

"The Person-Centered approach, then is primarily a way of being which finds its expression in attitudes and behaviors that create a growth-promoting climate."

Carl R. Rogers

Some New Challenges - Section 4

(Ruth Sanford, friend and colleague of Carl Rogers, suggested that this article be reprinted for review by the present membership of ADPCA. I have received permission from the American Psychological Association to reprint it in Renaissance. I have taken the liberty of dividing Carl's paper into five sections, Editor.)

Can We Permit Ourselves to be Whole Men and Women?

Now I wish to move on to a quite different, yet perhaps not unrelated, challenge. Most of us spent 20 or more years in educational institutions where the intellect was *all*. Anything that counted, anything of any importance, occurred above the neck — in absorbing and memorizing, in thinking and expression. Yet, in life, in therapy, in relationships with the opposite sex, in marriage in parent-child relationships, in encounter groups, in university faculty meetings, we were forced to learn that feelings were an equally important part of living. But, due largely to our education, we still tend to dichotomize these two aspects. I have observed this so strongly in groups. If the group is assembled for an intellectual task, feelings are denied, though they are often painfully evident. If the group is assembled for personal encounter, ideas are often strongly rejected as having no place in such a group. It seems that we live on an either-or basis. We are aware of, and express, what we think; or we are aware of, and express, our emotional reactions. Almost never are the two sides of our life brought together.

Anything that counted, anything of any importance, occurred above the neck — in absorbing and memorizing, in thinking and expression.

Clinical psychology is an interesting indication of the depth of this division. Training is usually separated into courses — the straight intellectual effort — or practicum experience, in which one deals with the emotions of others, and occasionally with one's own. But the rift is most clearly indicated if I present a hypothetical example. One student states that for his dissertation he wishes to measure, with all sophisticated precaution, the differences between Group A and Group B. He believes he will find this intellectually stimulating and valuable. Another states that for his dissertation he wishes to present, in appropriate form and thoughtfully viewed, the most important learning in

all his graduate years: the deeply insightful self-learning in his relationship with a difficult client with whom he discovered mutual growth, bringing about lasting changes in his own and his client's behavior. We all know that the first plan would be accepted without question. The second would not only be rejected, but probably angrily and summarily rejected. Who does the student think he is, trying to bring in his feelings, his understanding of his and his client's gut-level reactions, together with his thoughts about these? This would be regarded as a ridiculous subject for a dissertation.

Although this seems only normal educational procedure to the older generation, the present younger generation is more and more frequently refusing to accede. I think of a weekend encounter between faculty and students at a strife-torn university. It ended inconclusively. I thought one student summed up the dilemma accurately when he finally told the faculty: "I don't know if our two worlds can *ever* meet; because our world has feelings in it." For me, this said it.

Most of us consist of two separated parts, trying desperately to bring themselves together into an integrated soma, where the distinctions between mind and body, feelings, and intellect, would be obliterated.

Why are so many of our best students leaving universities? Because they find no place there for the whole person. Why are so many young people finding life perplexing and without meaning? Partly because they do not know that it is possible to live as a person of thought united with passion, of feeling suffused with intellect and curiosity. Thomas Hanna (1970), in his excellent book *Bodies in Revolt*, puts up a strong plea for the soma, a beautiful unity of the pulsing human organism in all of its manifestations. Among many other things, he has this to say about the feeling of many young people about our "absurd" world: "The experience of 'meaninglessness' is a living accusation of that hypertrophy of one aspect of our somas: namely conscious attention and rational effort [p. 227]." I could not agree with him more. It is the overstress on the conscious and the rational and the underestimation of the wisdom of our total reacting organism that prevent us from living as unified, whole human beings.

(continued on page 2)

(Some New Challenges continued)

Yet, I can testify from personal experience that it is not easy for people whose lives have been dichotomized for decades to achieve this unity. I have conducted courses in which the whole group, including myself, have agreed that our feelings are as important a part of the curriculum as our ideas. Yet, if a member starts exploring some highly emotionalized experiences into which he is beginning to gain understanding, other members hesitate to bring up anything but feeling reactions. And if one person starts a class meeting excitedly propounding the ideas involved in a budding theory he is just beginning to develop, that session tends to be intellectual in focus. Only occasionally has a group been able to *be* whole persons in the experience. Yet, when they have achieved this, the results are unforgettable. Some members turn in highly original and scholarly papers; another expresses his deepest learnings in a poem; still another brings to the final meeting a painted wooden "construction" in which he has tried artistically to set forth what his learnings have been; still another has written a sardonic and dramatic play, very pertinent to the course. For the traditional grade-bound instructor, this would be chaos. For one who is interested in expressions of learning by the total and unified person, this is heartwarming.

But in spite of such innovative efforts — and they are increasingly frequent — dichotomized persons are still an overwhelming majority. We still go to our universities for ideas, and to encounter groups or therapy to emit any "primal scream" of our pent-up emotions.

Yet if we are truly aware, we can hear the "silent screams" of denied feelings echoing off of every classroom wall and university corridor. And if we are sensitive enough, we can hear the creative thoughts and ideas that often emerge during and from the open expression of our feelings. Most of us consist of two separated parts, trying desperately to bring themselves together into an integrated soma, where the distinctions between mind and body, feelings, and intellect, would be obliterated.

...I think if change is to come about in dealing with ourselves and others as complete somas with thought and feeling intertwined, it will be the younger generation who achieves it.

Who can bring into being this whole person? From my experience I would say the least likely are university faculty members. Their traditionalism and smugness approach the incredible. I remember with something approaching horror the statement of a Columbia University professor shortly after buildings were seized and campus turmoil erupted among the students who could not be heard in any other way. This professor told me, "There's no problem of communication at Columbia. Why, I speak to students almost every day." He sounded like a southern slaveholder in the 1850s.

No, I think if change is to come about in dealing with ourselves and others as complete somas with thought and feeling

intertwined, it will be the younger generation who achieves it. They are throwing off the shackles of tradition. They have largely discarded the religious dogmas that proclaimed the body evil and only the mind and spirit capable of good. They are a strong hope against the dichotomized, dehumanized being who can drop bombs on Vietnamese civilians and handle this quite comfortably at the intellectual level. He has not murdered people, or torn flesh from bone. He has only engaged in "a protective reaction strike." Only the younger generation, I believe, can help us to see the awful dehumanization we have bred in our educational system by separating thoughts, which are to be approved, from feelings, which are somehow seen as animal in origin. Perhaps the young can make us whole again. God knows we need once more to be unified organisms, responsive to *all* of ourselves and *all* of our environment.

(American Psychologist, 1973, Vol. 28, Number 5 [p. 379-380] Copyright 1973 American Psychological Association. Reprinted by permission.)

References

- Castaneda, C. *The teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui way of knowing*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.
- Castaneda, C. *A separate reality: Further conversations with Don Juan*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1971.
- Coulson, W. R., & Rogers, C. R. (Eds.) *Man and the science of man*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1968.
- Dagenais, J. J. *Models of man*. The Hague, Netherlands: Nimhoff, 1972.
- Hanna, T. *Bodies in revolt: A primer in somatic thinking*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Hanna, T. The project of somatology. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Humanistic Psychology, Washington, D.C., September 1971.
- James, W. *The varieties of religious experience*. London: Longmans, Green, 1928.
- Koch, S. Epilogue. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science*. Vol. 3. *Formulations of the person and the social context*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- LeShan, L. *Toward a general theory of the paranormal*. New York: Parapsychology Foundation, 29 W. 57th Street, New York, New York, 1969.
- Oppenheimer, R. Analogy in science. *American Psychologist*, 1956, 11, 127-135.
- Ostrander, S., & Schroeder, L. *Psychic discoveries behind the Iron Curtain*. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- Polanyi, M. *Personal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Rogers, C. R. Persons or science? A philosophical question. *American Psychologist*, 1955, 10, 267-278.
- Rogers, C. R. Toward a science of the person. In T. W. Wann (Ed.), *Behaviorism and phenomenology: Contrasting bases for modern psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Schilpp, P. A. (Ed.) *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-scientist*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959.
- Schultz, D. P. (Ed.) *The science of psychology: Critical reflections*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Skinner, B. F. A case history in scientific method. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science*. Vol. 2. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Letters to the editor...

Facilitators at the ADPCA Annual Meetings

I really appreciate Barbara Temaner Brodley sending me her opinion on this matter. I disagree so strongly, as she knew I would, that I am impelled to reply. I trust others will do the same, as Doug Bower requested.

First of all, I would like to emphasize that facilitated small groups and community meetings have a long history in person-centered practice. In fact, as far as I know, the entire person-centered encounter and learning group movement as practiced by Carl Rogers with other colleagues at Center for Studies of the Person for over 25 years was based on small and large groups that were facilitated. I would venture to say that most person-centered groups being offered around the world today are facilitated by persons who first experienced this process in CSP's La Jolla Program, Living Now Institute, or Carl Rogers & Associates Workshops, or in programs and off-shoots of programs originally created by at least some persons who had participated in CSP programs, such as the Facilitator Development Institute in Great Britain and the Cross Cultural Workshops in Europe.

John K. Wood, who has facilitated person-centered groups all over the world for many many years, reminds us, in the paper he delivered in Austria last summer, that the person centered approach is an approach, not a methodology. He points out that while there is a theory of client-centered therapy, the application of the approach to groups is not theory-based or extensively researched. To claim as Barbara Temaner Brodley does, that "non led/non-designated facilitated group is a client-centered principles-determined phenomenon" is to imply a theoretical basis that does not exist. In fact, if the application of the approach from therapy to group process is to be made, it is much more appropriate to do so in the direction of facilitators creating the conditions in which group members can experience personal growth in their own attitudes of acceptance, empathy and congruence and a sense of connection with others.

Facilitators do not direct and control. Nor do they abuse power. In non-facilitated groups, no one has to take responsibility for the group process, and frequently no one does, certainly not with sufficient consistency to build a climate of trust. At ADPCA it is disappointing to me that some people seem unaware of the disproportionate amount of "air time" they take in community meetings and other manipulative behaviors. Given that experience most recently in Evanston, I was delighted with the suggestion that ADPCA try facilitated groups and community meetings.

I support the idea of experimenting, just as the Tennessee people did with the structure a few years ago and the Evanston group did with the pre-conference institutes. Accepting that the Annual Meeting is an opportunity to apply the approach, it behooves us to explore what might be effective in facilitating learning and connection for "experienced" therapists who may

or may not be experienced in person-centered group process, as well as newcomers wishing to explore ADPCA and experience what the person-centered approach is about. This is not about violating principles and compromising values. To me, much of what PCA is about is facilitating learning and I want us to look at how we can do it better - and how we can help each other learn to do it better. I want us to care about facilitating peoples' experience in the groups - not with explanations verbally and in writing outside the groups. I want to experience being in a community that respects different voices and different ways of doing things. I certainly don't want to be autocratic and insist that I won't participate unless it is done my way! As I said in Evanston, I appreciate the effort of any group willing to organize a meeting, I respect their creativity in designing it whatever way they thoughtfully consider worth trying, hoping that the community and the organization will always be open to new ideas, and knowing that whatever the community does not like, it can change. To me, that's where the energy is. I remember again, Carl noting at our first ADPCA meeting that there are "conservers and explorers." I too remain an explorer, but I want to say this time - let's not automatically conserve "the non-facilitated group or community" - which really has no roots either in the history or the theory. If we have learning goals for ourselves and newcomers, lets apply the approach creatively and see if we can do a better job than we have been doing.

Suzanne Spector

Response to Suzanne Spector concerning predesignated facilitators at the ADPCA Annual Meeting

First, our disagreement is not about facilitation in the community meetings when having it could contribute to the sense of safety and the freedom of participants and to the general level of the attitudinal conditions in the group climate. The disagreement is about the necessity and desirability of predesignated facilitators. My position first:

1. All participants have the right and the responsibility to share facilitation in the community group.
2. Participants in the ADPCA community group include many people who are able, willing and who do share facilitation responsibilities.
3. Errors and lapses in facilitation in the community group do occur. Group-shared facilitation can improve and probably will (a) as people have more experience in large groups without predesignated facilitators, (b) as participants are more free to request facilitation when they experience the need for it, and (c) as more participants understand that they are free to try to facilitate, regardless of their level of experience in big groups and regardless of their credentials.
4. The sharing of facilitation responsibilities is part of the challenge of big peer groups (as well as small ones).

(continued on page 4)

(Letters to the Editor continued)

Peer group community meetings constitute an ongoing experiment in PC pure democracy in action, and a context for deeper understanding of PC values and, also, for developing capabilities for facilitating big groups.

5. Chaos, confusion, regression from conditions of safety and freedom, emotional outbursts and "apparent" non-person-centered behavior are inevitable, from time to time, in CC/PC big groups with or without formal facilitators.
6. Criteria for success of big group experiences do not include the absence of various negative experiences. Criteria for success of CC/PC big group experiences do involve whether or not, within the time frame of the sequence of the meetings, (a) there is evidence of a general increase in the level of the therapeutic attitudes in the group climate and (b) evidence of specific implementations of the therapeutic attitudes in response to disturbing or hurtful events and interactions.

Second, I agree with Suzanne that there is a history of predesignated facilitators in CC/PC practice. At least as early as the 1940s, such groups existed in CC practice and training, and at least for the past 25 years very large formally facilitated CC/PC groups have emerged.

Suzanne is mistaken, however, in her view that "the application of the CC/PC approach to groups is not theory based". There is a considerable body of CC/PC theory and observation about small and large groups by Barrett-Lennard, Bebout, Bowen, Bozarth, Braaten, Hobbs, Leitaer, Meador, Raskin, Rogers, Stubbs, Wood and others.

Third, Suzanne apparently does not recognize the implications, for applications of CC/PC theory, of a meeting of peers (which is the situation of ADPCA annual meetings). She does not appear to recognize the distinction between meetings of persons conceived of as peers and meetings of persons who have been convened by therapists, educators, or by a staff of facilitators who have determined the purposes of the meetings.

In my E-mail statement which argued against the annual meeting having predesignated facilitators, I assumed my readers would understand that my point of view is partly based on the fact that we in the ADPCA define ourselves as a peer-group when we meet in the big group and the small groups, and the fact we are meeting in the context of an organization that does not have a hierarchical social/power structure or, even, elected officers.

Fourth, contrary to Suzanne's contention that there is no history or precedent in CC/PC approach for groups meeting without formal facilitators, there is a long history of CC/PC groups meeting without them. For example, at the University of Chicago, during the years 1960 to 1967 when I was involved at the counseling center, staff business meetings, general discussion meetings and, occasionally, even the CC practicum groups met without designated facilitators or leaders. I believe this practice

also existed earlier at the center during Rogers' tenure there. It was continued by the staff of the CC counseling center, which came into existence in 1970 as a private psychological agency when the University abandoned its clinical training and disbanded the counseling center founded by Rogers.

Rogers (in *A Way of Being*), describes staff of 8 or 10 people meeting as a peer-group for 3 or 4 days without facilitators as preparation for meetings (for training, cross-cultural, and personal development purposes). These staff groups met immediately prior to the convening of the participants in order to prepare themselves emotionally and professionally and to enhance their ability to work well together when they would be facilitating the big and small groups. The PC Forum meetings, begun in 1982 in Mexico, have not used predesignated facilitators for the big community meetings nor for the small groups. The Chicago area CC/PC network meetings have not involved predesignated facilitators for the 10 or so years they have met in groups ranging from 4 to 25 participants. The Warm Springs annual PC workshops do not involve predesignated facilitators for the community group, the small groups nor for the discussion groups. And, starting with the first annual meeting of the ADPCA, the big community meetings and the small groups have not had predesignated facilitators. There are probably many more examples of peer-group structure without formal facilitators going on in CC/PC practice than these I have mentioned.

Fifth, Suzanne is mistaken in her denial of the accuracy of my assertion that groups without predesignated facilitators are client-centered principles-determined phenomena. It is true that there is, so far, no specific theoretical writing (that I am aware of) which states the theoretical elements in, and the logic of, my assertion. But our theory is not located only in books and periodicals. Prior to becoming written theory, rational deduction from the basic principles of CC/PC theory and application of these deductions takes place. Many of us are creating and modifying CC/PC theory, and applying it before writing it. Some implications of CC/PC principles are implicitly understood by many people involved in working from the CC/PC approach. I think this is the case in the situations where facilitators have not been designated for various sizes of group meetings.

In situations where people are attempting to implement CC/PC values and the therapeutic attitudes, many features of the situation influence the specifics of implementation. The CC/PC principles that are always involved in figuring out the specifics of application and implementation are the basic values of respect for and trust in the capabilities of persons (and in aggregates of persons such as groups), the principle of protecting (or at least not thwarting) the autonomy and self-determination of persons, the principle of fostering non-hierarchical social structures to the extent possible under the given circumstances, and attempting to experience and live the therapeutic attitudes as much as possible under the given circumstances.

Groups without predesignated facilitators are the result of applying these principles to situations conceived as peer
(continued on page 5)

(Letters to the Editor continued)

situations wherein decisions about the structure and functioning of the groups is determined by some method chosen by the group. Thus not using predesignated facilitators is not inevitable in CC/PC groups. It is up to the group. In our ADPCA case, we delegate many decisions about the meeting to the convening committee that has volunteered to host the annual meeting. Thus it is appropriate for the Florida committee to consider whether or not to have formal facilitators.

There are other factors in specific situations (such as the purposes or goals that bring people together) that influence the specifics of application and implementation of CC/PC principles in addition to whether the group and its source of convening is conceived as peers or non-peers (such as therapists and clients or facilitators and trainees). In the case of peer conception of the group, there is another factor that influences the decision whether or not to use formal facilitators. That factor is whether or not there are persons in the group who understand the CC/PC principles enough to function as resources to persons who know enough about CC/PC to have chosen such a peer group but feel they have no idea at all how to apply the principles or who feel they are unfamiliar with all of the major elements. It is more likely, although not inevitable, that a CC/PC oriented peer group with no members who are familiar with the theory or some of its applications would choose some seasoned facilitators and/or resource persons. If the group is self-defined as a CC/PC oriented group of peers and it is convening itself, the group has the power to choose formal facilitators or not do so. Under the circumstances I am describing, the group could not have formal facilitators until it decided to have them, consequently the decision process could not be formally facilitated. I think this is the basis for the ADPCA meetings, so far, not having formal facilitators - we have been applying the principles of self-determination, etcetera to (at least implicitly recognized) a meeting of people conceived as peers. (I hope it is understood that "peer" does not imply literal equality or deny individual differences. It is a political term. Power and control is shared equally, in principle, among those who are peers.

Sixth, Suzanne states that CC/PC facilitators do not direct, control or abuse power. I assume she means they do not intend to direct, control or abuse power and I agree that it is always a CC/PC intention, based on the values mentioned above and the ubiquitous non-directive attitude in CC/PC applications. The principles and the experienced intentions of persons, however, do not inevitably result in what the principles assert and the people intend. Suzanne points out that experienced therapists may not be experienced in CC/PC group process. They, consequently, may do a poor job in their attempts to spontaneously facilitate during a community meeting. This is certainly true. The point applies to all applications of CC/PC theory. Experienced group therapists are not necessarily effective individual therapists, experienced couple therapists are not necessarily good group therapists, and experienced small group therapists are not necessarily good CC/PC teachers, etc. There

is, of course, some carry over of expertise from one of these CC/PC situations to the others. But each has its own characteristics and one must work in an individualistic way with the specific individuals, families, couples, groups, etc., and needs a lot of instances of working with individuals, families, etc. before becoming expert. I think it takes 3 or 4 thousand hours of individual therapy work with many individuals before one can be truly expert as an individual therapist. Given the complexity of large group facilitation I think it would take at least as many hours of experience with large groups to become expert. I doubt there are many people alive who have as much as 3000 hours of facilitation experience with experienced big group facilitators were still struggling to figure out what to do and how to do it under what circumstances. John Wood (in the Person Centered Journal, #3) discussed errors and problems he perceived in the application of the PCA at the Rust meeting facilitated by Rogers and other experienced large group facilitators. Nevertheless, if we continue not having formal facilitators at the ADPCA annual meetings I would hope that the people who are relatively experienced in big group facilitation would do their share spontaneously so we can learn from them. They could also offer presentations discussing their view of such facilitation. I am sure many annual meeting participants would attend such a presentation. I think most people want to help the community group be a safe, freeing, interesting and growthful experience.

Suzanne's assertion that "in non-facilitated groups, no one has to take responsibility for the group process" may be true in some instances, but it seems to be an over-generalization, at least in respect to CC/PC groupings. Her assertion that "frequently no one does" take responsibility for facilitation at ADPCA community meetings is contrary to my perceptions. There are lapses. But those can be interpreted not as failures in responsibility, but as due to noone, including the experienced facilitators, knowing for certain how to do it under the circumstances and/or hesitating to try to facilitate because of legitimate concerns about directing the group.

In some groups facilitated by staff, I have witnessed similar lapses and worse, "facilitative" responses that I have experienced as offensively directive or interpretive (such as "the group is avoiding feelings" — a most presumptuous interpretation). Given what I have observed in the USA and abroad, I doubt that there is anyone who has the level of expertise to facilitate in big groups without making many serious mistakes. My statement, of course, stems from a point of view about what is appropriate and effective facilitative behavior and there must be many differences in view about this among CC/PC people. All the people who made the mistakes, as I saw them, were earnestly attempting to function in a CC/PC manner and I thought the things that were said and done were quite inconsistent with the principles and theory. Given the limited number of experts and the disagreements likely to exist among us as to what is and is not facilitative behavior, this is another reason to continue with the practice of shared facilitation and support spontaneous experiments in facilitation by the participants.

(continued on page 7)

A Tentative Schedule for the Annual ADPCA Meeting

Entering the World as if... May 25-29, 1995 • The University of Tampa

A precondition for growth is "A...person who...is sufficiently secure within herself and in her relationship to others that she experiences an essential trust in the capacity of others to think for themselves, to learn for themselves. She regards human beings as trustworthy organisms. (*Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn for the 80's, p.188*).

"The individual is always in process, always striving toward recognition of his or her inherent potential, never losing the dynamic movement and striving." (*Jerold Bozarth, Quantum Theory and the Person-Centered Approach, Journal of Counseling and Development, Vol. 64, No. 3, p. 181*).

"What is fundamentally assumed [in client-centered therapy] is the potential to change...It underlies all belief in growth, education, and therapy. The change could be in any direction, but the prediction is that it will be in a positive direction...The establishing of certain conditions—such as a nourishing environment – has a predictable, encouraging, but not controlling, effect. (*Ronald Levant & John Shlien, Client Centered Therapy and the Person-Centered Approach, p.3*).

If the person-centered approach is to develop... it will establish directions and priorities that surprise us, deriving not from our projects aimed at results, but from our creations, our beings, and our dreams. (*Rachael Lee Rosenberg, Roundtable Discussion, Person-Centered Review, Vol. 1, No.3, p. 346*).

Annual Meeting Committee 1995

Shirley Harris
1451 Gulf Blvd. #219
Clearwater, FL 34630
(813) 596-8020 (H)
(813) 536-4788 (O)

Audrey Levin
5127 Monterey Lane
Delray Beach, FL 33484
(407) 495-4852 (H & O)

Doug Bower
Route 1, Box 186
Arnoldsville, GA 30619
(706) 742-7246

THURSDAY, MAY 25

3-6 PM Registration
4:30 Orientation to PC Approach
6:00 Dinner
7:15 Special Interest Groups
8:15 Community Meeting

FRIDAY, MAY 26

8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 Small Groups
10:45 Presentations
Noon Lunch
2:00 PM Presentations
3:45 Business Focused Community Meeting
6:00 Dinner
7:30 Community Meeting

SATURDAY, MAY 27

8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 Small Groups
10:45 Presentations
Noon Lunch
2:00 PM Presentations
4:00 First Bus to Beach, Special Interest Groups at Beach or Special Interest Groups at College
5:30 Second Bus to Beach
6:00 Picnic at Fort DeSoto
9:00 Community Meeting

SUNDAY, MAY 28

8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 Small Groups
10:45 Presentations
Noon Lunch
2:00 PM Presentations
4:00 Business Focused Community Meeting
6:00 Dinner
7:30 Community Meeting

MONDAY, MAY 29

8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 Small Groups
10:00 Community Meeting

(Letters to the Editor continued)

Seventh, I am also disappointed, and even annoyed, when I think some people in the Community are taking a disproportionate amount of air time. I have never witnessed, however, an experienced-staff-facilitated group where such incidents did not occur. I think that is not a very easy thing to prevent when functioning from CC/PC principles. It is even questionable that it should be prevented.

I do not know what Suzanne's data is, in her remark about "other manipulative behaviors". I think such judgemental interpretations are unhelpful in CC/PC contexts. They involve reading a log of things into other peoples' behavior and I am against that as a psychologist and as a CC/PC person. I try to show my students how to discriminate what they perceive as consensually describable in behavior, from their feelings and emotional reactions, and discriminate those things from the interpretations they are applying to the person. There are many other possibilities for accurate understanding of what is interpreted as "manipulative" behavior.

Finally, I think the community meetings at ADPCA, and the small groups should continue to be unfacilitated. Personally, the most interesting and challenging experiences at annual meetings are the community meetings without formal facilitators. I think they are going well, gradually improving even with the many ups and downs and mistakes, especially taking into account that the group composition changes considerably every year. I agree with Suzanne that experimentation is desirable. I am in favor of thoughtful experimentation in all aspects of CC/PC activities. To be against a particular experiment is not rejecting experimentation. To choose to keep away, if a particular experiment has been chosen, is not being autocratic. I hope that people who do not want to participate in some application of CC/PC ideas can be treated with as much respect as those who go for it. In any case, I think the experiment in having our ADPCA peer groups, big and small, function without formal facilitators is a great experiment and one deserving much more time.

Barbara T. Brodley

Facilitation and facilitators for ADPCA meetings

Speaking from the vantage point of having prior exposure to the three articles by Suzanne Spector and Barbara Broadly as well as from nearly twenty-five years of teaching a graduate course on Group Facilitation (actually a two-semester sequence) I would like to add a very supportive statement for the presence of facilitators at our meetings. And not only from the obvious stand point that all of us more experienced members (those of us who have attended a number of annual ADPCA meetings) are always welcome and even expected to offer our efforts at facilitation during large and small group meetings.

The Person-Centered approach as well as client-centered therapy is not doing what comes naturally. It is a way of being that is learned. It is quite in opposition to the usual way we are expected to behave in about all other interpersonal exchanges.

Active listening can and is taught. The three helping variables defined by Rogers can be identified and taught and learned.

This "way of being" is not something one can "pick up" by flying by the seat of one's pants (or slacks, or dress, or skirt, etc., to keep from being accused of being sexist).

The ability to respond empathically may grow, under ideal conditions, if there is enough time and are others offering empathic responses; if there are others showing and having accepting and nonjudgmental behaviors, if there are others being genuine and authentic. It is entirely another climate, probably not conducive to the growth of Person-Centered values which predominate in a free flowing, completely unstructured, facilitatorless group. Whether that group is 2, 8 or 50.

It is obvious (to me) that many newcomers are confused, frightened, and find valueless our ADPCA meetings when they are exposed to a structure which is mysterious and faceless.

Granted there are those who survive and grow. And there are all too many who seem to be bewildered and irritated. I will grant that if these people came back year after year they eventually become immune to this "Tabula Rasa." Most would not, and do not, return however.

I know that most, if not all other environments, do not permit the luxury of providing such a growing environment. I know that my students (and clients) require many hours of experience to our (my) way of being before it (we) have established a climate (relationship) which permits and encourages change.

I realize that ADPCA meets but once a year. We have few opportunities to provide the growthful environment so necessary for human growth. And I have found identifying and utilizing the ingredients necessary for human growth is stimulating for that growth.

A person will grow (exist) in most any climate or environment: A "human" grows through the provision of very identifiable ingredients. I know that the gardener who offers/provides/makes these ingredients available will enable the "human being" to grow to full potential.

Obviously, I strongly support facilitators for our ADPCA meeting.

Ken Newton

See page 9 for another comment regarding facilitation by Barbara Brodley.
