mind's plasticity and vulnerability.

Furthermore, the philosophical implications of an inherent Self can be complex. Does it imply a form of

preordained destiny or essentialism? Some philosophical traditions might find this concept to be too deterministic or overly simplistic in its view of human nature. The debate around the ontology of the Self is a nuanced area within the broader context of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Empirical Evidence and Research Gaps

A frequently cited criticism of Internal Family Systems therapy is the perceived lack of robust, large-scale empirical research to substantiate its efficacy compared to more established modalities. While there is a growing body of evidence, including several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and outcome studies, some critics argue that the existing research is not yet sufficient to meet the rigorous standards of evidence-based practice demanded by the broader scientific community. This is particularly true when comparing IFS to therapies like Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) or Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT), which have extensive research portfolios.

The methodological challenges in studying a model like IFS, which relies heavily on subjective internal experiences and the therapeutic relationship, also contribute to this gap. Measuring the impact on "parts" or the "Self" can be difficult using traditional quantitative research methods. This leads to calls for more diverse research designs, including qualitative studies and replication of existing positive findings, to further solidify the empirical standing of IFS within the field, a key concern in internal family systems therapy criticism.

Methodological Challenges in Research

Researching Internal Family Systems therapy presents unique methodological challenges that contribute to its criticism regarding empirical support. The core of IFS therapy involves the client's internal experience of "parts" and their interaction with the "Self." Quantifying these subjective experiences in a way that is scientifically rigorous and replicable is inherently difficult. Traditional outcome measures may not fully capture the nuances of IFS interventions, such as the unburdening of

exiled parts or the development of Self-leadership. Researchers must devise innovative ways to assess these internal shifts.

Moreover, the deeply relational aspect of IFS therapy, where the therapist's presence and attuned Self-energy are crucial, adds another layer of complexity. Isolating the specific effects of the IFS model from the general effectiveness of a strong therapeutic alliance can be challenging in study designs. This makes it harder to definitively attribute positive outcomes solely to the IFS techniques themselves, a point frequently raised in internal family systems therapy criticism.

Need for More Randomized Controlled Trials

While outcome studies and some randomized controlled trials (RCTs) exist for Internal Family Systems therapy, critics often call for more extensive and diverse RCTs to solidify its evidence base. The gold standard for establishing therapeutic efficacy in psychotherapy is often considered to be well-designed RCTs that compare the intervention to a placebo, an active control group, or another established treatment. Although some promising RCTs have emerged, particularly for conditions like depression and PTSD, the overall volume and scope of such studies are still considered limited by some in the field.

The breadth of conditions for which IFS is applied also means that more targeted RCTs are needed for specific diagnoses. For example, while there's growing evidence for IFS in trauma and depression, its application in other areas, such as eating disorders, addiction, or psychosis, may require dedicated research efforts. This ongoing need for more robust empirical validation is a significant component of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Criticisms Regarding Clinical Application

Beyond theoretical disagreements and empirical gaps, internal family systems therapy criticism also

arises from its practical application in clinical settings. One concern is the potential for the IFS model to be overly simplistic for complex presentations, particularly in individuals with severe personality disorders or chronic mental health conditions. While IFS is designed to be adaptable, critics worry that a rigid adherence to the "parts" model might not adequately address the deeply ingrained patterns and systemic dysfunctions that characterize these more challenging cases.

Another area of concern is the possibility of therapeutic drift or misinterpretation of the IFS model. Without thorough training and ongoing supervision, therapists might inadvertently distort the core principles, leading to a less effective or even harmful application of the therapy. The nuanced understanding of Self-energy and the subtle dynamics of part interactions require significant skill and discernment, which can be challenging to cultivate.

Over-Simplification of Complex Presentations

Critics sometimes argue that the elegant simplicity of the IFS model, while a strength, can also be a potential pitfall when applied to highly complex psychological presentations. For individuals with severe trauma histories, dissociative disorders, or deeply entrenched personality pathologies, the straightforward mapping of "parts" and the process of accessing "Self-energy" might feel insufficient. There's a concern that this approach could inadvertently minimize the severity of the client's distress or overlook critical underlying mechanisms that require more specialized interventions.

For instance, in cases of severe attachment ruptures or profound identity diffusion, the inherent goodness of the Self might be difficult for the client to access or even believe. A therapist unfamiliar with these complexities within the IFS framework might struggle to navigate these deep-seated issues, potentially leading to frustration for both the client and the therapist. This is a nuanced point within the broader discussion of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Risk of Therapeutic Misinterpretation

The IFS model, with its unique terminology and conceptualization of the psyche, carries a risk of misinterpretation, especially for therapists who are new to the approach or who lack comprehensive training. Critics point to the potential for a literal understanding of "parts" rather than as metaphorical constructs, which could lead to clients feeling more fragmented rather than integrated. The concept of the "Self" can also be misunderstood, with individuals mistaking a dominant or idealized part for their true Self.

Furthermore, the skillful differentiation between various types of protective parts (Managers and Firefighters) and the vulnerable "exiles" requires significant clinical acumen. Without proper guidance, therapists might struggle to accurately identify these parts or understand their intricate interrelationships. This can lead to an ineffective therapeutic process, a common concern within the critiques of internal family systems therapy.

Training and Competency Concerns

The rapid growth in the popularity of Internal Family Systems therapy has led to an increased demand for training. While this is positive for the modality's reach, it also raises concerns about the quality and depth of training available. Critics sometimes suggest that some training programs may not adequately prepare therapists to handle the full spectrum of psychological issues that clients present with, particularly those involving severe trauma, psychosis, or complex personality disorders.

Ensuring therapist competency in IFS requires not only didactic learning but also extensive supervised practice and personal work with the IFS model. The challenge lies in standardizing the quality of training and ensuring that all certified IFS therapists possess the necessary skills and ethical grounding to practice the model effectively and safely. This aspect of training and competency is a crucial element of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Standardization of Training Programs

One of the significant points of internal family systems therapy criticism revolves around the standardization and quality control of training programs. As IFS gains popularity, numerous training institutions and individual practitioners offer courses, ranging from introductory workshops to advanced certification programs. Critics argue that the lack of a single, universally mandated accreditation body with stringent requirements can lead to variability in the quality and depth of training received by therapists. This can result in practitioners who may have a superficial understanding of IFS principles and techniques, potentially leading to less effective or even detrimental therapeutic outcomes.

The comprehensive nature of IFS training, which often includes personal exploration of one's own internal system, requires significant time and resources. Critics worry that some programs may rush through these essential components, leaving trainees ill-equipped to handle the complex internal dynamics of their clients. Ensuring that all IFS-trained therapists are competent in core IFS principles, ethical considerations, and advanced applications is an ongoing challenge for the field.

Competency in Addressing Complex Trauma

While Internal Family Systems therapy has shown promise in treating trauma, critics raise concerns about the competency of therapists in addressing complex trauma presentations using the IFS model. Complex trauma, often resulting from prolonged and repeated exposure to adversity, can lead to profound alterations in brain structure and function, attachment difficulties, and severe emotional dysregulation. Some critics argue that the standard IFS training may not provide sufficient depth for therapists to adequately manage these severe presentations without potentially retraumatizing clients or exacerbating their symptoms.

There's a concern that the IFS model's emphasis on the inherent Self and the possibility of unburdening might, in some cases, be insufficient to address the deeply ingrained survival mechanisms and altered neurobiology associated with complex trauma. Specialized training in trauma-

informed IFS or integration with other trauma-specific modalities is often recommended, but the extent to which this is universally implemented among IFS practitioners is a point of discussion within internal family systems therapy criticism.

Ethical Considerations and Potential Misuse

Ethical considerations are paramount in any therapeutic modality, and IFS is no exception. One area of concern within internal family systems therapy criticism relates to the potential for therapist boundary violations, particularly given the intimate nature of exploring internal "parts." The inherent vulnerability of clients as they explore their inner world necessitates a strong ethical framework to prevent exploitation or the development of unhealthy dependencies.

Furthermore, questions can arise about the appropriateness of applying IFS to certain populations. While IFS is often presented as a universally applicable model, there are discussions about whether it is always the most suitable or ethical approach for individuals with severe psychosis, acute suicidality, or certain dissociative disorders without significant modifications or adjunct therapies. The responsible application of IFS, with careful consideration of client safety and individual needs, is crucial.

Boundary Issues in an Intimate Modality

Internal Family Systems therapy, by its nature, involves deep introspection and the exploration of vulnerable internal states. This intimacy can, in some instances, blur professional boundaries if not managed carefully. Critics sometimes express concern that the focus on internal parts, which can feel like distinct relationships within the psyche, might inadvertently lead clients to form an overly intense or inappropriate therapeutic relationship with the therapist, mistaking the therapist's role as a parental or confidant figure to their internal parts.

The therapist's own internal "parts" and their potential influence on the therapeutic process also

warrant ethical consideration. A therapist who is not Self-led or who has unintegrated "manager" parts might unconsciously project these onto the client's internal system, leading to unintended consequences. Maintaining clear professional boundaries, managing transference and countertransference, and ensuring the therapist is consistently operating from a Self-led stance are vital ethical considerations in IFS, and are often discussed within internal family systems therapy criticism.

Appropriateness for Specific Clinical Populations

While Internal Family Systems therapy is widely applicable, there are ongoing discussions about its appropriateness for certain clinical populations without significant modifications or integration with other therapeutic approaches. For individuals experiencing acute psychosis, for example, the concept of multiple distinct "parts" might be confused with psychotic delusions or hallucinations, potentially exacerbating their condition. Similarly, for individuals with severe dissociative identity disorder (DID), a direct application of IFS without specialized training and careful differentiation might be harmful.

The IFS model's emphasis on inherent goodness and the presence of a Self can also be challenging for individuals who have experienced profound betrayal and a complete loss of trust. Critics question whether the model adequately addresses the deep-seated rage, despair, or nihilism that can arise from such experiences, or if it risks invalidating these powerful emotions. The ethical application of IFS requires careful assessment of client readiness and the potential need for adjunctive therapies, a pertinent aspect of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Comparisons with Other Therapeutic Modalities

When evaluating any therapeutic approach, it is essential to compare it with existing modalities. Internal Family Systems therapy criticism often arises when its unique conceptualizations are contrasted with more established therapies. For instance, compared to Dialectical Behavior Therapy

(DBT), which provides explicit skills training for emotion regulation and interpersonal effectiveness, IFS is often seen as more experiential and less skills-focused in its initial stages, though skills are developed through Self-leadership. Similarly, while both IFS and psychodynamic therapy explore internal states, the framing and accessibility of these states differ significantly.

The criticisms in this comparative context often highlight perceived strengths and weaknesses of IFS relative to other well-researched and widely practiced forms of psychotherapy. Understanding these comparisons helps to situate IFS within the broader landscape of mental health treatment and to identify areas where it excels and where other modalities might offer more direct or robust interventions for specific issues. This comparative analysis is a recurring theme in internal family systems therapy criticism.

IFS vs. Psychodynamic Therapies

The contrast between Internal Family Systems therapy and psychodynamic therapies is a frequent subject of discussion within internal family systems therapy criticism. Psychodynamic approaches, rooted in the work of Freud and his successors, emphasize the unconscious mind, defense mechanisms, the impact of early childhood experiences on adult relationships, and the therapeutic transference. IFS, on the other hand, posits a differentiated psyche with a core Self and distinct "parts," focusing on accessing Self-energy for healing and integration, often with less emphasis on tracing every part back to a specific childhood trauma.

Critics from a psychodynamic perspective may argue that IFS, while offering a unique framework, might not delve deeply enough into the developmental origins of these parts or the unconscious processes that maintain them. They might contend that the IFS focus on directly interacting with parts could bypass crucial unconscious conflicts that need to be brought to conscious awareness through other means. Conversely, IFS proponents might argue that their model offers a more direct and less pathologizing route to healing by focusing on the inherent wisdom and capacity for healing within the individual, bypassing the need to revisit traumatic memories in a abreactive manner.

IFS vs. Cognitive Behavioral Therapies

When comparing Internal Family Systems therapy with Cognitive Behavioral Therapies (CBT), distinct differences in theoretical orientation and intervention strategies become apparent, forming another area of internal family systems therapy criticism. CBT, a highly evidence-based modality, primarily focuses on identifying and modifying maladaptive thought patterns and behaviors. Its interventions are often structured, goal-oriented, and involve direct skill-building techniques.

IFS, however, is more experiential and process-oriented. Instead of directly challenging thoughts or behaviors, IFS aims to understand the underlying "parts" that drive them and to foster compassion and integration from the Self. Critics might point out that for certain issues, such as acute anxiety or phobias, the direct and systematic approach of CBT might yield faster or more measurable results. Conversely, IFS advocates might argue that while CBT can alleviate symptoms, IFS addresses the deeper roots of suffering by healing the wounded parts of the psyche, leading to more profound and lasting change.

The Future of IFS and Addressing Criticisms

The future of Internal Family Systems therapy will likely involve a continued effort to address the criticisms it faces. This includes a commitment to further empirical research, particularly more large-scale RCTs and studies exploring its efficacy across a wider range of conditions. Developing more standardized and rigorous training programs will also be crucial to ensure therapist competency and ethical practice.

Furthermore, ongoing dialogue and collaboration between IFS practitioners and those from other therapeutic traditions can foster a more integrated understanding of mental health treatment. By acknowledging and thoughtfully responding to critiques, IFS can continue to evolve, refine its theoretical models, and strengthen its position as a valuable and effective therapeutic modality. The

ongoing development of IFS is intrinsically linked to its engagement with criticism, a vital aspect of its maturation.

Ongoing Research and Validation

To solidify its place within evidence-based practice, Internal Family Systems therapy must continue to invest in rigorous research. This includes conducting more large-scale, multi-site randomized controlled trials to demonstrate its efficacy across a broader spectrum of mental health conditions, such as complex trauma, eating disorders, and addiction. Researchers are also exploring the neurobiological underpinnings of IFS, seeking to understand how the process of Self-leadership and part integration affects brain function and connectivity.

Beyond quantitative studies, qualitative research that deeply explores client experiences and the nuances of the therapeutic process will remain essential. This type of research can provide rich insights into the mechanisms of change within IFS and help to further refine its theoretical framework. The commitment to ongoing research and validation is critical for addressing much of the internal family systems therapy criticism and for its continued growth and acceptance.

Integration and Interdisciplinary Dialogue

The future of Internal Family Systems therapy also lies in its integration with other therapeutic modalities and its engagement in interdisciplinary dialogue. Rather than viewing IFS in isolation, practitioners and researchers are increasingly exploring how it can complement and enhance other approaches. For example, combining IFS with trauma-informed therapies, attachment-based interventions, or even certain neurofeedback techniques could lead to more comprehensive treatment plans for complex conditions.

Engaging in open and honest dialogue with professionals from diverse theoretical backgrounds is also

vital. By actively listening to and thoughtfully responding to criticisms from psychodynamic, CBT, or humanistic perspectives, the IFS community can gain valuable insights, refine its models, and foster a more collaborative and less siloed approach to mental health. This interdisciplinary exchange is crucial for the ongoing development and nuanced understanding of IFS, and for addressing the broader landscape of internal family systems therapy criticism.

Q: What are the main theoretical objections to Internal Family Systems therapy?

A: The main theoretical objections often center on the conceptualization of "parts" as distinct entities, questioning whether they represent literal psychological structures or metaphorical constructs. Some also debate the philosophical underpinnings of an inherent, unfragmented "Self" and its empirical validation.

Q: Why is the empirical evidence for IFS sometimes criticized?

A: Criticism regarding empirical evidence often stems from a perceived lack of large-scale randomized controlled trials (RCTs) compared to more established therapies. Methodological challenges in quantifying subjective internal experiences and the complex interplay of factors in therapy also contribute to these critiques.

Q: Can Internal Family Systems therapy be too simplistic for complex mental health issues?

A: Critics sometimes argue that IFS might be oversimplified for highly complex presentations, such as severe personality disorders or acute trauma, suggesting that it may not adequately address deeply ingrained patterns or severe neurobiological alterations without modifications or adjunctive therapies.

Q: What are the concerns about training and competency in IFS?

A: Concerns include the standardization and quality control of training programs, with fears that some may not adequately prepare therapists to handle the full spectrum of psychological issues. Ensuring therapist competency in addressing complex trauma and severe psychopathology is a key area of criticism.

Q: Are there ethical concerns regarding the application of IFS?

A: Yes, ethical considerations include potential boundary issues due to the intimate nature of exploring internal parts, and questions about the appropriateness of IFS for specific clinical populations (e.g., psychosis, severe dissociation) without specialized training and adaptations.

Q: How does IFS compare to other therapeutic modalities like CBT?

A: Compared to CBT, which focuses on modifying thoughts and behaviors, IFS is more experiential and process-oriented, aiming to understand and heal underlying "parts" from the "Self." Critics might argue CBT offers more direct symptom relief for certain issues, while IFS proponents claim deeper, lasting change.

Q: Is there a risk of clients becoming more fragmented by the IFS model?

A: Yes, there is a risk of misinterpretation where clients or therapists might literally view "parts" as separate beings, potentially leading to fragmentation rather than integration. This underscores the importance of skilled facilitation and a clear understanding of the model's metaphorical nature.

Q: What is being done to address the criticisms of Internal Family Systems therapy?

A: Efforts to address criticisms include ongoing empirical research to build a stronger evidence base, development of more standardized and rigorous training programs, and fostering interdisciplinary dialogue to integrate IFS with other therapeutic approaches and perspectives.

Q: How does IFS handle severe trauma or attachment issues in its clinical application?

A: While IFS shows promise for trauma, critics raise concerns about competency in addressing complex trauma. Specialized training and integration with other trauma-informed modalities are often recommended to ensure client safety and effective treatment for severe attachment ruptures.

Q: Can IFS be harmful if not applied correctly?

A: Like any therapeutic modality, IFS can be harmful if applied incorrectly, especially by undertrained practitioners or with clients for whom it is not appropriate without modifications. Misinterpretations or a lack of awareness of client needs can lead to negative outcomes.

Internal Family Systems Therapy Criticism

Internal Family Systems Therapy Criticism

Related Articles

- is the perfect storm a true story
- interpersonal rejection
- introduction to general organic and biochemistry 9th edition

Back to Home