A NEW EXPLANATION FOR THE BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF CLIENT CENTERED THERAPY: THE POSSIBILITY OF A NEW PARADIGM

Fred Zimring
Case Western Reserve University

ABSTRACT. *In this paper the usual idea that our psychological problems are caused by unknown feelings and experiencing is questioned and an alternative understanding of the reason for our problems is proposed. More specifically, Rogers's explanation that the success of his methods occurs because of increased awareness of unknown experience is questioned. Instead, it is proposed that our problems are due to the nature of our internal framework, rather than to feelings of which we are not aware. Our problems are seen as arising when our framework incorporates the more objective standards of the world and fails to develop the more subjective aspects. How having a more subjective or objective internal world affects our experience is discussed and how the "necessary and sufficient" conditions and the "mini-culture" of client-centered therapy develops these subjective aspects is described.*

In this paper, I will offer a framework which, hopefully, will explain the beneficial effects of client-centered therapy and other kinds of psychotherapy. At the start I will be challenging a frequently used explanation for the beneficial effects of client-centered therapy, an explanation that is also used for other kinds of psychotherapy. This explanation, the "Old Paradigm," assumes that unaware feelings and impulses cause psychological maladjustment, that there is resistance to becoming aware of these feelings and impulses and that becoming aware frees us of maladjustments and distress.

A description of the person that gives rise to a different explanation for psychological distress and its cure, the "New Paradigm," may result in a better understanding of why client-centered methods work. Hopefully, this explanation will be applicable to other psychotherapeautic methods.

A new explanation is necessary because some of the theories that Rogers used to explain why change occurs do not match his therapy methods. Thus, in line with the old paradigm, his theory in "Client-Centered Therapy" (1951) refers to experience not in awareness. In distinction, his therapy theory, his six "necessary and sufficient" conditions, (Rogers, 1957), do not have reference to material not in awareness. If the therapist attends to material not in the client's awareness, the therapist is not in the client's internal frame of reference and so would not be fulfilling an important "necessary" condition.

The framework presented here may enable us to describe our clients, during supervision, in ways that are respectful of the client, without reference to unaware material. Rogers's theories do not provide such a descriptive framework. Also, if we had a good explanation for why Rogers's conditions are effective, one that matched the necessary and sufficient conditions, we could better discuss our successes and failures in therapy. Is one client more successful than another only because we were better able to provide the "necessary" conditions for one client rather than another?

Rogers's assumptions about the importance of unaware feelings and meanings, which come from our culture, are shared by all of us and are evidenced in how we think and talk about our feelings. For example, using the assumption that underlying feelings can cause emotional behavior, we say that we slam the door because we are angry. Using the assumption that psychological problems occur when we are not aware of our feelings, we say that we are depressed because we are out of touch with our feelings.

It is hard to believe that these observations about our feelings and behaviors are assumptions and not statements about reality. What causes emotional behavior if not underlying feelings? Although the answer to this question would take a prohibitively lengthy discussion, it is possible to give an example that complex behaviors are not necessarily based on complex inner structures. One such example is language behavior in a young child. A three year old girl of my acquaintance spoke in sentences with the right order of verbs, nouns, etc. We would not expect such a child to know the rules for such behaviors, and would not impute repression or denial for her lack of understanding of the rules for these behaviors. We assume that such a child will go to school for years to learn the rules for her linguistic behaviors. If such complex behaviors are not manifestations of inner structures to which she can refer, perhaps it is not necessary to assume that there are inner structures for our feeling behaviors to which we can refer.

THE "NEW PARADIGM"

The explanation offered here does not assume, as does the old paradigm, that the cause of one's emotional problems is not knowing one's feeling. Rather than having our reactions and experience being caused by meanings with which we may, or may not, be in touch, it is argued here that our experience occurs in reaction to what the world seems to be at the moment (i.e., to what will be described here as our phenomenological or internal context). We will start by examining characteristics of this context, and then see how they are determined by the assumptions that reach us from our culture and families.

Unknown feelings are assumed to be the source of our negative experience. We will argue that this negative experience comes from some characteristics of our internal context. Finally, how Rogers's methods change our internal contexts and so change our experience will be described.

The phenomenological, or internal, context

The phenomenological context in which the person finds him or herself is central to the explanation proposed here. By "phenomenological context" is meant something close to what Rogers meant by "perceptual field" and "phenomenal field" in his fundamental propositions set forth in "Client-Centered Therapy." Proposition II is "The organism reacts to the field as it is experienced and perceived. This perceptual field is, for the individual, 'reality.'" In Proposition III he said "The organism reacts as an organized whole to this phenomenal field."

We respond in one way rather than another because of the context that exists for us. We are always behaving and reacting *in a context*, in our world as it seems at the moment. If I am remembering a situation in which somebody said something to me and I am mentally answering

them, that partially remembered and partially created situation is the phenomenological context in which I am existing at the moment.

We carry and use a model of the world in which we live. Our experience, the flow of inner events, occurs within our model of the world. If I think of finishing the writing of a chapter, I picture going to the office, sitting at the computer, etc. All of these events occur within my model of my work world. What we picture and react to depends upon our model of the world and the events that seem to us to be happening with it. My "angry" behaviors, which may include saying "I am angry," take place within my model of the world. In that model I see someone transgressing on my space.

The assumption in our culture is that when we talk about our feelings, or self, we are describing feelings and a self that already exists within us. A different position is taken here. Rather than describing something internal, we construct our feelings and self when we talk to ourselves and to others about ourselves and our feelings. Thus, the client who says "And so, when she said that to me, I told her that I wasn't going to stand for it and I got up and left," is responding to his phenomenological context and to the situation of therapy and is choosing to construct, and communicate, a defiant self at that moment. Theories describing the narrative construction of our world have been advanced by J. Bruner, (1990), by Harre and Gillett (1994), who call it "The second cognitive revolution."

The phenomenological context does not lie behind what is talked about, but rather is the locus of the action and interaction of what is being talked about. Thus, if someone says "She called me and told me she wasn't going to come and I asked her why she didn't call me before that" and then goes on in a similar vein, the locus of the events described in the narrative are in the objective world. The phenomenological context in that narrative is one of action in the world. To repeat: The phenomenological context exists in what is being talked about at the moment, the world that is being described. It is what is being discussed that is important, not what we can infer about what lies behind what is being discussed. If someone is indignant because a friend did not call when promised, and is talking about the fact that the friend did not call and should have, and that this has happened before, it is not the indignation that is being attended to by the person speaking, but rather what the friend did, or didn't, do. In this example the indignant person's narrative world consists of describing the objective circumstances of the friend's action.

This is a difficult point. Our phenomenological context exists in our verbalization at the moment in the same sense that any learning exists in the moment of its use. The context or world existing in our verbalizations does not reflect a world that already exists within us. A child's complex language interactions does not reflect "inner" language behavior.

It should be emphasized that there is a difference between a person's reactions and what the person is symbolizing or narrating, what the person is focusing on in his or her narration. Because a person has an emotional reaction, we should not assume that the person is creating, or, indeed, is capable of either creating or referring to subjective material. That person may be *having* a reaction, and not be *considering* the reaction. When we visualize others doing things to us and rehearse our responses, we are not referring to our subjective world but rather are considering actions and responses in the objective world. We are not symbolizing, describing, attending to, or developing our subjective reactions.

To understand the qualities and experience of this inner world which are changed by Rogers's methods, we have to look more closely at this inner context or world. Important aspects of that world result from our culture and our families.

How this inner context is produced

The influence of our culture on our inner context or world. Our culture has many influences on our inner context. The general influence of the culture determines how we see the world and ourselves in relation to the world.

Thus we believe both that the self and the world are entities and that they are separate entities. The belief in the self as an entity separate from the world is the assumption of an "egocentric" self. Some cultures assume a "sociocentric" self, that the self includes others such as the family. When we adopt our egocentric cultural assumption, we see ourselves as separate from each other and from the world, and we experience isolation and loneliness.

This assumption of the self and the world as separate entities becomes a belief that the world of the self and the world outside the self are separate. Our culture assumes these worlds to be very distinct, with a large difference between them, with little in common. These cultural beliefs lead us to have different experiences in each of these worlds, a topic which will be discussed later in this paper.

Our culture gives very different importance to these two worlds. It sees the objective world as very important, powerful and real. It sees the subjective world as insignificant, small and insubstantial. As a result of these views of our culture about the objective and subjective worlds, we come to believe that what happens in our subjective world as less important than what happens in the "outside" world. We come to believe that world to be much more powerful than we are, that we are small and insignificant in comparison.

An important cultural assumption is that we are objects like other objects in the world. Believing ourselves to be objects, we experience ourselves as part of the world, usually in interaction in the world and as controlled by the forces that exist in the objective world. We assume that we function like other objects and are governed by the rules that govern the functioning of other objects. Thus, for successful functioning we should use logic. We assume we are governed by cause and effect and that our functioning is governed by the same scientific principles that govern other objects. These assumptions lead us to think it wrong, illogical and "emotional" to give credence to the qualitative, subjective aspects of our life where cause and effect, for example, may have little validity. Thus, it does not make objective sense for someone to get in the way of something he or she wants and yet this may happen in one's subjective world.

When we see ourselves as objects, we see ourselves as we exist and function in the objective world ("I teach"), or as our roles ("I am a father") or we remember and construct our actions in the world ("I called her and said X and she called me back and said Y") or if we see someone acting on us ("And then he sent me a letter"). The self in what is being narrated is the objective self. Being objects in the world, we judge ourselves by the world's standards. Thus, when we say "I should spend more time studying" or "I didn't try as hard as I should have," it is the action of the "I" in the world that is being considered and discussed from the perspective of the world's standards.

As we see any object in the world, we see ourselves as a collection of objective characteristics such as being of a particular age, being in particular circumstances and gender, etc. This is quite different from seeing oneself as a person, as an "I" with an independent, unitary outlook, as being more than one's objective characteristics.

I am most aware of my automobile and other objects when they are not functioning correctly. Seeing ourselves as objects in the world, we tend to ignore our functioning unless there is a problem. Thus, our awareness of ourselves tends to be oriented to our problems. When we are not functioning well, we see the fault in our objective characteristics. Thus, we tend not to experience our "I" but rather our problems.

Because of the cultural emphases, functioning in the subjective world is thought to be insignificant and something to be done in our spare time. This leads us to ignore our subjective functioning and to be guilty if we are not functioning effectively in the objective world, but are, instead, attending to the subjective aspects of our lives.

The cultural assumptions about the importance of the objective world and the unimportance of the subjective world, coupled with the assumptions about the smallness of the self compared to the objective world, produces the experience of the self as not being an independent agent, but rather as being an inextricable part of the objective world. Thus, when I think of myself, I think of myself in the world. When I plan, my plans are about objective problems and I search among my objective circumstances for what is important, by objective criteria, for me to do at the moment.

To repeat: Cultural assumptions operate together to produce our view of the world which strongly influences our internal context. If we, as a result of these cultural beliefs, see the objective world as powerful and important and large when compared to our selves and our inner worlds, then this will be the nature of our internal context.

Two types of internal contexts

The above assumptions operating together produce particular kinds of unitary worlds, the internal, phenomenological contexts to which we respond. Two kinds of context can be described. One is the objective narrative context, the other the subjective narrative context. It should be noted that our contexts are frequently mixtures of the two.

If we are, as in the last example, talking about ourselves as we exist in the world, then our internal context is objective in that narration. The other kind of context is the reflexive, subjective, narrative context. When we are considering our feelings, meanings, or experience, the context in our narrative at that moment is reflexive and subjective. This context exists in the narrative of someone who says "I was depressed but I also felt hopeful" and then goes on to say: "Hopefulness was fighting the depression. Like one side of me wanted to be depressed, but then another side was like fighting the depression and being hopeful. So it was a sort of unsettling feeling." Note that the context is of the experience of the actor.

The differences between the two narrative contexts are clear. Experience is being discussed when the reflexive, subjective, context is present. It is the objective world and the action of the individual in the objective world that is discussed when the context is objective.

There is a difference between the usual contrast drawn between external and internal and what is being proposed here. We are accustomed to the distinction between the external and the internal world. Here, the distinction is not between internal and external. Instead, it is a distinction about two kinds of internal worlds. In one, the content of the experience resembles what happens in the objective world. For example, one may have the mental experience of talking to someone. In the other, the experience is quite different, it is the experience of something subjective, of someone, for example, who is looking at his or her fear that occurs in a particular situation. To repeat, in the discussions of both the objective and the reflexive, subjective contexts we are concerned not with the outer and inner worlds, but rather with the characteristics of two types of internal contexts.

Frequently, our context is a mixture of the two types, is neither completely reflexive or objective, but is somewhere between the two extremes. Thus, a student who says "This place is driving me up the wall with trying to register for classes" has some consideration of her internal state, i.e. "driving me up the wall" and some of the objective circumstances, i.e. "trying to register." It became clear that her narrative was mainly objective when she went on to say "They

are telling you haven't paid your bills, you know you have paid your bills. They tell you 'no, you haven't,' and you're like 'yes, I have.' "

In some people, their narrative almost always reflects the objective world. These people see themselves working in the world, interacting with people, people telling them things, etc., and seldom create, in their narrative to themselves or others, a reflexive self, a symbolized world of experience and meanings. Contrary to the usual psychotherapy theory, this lack of subjectivity is not "defensiveness" about a particular impulse or topic. These people cannot symbolize their subjective reactions, do not create and live in the their reflexive, subjective world in any realm of their lives. To repeat: it is not a question of not being able to face one particular kind of experience or feeling. These people do not symbolize or narrate any kind of subjective experience.

The experiential worlds in the two contexts

As mentioned above, the old paradigm assumes that our experience is determined by inner meanings and reactions. Thus, if we feel bad, it is assumed that we are not aware of some internal meaning which is affecting our experience. In the new paradigm our experience is seen as having a different source: experience is seen as coming from the context in which we are at the moment. We feel differently when in one context rather than in the other.

Our activities are different when we are in each of the contexts. When in the subjective, reflexive context we encounter and examine experience and the self. When I am looking at my purposes in giving a lecture and deciding if I am satisfied with what I have written, I am in the reflexive context. The activity experienced when in the internal objective context is that of encountering the external world. When in the objective context, I might picture myself as a lecturer or speaker, be mentally talking to others, imagining their reactions, etc.

When we are in the objective context, we see ourselves as objects in the world and, like other objects, we see ourselves as acted upon by all the forces of logic, cause and effect, etc. Most of these forces are experienced as being beyond our control. We see ourselves as being acted upon rather than as directors of what is happening.

When we are not successful in the objective context, our experience is harsh and punitive. We experience judgement and guilt at not having fulfilled the standards of the world and of others. Also, when in the objective self, our actions are initiated by the world and by others.

The reactions and perceptions that affect us and determine our experience when we are in the objective context do not affect us as much when we are in the reflexive context. When responding within that context, we are responding to something different than when in the objective; we are responding to feelings and experience rather than to the logic and judgment of the objective world. To take an objective context situation, if I am upset and I keep picturing what happened, I am attending to the objective world, keep being upset. If, however, I am attending to my reflexive context, I will attend to the feeling of being upset rather than attending to the circumstance that caused the upset, will stop picturing what happened and so the feeling of upset will change.

Our experience is affected by the criteria of the context we are in at the moment. In the objective context the criteria of success or failure, of logic and of cause are important. In the reflexive context it is the quality of the reaction to which we are attending, its fresh presentness, personal relevance, and aliveness, which are relevant. Thus, we do not experience the same amount of judgement and pathology when in the subjective context. As an example: If, when writing this paper, I am thinking about and mentally interacting with the people who might read it, I am in the objective context and am judging myself by the standards of these people. I have a quite

different experience when I focus on if what I am writing satisfies *me*. In this latter case, I am not judging myself by the standards of others, but rather by my own.

An important difference between contexts is the experience of and pressure from time. Time is not a dimension that exists in the subjective context. Time does not exist in the appreciation of a rose or the uplifting of the spirit at a moment of growth. So, when we are in our subjective context we do not suffer stress from the passage of time. The situation is quite different in the objective context. There, we exist in the stream of time from which we can not escape. Time is felt to be inexorable, something we can not control, but only struggle to use as well as we can. This is inherently stressful.

We know things differently in the two contexts. Different ways of knowing give rise to different experiences. In the objective context there is objective knowing, the knowing of the characteristics of things as they exist in the world. For example, I know that a particular rose is so many inches high, is red, has thorns and leaves. My experience of this knowing is that of knowing facts. It is the experience of the registration and perception of the objective fact.

In the reflexive, subjective, context, there is subjective knowing which involves qualitative experience. Thus, I know that a particular rose is beautiful and I experience the beauty. A preponderance of objective context leads to a preponderance of objective knowing and objective experience, and conversely for the reflexive context.

Differences between and within people

People differ in the amount of subjective context they possess. Some people possess only a small amount and so, regardless of circumstance, will describe little or no subjectivity to themselves or to others. Most of the time these people see themselves as part of the objective world. When forced to describe something that may have subjective dimensions, they will emphasize the objective aspect of the thing described. A man described how he cried on the anniversary of his daughter's death. When asked how he felt when he was crying, he responded "I hoped I could stop." In the client centered situation, this person may be seen as the "difficult" client (the difficulty is not in the client but rather in the therapist's unrealistic expectation that the client "should" be talking about a subjective world). In other therapy contexts, this client is seen as defensive. The present analysis gives rise to a different description. Here, this client is seen as not having *developed* a reflexive, subjective world. Later, we will describe how client centered therapy increases the amount of the client's subjective context. Then, we will examine how this kind of therapy affects the client who has not developed much subjective context.

People who do possess more subjective context differ in how often they call this context into being for themselves. That is, people who are capable of narrating their world in subjective terms differ in the degree to which they actually do so. Some frequently describe their subjective experience and so strengthen their reflexive selves at that moment. Others, most frequently describe themselves in the objective world even though they are capable of describing and having subjective experience.

Both temporary and permanent changes in our internal contexts occur. Temporary changes in the internal contexts in which we are living happen daily. Being treated like an object brings our internal objective context into being. If a physician, after keeping you waiting without apology, does not address you as a person, but instead talks only about your physical functioning, your internal objective context is likely to come into being. That is, when we are treated as a patient, or as a problem rather than as a person, our internal objective context is likely to be activated.

On the other hand, there are circumstances that shift us into our reflexive, subjective world. Experiences such as talking to a friend who focuses on our experience or walking into our therapist's office, shifts us into our reflexive context.

An example of how easily circumstances can shift us, temporarily, into either an objective or a subjective context occurred recently in an experiment. The members of one group of participants were welcomed by name and asked about his or her college major. Members of the other group were dressed in laboratory coats with numbers, were addressed by number rather than by name and were talked to impersonally about the experiment. Then, the participants in both groups were asked to complete sentences. Those that had been addressed personally used more personal, subjective references in completing their sentences.

Permanent changes in our contexts occur when we repeatedly encounter either objective or subjective situations and materials. This, in the most general sense, is what learning is. The process by which these permanent changes take place will be described somewhat more fully when the effects of therapy are discussed below.

How Rogers's methods bring change

A central theme here is that the beneficial aspects of therapy occur when this therapy counteracts the excessive strength of the internal objective context produced within us by our society. Therapy has to do several classes of things to overcome the strong internal objective context produced by our culture. One is to increase the importance given by the person to subjective functioning. Another is to increase the amount of the subjective, reflexive self possessed by the person. These occur separately. We have to increase our belief in the importance of the subjective before increase can occur in the amount of subjective context we possess.

Rogers's methods and change: General effects. There are several ways in which client-centered therapy causes change in the excessive strength of the internal objective context. One occurs when the therapist shifts the client's attention from the objective to the subjective by responding to the client's subjective world. Assume that the client said "It really bothered me when I told her and told her not to do it and she did it anyway. She did X and Y" and that you respond "You were really exasperated when she didn't listen." Your response may change the focus of the client from what "she" did to a focus on the client's exasperation. This shift in attention may, at least temporarily, put the client into his or her subjective world. This effect of the shift of attention occurs even during brief role playing in a class in psychotherapy where, as a result of the therapist's responses, the role playing client shifts from considering the objective factors to examining the subjective aspects. The opposite is also true. If we are put into a situation where the objective aspects of what we are saying receives attention, we will become, for the moment, more of the objective self. If in a subjective context I am examining how I feel and say "I feel depressed today" and the listener responds "Are you depressed often" I will start to think of when I was depressed last and then of the times before that, and because I am thinking of time and circumstance, shift into an objective context.

Rogers's methods and change: The effect of the "necessary" conditions. Empathy. Rogers described a number of conditions and attitudes which increase the client's reflexive, subjective, context. One of the most important of these conditions is that of the therapist's empathy, which involves attending to the client's internal frame of reference.

As mentioned above, our culture teaches us that we are weak and somewhat powerless. One of the principal effects of empathy is to strengthen the self of the client. In being empathic, the therapist is attending to the perspective, to the "organized whole" that Rogers talked about in Proposition III, the phenomenal field which lies prior to the problems or feelings that the client is discussing. Assume, for example, that the client is talking about what his girlfriend did yesterday and said "I told her off when she wouldn't pay attention to me." The client centered therapist would focus on the "I" who was not able to stand it when his friend didn't pay attention to him. In focusing on the I the therapist might respond "You protested being ignored."

This is in addition to, and somewhat different than the therapist trying to understand the client's internal frame of reference in that situation, (i.e., what the situation was for the client and how the client felt in that situation). Here the therapist might respond: "You let her know it when she ignored you."

Because the internal frame of reference is subjective, it has been denigrated by our culture. Because of this, the client is sometimes not aware that the this perspective exists, or if aware, does not award it much validity, or look to it for answers. By attending to the client's "I," to the perspective of the client which lies prior to the client's feelings and problems, we strengthen this frame of reference or self. In strengthening this frame of reference for the client, in the client coming to find it to be the source of choices and of purposes, we reverse many of the negative effects that the client has received from his or her original family culture. If the client was raised in a family where "the family" was seen as much more important than the individual, the client may feel that he has few rights in adult relationships. Responding to his context, to his "I," might increase the validity and importance of the "I" for him and so he might come to feel that he had more rights in relationships with others.

Another effect of empathy is that it increases the client's narrative about subjective matters. In attending and responding to the internal frame of reference, the therapist's responses will be about the client's subjective world and the client will respond with increased narrative about subjective experience.

Empathy also builds the client's subjective, reflexive self when, as a result of the therapist actively listening without hypothesis or judgement, the client has a new perception, synthesis or answer. This coming into being for the client of something that didn't exist before is the creation of new aspects of the client's world. In the above example, assume that the client after reflecting on people not paying attention to him says "Yes, when someone ignores me, it feels like everything grinds to a halt, everything stops in me." This internal stopping may be a new aspect of the client's self.

These new aspects become fundamental reality for the client. This creation also serves to convince the client of the importance and validity of his or her subjective frame of reference. If these creations, which sometimes solve problems, occur from within the self, the client may come to doubt that only objective information is valid.

Therapist congruence, another important therapy condition for Rogers, is here taken to mean that the therapist's communication matches his or her attitudes about the client. This is necessary, given the framework presented here, so that the client comes to believe and trust the therapist not to have any unexpressed responses about the objective characteristics of what the client has said. Thus, the client comes to believe that the therapist is not the usual kind of expert, someone who is using the objective framework to solve the client's problems.

Apprehension about objective evaluation and judgement would maximize the client's use of his or her objective context. **Unconditional positive regard** by the therapist, another of Rogers's conditions, helps to remove this apprehension and increases the possibility of the reflexive self coming into being.

Rogers's methods and change: Client-centered therapy as a mini-culture. It will be remembered that cultural and familial pressures resulted in people's internal contexts being very objective. An important reason for the beneficial results of Rogers's methods is that the client-centered therapy situation acts as a cultural situation which has many effects opposite to those of our original culture.

The client-centered therapy situation is very structured and consistent. This consistent situation operates as a mini-culture. The internal contexts, the world of the client, is shaped by the

client-centered cultural situation just as his or her contexts were formed in the original familial, cultural situation. In this mini-culture, in addition to what the therapist does, there is also a strong effect of what the therapist doesn't do.

In cultural situations there are many implicit understandings. These include understandings about what should, and should not, be done, understandings that there are certain legitimate purposes and certain ways of getting to these purposes. Our original culture teaches us that the important problems are objective problems that are to be solved in particular ways: with logic, preparation, hard work, etc. Our culture also teaches us who is to solve these problems–the experts. Our culture also teaches us that reliable objective information is the best kind of information to solve these problems.

The client-centered mini-culture changes many of these understandings. In the client-centered culture, regardless of what the client expects or wants, the therapist acts in a number of very consistent ways:

1. The therapist will not try to solve the client's problems. Instead the therapist assumes that the client will solve his or her own problems.

2. The therapist will not seek objective information or objective causes for the client's problem. Instead, the therapist will respond to subjective aspects of the client's narration.

3. The therapist will not look for aspects of personality or objective factors as causes for the client's problems. Instead, the therapist assumes that the solutions will emerge by themselves within the client's subjective world.

As a result of the operation of the client centered culture, the client begins to change his or her world view, begins to find the subjective context more important and valid. More specifically, the client finds that:

1. The important problems are internal, and external problems depend upon the internal.

2. Problems are to be solved on the basis of sensing and attending to one's internal world.

3. The problems can be solved only by the client.

4. Solutions to the client's problems frequently occur on the basis of qualitative information, information about our subjective context.

5. The subjective and objective worlds overlap, and the objective world is not necessarily larger or more important than the subjective.

Rogers's methods and change: Change of internal content. So far, several ways in which client-centered therapy brings change has been discussed. One is by strengthening the "I" of the client. Another is by changing that to which the client attends. A third is through the client centered therapy situation operating as a mini-culture which changes many of the client's beliefs about the nature of the world and the self.

Client-centered therapy also changes the content, the material and structure, of the internal context. What we encounter when we think or explore is the content or material of our context. When I picture going to a particular restaurant and talking to my wife, I am encountering objective content or material in my internal context. Sensing how I would feel if we went to a restaurant that she wanted to go to, but that I didn't, is encountering subjective material.

New material in our internal worlds, new content of our phenomenological context, comes into being when we repeatedly encounter a situation. If I frequently talk about something with

someone, later, when I picture the person, I might picture myself in conversation about that topic. This interaction has become part of my objective context.

Our objective context also grows when we repeatedly encounter something that exists only in our own minds. To repeatedly imagine a friend in whom I confided telling someone what I have told him in confidence has an effect, creates objective context, similar to that which would have resulted from the actual experience of my friend repeatedly telling people my secrets. This effect is to create in my internal world the reality of betrayal so that when I picture telling someone something, I also picture their act of betrayal.

Similarly, we create structures and situations in our reflexive, subjective world. If I notice on several occasions that I have a similar reaction when my wife goes on trips without me and then, after working with my reaction, decide that this reaction is feeling like a lost child, this newly formed feeling becomes a unit ("lost and abandoned") which I can encounter, it takes on a reality that I can examine and work with.

The fact that the truth of our experience consists of tangible, existent, mental situations means that it is difficult to convince us of new truths. In the above example of people betraying my confidences, my perception of betrayal is based on my reality which has grown from my, perhaps imagined, experience. If you were to tell me that people do not betray me, your statement contradicts my experience and reality and so would have little effect.

The reflexive, subjective context is built when the therapist selects and responds to the subjective aspects of what the client says. Through repeated, reflexive, encounters with this subjective material the client builds subjective situations. By reflexively finding similarity and differences between these subjective situations, the client builds structures of subjective experience. The structure becomes part of the client's internal context, becomes what the client encounters when ruminating, becomes that to which the client reacts.

It is important to contrast the process of growth being described here with the process of discovery assumed in the old paradigm. In that explanation for the effect of psychotherapy, it is assumed that fresh subjective material is talked about when the person is less defended and threatened. Growth is seen as occurring because material is emerging as a result of this lack of defensiveness. In the new paradigm it is assumed that this fresh material has been newly developed, that growth is a process of development.

DIFFERENT EFFECTS OF CLIENT-CENTERED THERAPY WITH CLIENTS WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF INTERNAL CONTEXT

As mentioned earlier, people differ in the amount of subjective context they possess. Some people will describe little or no subjectivity to themselves or others. These people see themselves as part of the objective world and have not as yet developed much of a subjective context. For this person, living almost solely in the objective world, some change in the view of the world (i.e., learning of the importance and reality of the subjective world) may be all that therapy can accomplish at that time. The building of subjective structures, the development of the subjective context, may have to wait until the importance and reality of the subjective world has been assimilated by the client. The client who feels that therapy was a success, even though little in the way of the development of new material occurred, may have come to see the reality and importance of the subjective world, but has not yet built subjective structures.

For the person who is frequently subjective, the importance of the subjective is probably already known and assumed. The importance of client centered therapy for this person would be in the building of new structures in the subjective context and the diminishing of the distance between the objective and subjective.

A few remarks about the self. The necessity for understanding action from the perspective of the individual is in the forefront of the newer discussions of personality theory in psychology and in anthropology. It is a mark of Rogers's genius that he used the self and the framework of the individual as the bed rock for his explanatory concepts in 1951. But as the intellectual climate has changed, the assumptions about the nature of the self has changed.

The theory presented here assumes the self to be existing in the discourse that occurs in reaction to the phenomenological and social context, assumes a self that exists in perspective and in action, rather than a self that exists as an entity that determines action. This view of self implies a new view of the processes of change of self. This view is that the self changes from a change in perspective and discourse, not from a discovery of the hidden, true self. This argument about the self and its change is similar to what was said about feelings and reactions and their change. That is, it is being asserted here that the self changes, as feelings do, when we develop a new context.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, it was hoped that the framework presented here might serve several purposes. One was to provide a new explanation for why change occurs as a result of Rogers's methods, one that doesn't employ old paradigm assumptions of discovery or uncovering explanation. The explanation offered in this paper does not assume that problems are caused by feelings and experiencing not in awareness. Rather, our problems occur because of the nature of our internal contexts. Problems are solved, and our experience is changed, when the internal contexts are changed. More specifically, client-centered therapy changes our experience by:

1. Our culture gives rise to a number of assumptions.

2. These assumptions determine our inner context.

3. Our reactions occur in response to our internal context.

4. Both our negative and positive experience is determined by the kind of inner context we have.

5. Client-centered therapy is a mini-culture which:

    a. Changes our cultural assumptions which

    b. Changes our context which

    c. Changes our experience.

This different view of the process of psychotherapeutic change means that as therapists we are working with the client's perspective and context, something that only the client can really know. We don't work with that which is hidden from the client, something we can know even if the client doesn't.

As people, the view proposed here gives rise to a different source for our personal problems. Rather than our problems being caused by what we are hiding from ourselves, it is our perspective on reality, the sort of internal context that we have created for ourselves, which needs to be changed.

The third hope for the framework presented here was that it gives us a way of describing clients that would not violate our perspective that we are not experts in the client's world. This seems reasonably possible because the new paradigm corresponds to how we ordinarily describe clients.

For example, when we receive or give supervision, we describe the kind of world in which the client lives in ways much like those discussed in this paper. Thus, to someone I am supervising I might say, after reading a part of a transcript, "She is trying to make someone believe that she is in pain" and about a larger part of the transcript I might say "She seems to be looking at the impossibility of getting anyone to believe her." What I am describing is what seems to me to be happening in her phenomenological world and could serve as response to the client in a therapy hour.

Perhaps also, the idea and description of the internal subjective and objective contexts presented here will sensitize us to where our clients are in their worlds and to the changes that are occurring. Given the new paradigm, the changes that occur in the client can be described in terms that have to do with the client's world rather than just in terms of change in feeling. For example, we might talk in terms of the client trusting the subjective and living more in his or her subjective context, rather than in describing changes in particular feelings.

REFERENCES

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Harre, R., & Gillett, G. *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21*, 95-103.

Policy Statement

The Person-Centered Journal is sponsored by the Association for Development of the Person-Centered Approach (ADPCA). The publication is intended to promote and disseminate scholarly thinking about person-centered principles, practices, and philosophy.