Maggie Valladares, MD

PSYCHIATRY & PSYCHOANALYTIC CARE

THE INNER LIFE / ESSAY 02

The Art of Listening

On empathy, the therapeutic relationship and being understood



ESSAYS ON THE HUMAN MIND

Prepared for Dr. Valladares's review. Not approved for publication or attributed authorship.

Listening beyond the words

There is a difference between being given an opportunity to speak and experiencing another person as genuinely interested in what one has to say. In ordinary life, conversation frequently moves toward advice, reassurance or a comparison with someone else's experience. These responses can be generous. Yet there are moments when they arrive before the experience itself has been understood.

In psychotherapy, listening is both a human encounter and a professional discipline. It requires attention to words, emotional tone, hesitation and context, while resisting the temptation to decide too quickly what any of these signify. Silence can communicate grief, reflection, fear, disagreement or simply a need for time. Its meaning cannot be determined from silence alone.

The psychoanalytic tradition gives particular weight to experiences that are difficult to express directly. Freud's discussion of repetition in treatment suggests that the relationship itself may bring previously unrecognized expectations into view [1]. Listening therefore includes attention to what happens between two people, as well as to the narrative being told. This is a framework for inquiry, not a method of reading another person's mind.

Empathy without presumption

Empathy involves approaching another person's experience without assuming it is identical to one's own. A clinician can misunderstand even while feeling sympathetic. An expression of anger might be heard as defensiveness when it is a justified response to unfairness; quietness might be mistaken for agreement when it reflects discomfort.

Mentalizing theory emphasizes understanding behavior in relation to mental states [2]. An important implication is epistemic humility: another person's inner world is never entirely transparent. Questions, tentative observations and invitations to correct misunderstanding can be more useful than confident interpretations.

Language, culture and social position affect how distress is communicated and what it means to seek care. A bilingual patient may find that different languages evoke different memories or emotional registers. Another person may approach a clinician cautiously because previous encounters with institutions have been dismissive. These possibilities deserve attention without turning identity into a predetermined explanation. Listening includes recognizing external realities as well as subjective meanings.

Empathy also has limits. Understanding a person’s feelings does not require endorsing every conclusion or action. Professional boundaries, informed consent and a clear treatment framework help preserve the distinction between therapeutic care and ordinary friendship.

What the research tells us

The therapeutic alliance is broader than warmth: it includes collaboration about the goals and work of treatment alongside the relational bond. A major 2018 synthesis of 295 studies covering more than 30,000 patients reported an association of r = .278 between alliance and outcomes in face-to-face psychotherapy [3]. A separate meta-analysis of empathy, involving 82 samples and 6,138 clients, reported an association of r = .28 [4]. These are meaningful average relationships across varied clinical settings.

Neither finding proves that empathic listening independently causes recovery. Early symptom improvement may strengthen the alliance; patient characteristics and treatment fit may influence both. Measures of empathy and alliance can overlap. The findings support taking relational quality seriously, not replacing diagnosis, evidence-based treatment selection or monitoring of progress with warmth alone.

A good relationship also includes the capacity to address disagreement. A meta-analysis of 11 studies of alliance rupture repair, covering 1,314 patients, found a positive association with outcomes (r = .29); a separate analysis within the same report did not find a statistically significant overall effect of rupture-repair training on patient outcomes [5]. These results encourage attention to repair without claiming that every difficult interaction is therapeutic.

The courage to be corrected

Consider a fictional exchange in which a patient describes a painful family dispute and a clinician suggests that the patient may fear closeness. The patient becomes quieter. Rather than treating the silence as confirmation of the interpretation, the clinician might ask how the comment was received. The patient explains that the suggestion felt like blame. This creates an opportunity to acknowledge the impact, reconsider the formulation and return to the actual dispute.

Repair is not a performance of perfect understanding. It requires a willingness to recognize error and tolerate uncertainty. A clinician may learn that a familiar theoretical explanation is inadequate, that a patient needs more practical support, or that the treatment goals themselves warrant revisiting.

Listening also coexists with active medical care. A psychiatrist may need to ask direct questions about symptoms, functioning, medication effects or safety. Such assessment is not opposed to depth-oriented understanding; it can make psychological exploration safer and

more appropriately focused.

The art of listening is ultimately less about finding an impressive interpretation than establishing a setting in which experience can be examined without premature closure. To feel heard is not the same as being told that every perception is correct. It is to encounter a serious interest in what one is living through, and a willingness to think together about what it might mean.

References & reading notes

1. Freud, S. (1914/1958). Remembering, repeating and working-through. Standard Edition, 12, 145–156. https://marcuse.faculty.history.ucsb.edu/classes/201/articles/1914FreudRemembering.pdf

2. Luyten, P., Campbell, C., Allison, E., & Fonagy, P. (2020). The mentalizing approach to psychopathology. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 16, 297–325. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-071919-015355

3. Flückiger, C., Del Re, A. C., Wampold, B. E., & Horvath, A. O. (2018). The alliance in adult psychotherapy: A meta-analytic synthesis. Psychotherapy, 55, 316–340. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000172

4. Elliott, R., Bohart, A. C., Watson, J. C., & Murphy, D. (2018). Therapist empathy and client outcome: An updated meta-analysis. Psychotherapy, 55, 399–410. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000175

5. Eubanks, C. F., Muran, J. C., & Safran, J. D. (2018). Alliance rupture repair: A meta-analysis. Psychotherapy, 55, 508–519. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000185

Editorial note

This narrative essay draws on selected classical writings and contemporary research reviews. It is not a systematic literature review. Illustrative situations are fictional; no patient records or clinical experiences of Dr. Valladares are represented. Educational material only, not individualized medical advice. Cover artwork is reused from the website prototype.