

"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

Designated Facilitators in Person-Centered Community Groups: Unnecessary and Insufficient

By Jerold D. Bozarth, Ph.D.

CHAPTER 3

I have been permitted by Jerold to "serialize" his paper (Jerold's term). AND I also told Jerold I would like to respond to his article, which also seemed OK. I hope others will respond here and/or in our Person Centered Journal. There will be four parts to Jerold's paper as well as four responses from me. I do hope we will hear from others, also.

The bibliography will appear only twice; at the end of the first chapter of our "serial" and at the end of our last chapter, chapter 4.

KEN NEWTON

SOME LEARNINGS FROM THE WARM SPRINGS WORKSHOPS

The first Person-Centered Workshop at Warm Springs, Georgia took place in 1987. Carl Rogers had died just a week before. The idea of an ongoing workshop was initiated at the first meeting of the ADPCA in Chicago. The individuals who were involved were: Barbara Brodley, Chuck Devonshire, Nat Raskin, Dave Spahn, Fred Zimring and me. These individuals were identified as staff on the brochure and had somewhat varying ideas of what it meant to facilitate a person-centered group. A core of students acquainted with person-centered principles from the University of Georgia were quite actively involved in creating the psychological environment of the workshop. Warm Springs is the name of the Georgia town in which the little white house existed at the Warm Springs Rehabilitation Center during much of the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt spent much of the year at the center where he was close to treatment resources for polio. This historical site seems appropriate for the person-centered workshops. Over the ten meetings, there was a shift towards not identifying staff or facilitators to the point that the only name on the 1996 brochure was mine and that simply indicated to whom to send the registration form. Of this group, only Dave Spahn and myself were at the 1995 workshop. There were, however, other participants who had attended most of the workshops. The first seven workshops were held for four days while the last two years were seven days. Attendance was always mobile and fluid. There were always some individuals who

came for only a part of a day and some who came, left and returned. There has always been a structure on the brochure that included the community group, topic groups and small groups. However, the schedule was seldom adhered to in any structured way. The community meeting was the core site of scheduling. I will mention a couple of my observations about this experience. These observations are:

1. The event was in large part emergent. That is, there was virtually no planning and little conventional organization.
2. Although there were no designated facilitators, some individuals assumed that there were and, as well, identified other participants as facilitators. A few people assumed that I and the student coordinator were the facilitators. Others assumed prominent individuals were the facilitators. That is, varying participants chose to perceive varying individuals as the designated facilitators (A point consistent with Stubbs' findings).
3. There were often statements at the end of the workshops that the experience had "...changed my life..."; "...been an exceptional experience..."; "...will have a major impact on my life..." There were also some who complained that the group should have been different but who continued to come back year after year. About half of the participants never return for reasons which vary dramatically. In addition, there were wide varieties of perception of the event itself

(continued on page 3)

A SENSE OF COMMUNITY, A SENSE OF BELONGING

Barbara June Hunter, Ph.D.

Since our 1996 annual meeting, I have wanted to write of my experience there as well as some related thoughts. I know I want to say something about my idea of community as that relates to my behavior in the community meetings at the 1996 meeting, but I'm not sure what.

I read a few items that seem pertinent to my reflections; one is the question (Ken's?) in the last (Summer) issue of Renaissance:

Where does "society" begin AND where do "I" start? How can I blame "society" for my behavior if I am part of society?... What part is me and what part is society?

Either I would word my question differently or perhaps it is a different question: How do I choose to let the community affect me and how do I want to — and how do I actually — affect the community? That question feels important. I guess, in a way, answering it is part of the reason I'm writing.

I was really shocked when, on either the last day or the last evening of the (annual) meeting, a younger member of the community told me there is no purpose to the community meetings. He said that whatever happens is what happens. I was shocked because only then did I become aware that my view of the purpose of the community meetings was not universal, was not **THE** way to perceive them! I responded and continue to believe that the purpose of the community meeting is to build or become a community. That is one of my purposes, perhaps my main purpose, in attending them. So, after giving this further thought, I realized that is what I try to **DO** in those meetings; I do what I believe will contribute to the building of a sense of community.

I responded and continue to believe that the purpose of the community meeting is to build or become a community.

Another item, which I reread, is Sanford's "Purpose and Value of Community in Person-Centered Groups"¹ and I'm glad I did; I took heart from her words. They seemed to affirm what I believe, because after hearing that other member's opinion (at the 1996 meeting), I began to reexamine not only my opinion but also my behavior in community meetings, since it does reflect my views. One of my opinions about contributing to community is that to do so means that the well-being of the others (in the community) is as important

to me as my own. This is not to suggest I'm even close to being there; like many of us, I am aspiring.

One more thought I'd like to share before describing what happened for me at the 1996 meeting is my sense that patience is close to, if not at, the heart of the person-centered approach. As Sanford said, "...commitment to...patience with the process [is] essential to the transformation of a group of individuals into a community"².

I guess I believe, too, that openness, some degree of making oneself vulnerable, trusting, also contributes to the building of community. When I speak, therefore, I try hard to be congruent (in both what I feel and what I say) and also to reflect positive regard for those who are listening. All that I've just said went into my initial comments at the Thursday night (first) community meeting for 1996. I mentioned my fear of sharing at the community meetings, my fear of being judged, of how I would be looked at, of how I would be seen. I mentioned that I speak anyway, because of my desire to connect with more members of the community than would be possible in one-on-one or small group experiences. And I asserted that I would, despite these fears, try with all my heart always to speak from my heart.

In a discussion, which I believed occurred at the Friday meeting, one member suggested — as one of two possible guides to responding to what someone had shared at a meeting — an expressed request for a response. Sometime later, having given some further thought to both the quality of our community meetings in general and my own fearfulness re: speaking at them in particular, I shared my observation. I said that I did not believe that all the nurturing and support in the world that the community might provide to me could eliminate my fear about speaking because the community was not the cause of my fear. Rather, I had brought that fear with me; its source was inside me.

Although I recognized that a supportive community response might lessen my fear, I was clear that it (such a response) could never totally dispel it. I went on that degree of dissolution (of my fear) would require work on it by me, separate from the community. My concluding comment was a request to know if anyone understood what I was saying. Of the approximately 100 people present, one responded, and I had no sense that he had understood, which I attempted to convey to him.

The community moved on to other seemingly unrelated issues, and since I was convinced I was correct, I gave no further thought to my contribution or to what I considered a lack of response to it. I was therefore completely bewildered by my reaction when, later, a member of the community thanked me for what I'd said. She indicated she had completely

(continued on page 6)

Designated Facilitators continued

from those who attended. After one workshop, I heard a range of explanations to others by participants that included: "...it was a big party," "...it was group therapy..."; "...great intellectual experience..."; "...it was a family reunion..."; "...it was so terribly intense..."

4. I periodically thought that the last three workshops verged on the edge of being laissez faire to the point that I personally became a bit concerned. Several times, only a couple of individuals of the community came for the scheduled community meetings. Yet, the community group at the end of the workshop was one that reflected cohesion and individual satisfaction.
5. Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed during the 1995 workshop when I did not go to the community meeting one day. It was reported that the group was leaderlessly walking the grounds looking for me. One person was ready to leave and another wanted a refund of her registration fee. The concerned group met for the entire night and the next day had changed their view to that of having had a very positive workshop experience.

I have reached the conclusion from the Warm Springs experience that designated facilitators, workshop format, or the presence or absence of particular individuals are of little relevance. When people feel fundamentally free to be who they are at the moment, they move in constructive directions. And that it is often in the struggle that they find freedom and growth. The relevant question to ask might be: "How is that atmosphere created?" The general answer is, "...to be free to be themselves."

IMPLICATIONS OF THE AXIOMS IN REVIEW

My current view is that all of the previous axioms remain the same except the second one. These axioms, however, have implications when considering the roles of facilitators.

AXIOM 1: THE BASIC INTENT OF THE PERSON-CENTERED APPROACH IS TO PERPETUATE THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF HUMANS AND, IN DOING SO, TO PERPETUATE THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF THE UNIVERSE.

An implication of this axiom is that there is an interconnection of the organismic constructive movement of the individual (Actualizing Tendency) with the constructive direction of the universe (Formative Tendency). This exceeds Rogers' linear delineation of his theory but corresponds with statements in the latter part of his life (Baldwin, 1987; Rogers, 1980) including

his references to "transcendent self", "inner intuitive self", "presence is healing", and his periodic references to "group wisdom".

AXIOM 2: THE PRIMARY THRUST AND ABIDING INTENT OF THE FACILITATOR IS TO STRIVE TO BE A GENUINE PERSON WHO EMPATHICALLY ACCEPTS THE WORLD OF THE OTHER PERSON FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THAT PERSON.

The emphasis here is not on understanding. Rather, it is on the willingness to accept the individual's perceptions as meaningful and viable to him/her. This is closer to Rogers' reference to the importance of the intention to understand and the willingness to have no preconceptions of what might occur. Although it may be desirable to understand, the importance of actual understanding is less important than I previously believed. If this is not true in general, it still holds true for the facilitator since empathic understanding is as readily experienced with others as with the facilitator. I believe that the term empathic acceptance is more accurate than empathic understanding since I believe that Rogers' conceptualization of empathy is part and parcel of unconditional positive regard (Bozart, in press) or, if there should be any separation of the necessary and sufficient conditions, that empathy is one of the purist conveyers of unconditional positive regard (Bozarth, 1993). Other views of empathy suggest to me that we need to be open beyond the general concept of empathic understanding. For example, Dossey (1993) identifies empathy as a major factor in paranormal experiments dealing with nonlocal events in a laboratory. He cites multiple studies that indicate that subjects "...can influence the outcome of random physical events and can mentally convey complex information to other subjects from whom they are widely separated..." and states "...that almost all of the successes occur between people who are empathic." (p. 51).

The concept of empathic understanding as we now know it is functionally related to "...how to do it", which in my view (Bozarth, 1992), has been a major factor in the misunderstanding of the approach in spite of Rogers' great contribution to "...how to do it." Referring to groups, Rogers (Baldwin, 1987) states that:

...you have to surrender yourself to a process of which you are a part and admit you can't have a complete understanding. And then when you get to dealing with a group of 500 or 600, you surrender any hope of understanding what is going on and, yet, by surrendering yourself to the process, certain things happen. (p. 50)

(continued on page 4)

*Designated Facilitators continued***AXIOM 3: INDIVIDUALS MOVE TOWARD THE BEST GROWTH MODE AVAILABLE TO THEM THROUGH THEIR OWN BEST PROCESS.**

This axiom has direct implications to the idea that each individual has his/her own growth mode and process that is most likely not related to the facilitator's ideas about what should be done for the person to grow. The primary factor is that the individuals have the freedom to find this mode and process. The importance of the intention of the facilitator to not direct is more important than even Merry's & Lusty's (1993) representative and reasonably innocuous comment that person-centered facilitators are inclined to take a back seat role in focusing on particular issues but "...are more concerned mostly with ensuring that all participants are fully heard" (p. 93). From my perspective, the trust of individuals and of the group does not necessitate that anyone take care of any one else in a systematic and predetermined way. When there is an intention to "...provide a safety net..." or ensure individuals of "air time", there is a violation of the basic principle of trusting the actualizing tendency. Again, Merry and Lusty provide an accurate summary of Rogers' observations of patterns of development in encounter groups. They have, following Rogers' lead, focused on general observations rather than individual differences for the purpose of explanation. The problem, in my

opinion, comes when these observations begin to be presuppositions and/or criteria for a "good" group.

AXIOM 4: THE INFUSION OF ONE'S SELF INTO THE GROUP AS A GENUINE PERSONA AND GROUP MEMBER HELPS TO FACILITATE THE GROUP.

The theme remains the same with this axiom. Everyone being themselves as best as they can facilitates the process. The expectations (internal and external) for the facilitator may often inhibit this happening. Mearns refers to this idea when he suggests that it is important for trainees in unstructured large groups to become congruent rather than to attempt to "portray" the helping attitudes of facilitators.

AXIOM 5: THERE IS NO PRESUPPOSITION OF WHAT PEOPLE WILL BE LIKE, OR DO, OR BECOME DURING OR AFTER THE GROUP EXPERIENCE.

This axiom has direct implication for the facilitator since the idea of a designated facilitator often supposes that the group has certain needs and should go in knowable directions. In addition, it suggests that it is not necessarily any better for group members to talk about themselves, or talk at all, or stay in the room, or attend to the group, or play the tag game, "kick the can."

(to be continued in the next issue of Renaissance)

RESPONSE TO JEROLD BOZARTH'S ARTICLE "DESIGNATED FACILITATORS IN PERSON-CENTERED COMMUNITY GROUPS: UNNECESSARY AND INSUFFICIENT"

CHAPTER 3

By Ken Newton

The appropriateness of Warm Springs for our continuing person-centered workshops does seem, to me, to be quite apparent. That is the location that Franklin D. Roosevelt (who was possibly the most inventive leader that our country has had) utilized for his personal rejuvenation. His goal for us seemed to be to provide the best growth climate for all of us. His "creations" whether they were TVA, WPA, CCC, etc. were attempts to develop an environment for our most/highest potential.

From my own experiences, of me and of individuals and of groups of individuals, I seem to have reached a place different from Jerold. My faith in, dependence upon, growth from relationships seems to me, undeniable. I would at times, like to believe that I became "I" all by myself. However I cannot get there. The other is always primary to me; AND,

grandiostically (is this a word?) I know that I am primary for the other. To quote Buber (from Maurice Friedman) I want to be a change for everyone I meet AND I want to be changed also.

To paraphrase Yalom (and Natiello). It is the relationship that heals, changes and produces growth.

While I find it impossible to "honestly" differ with some one else's interpretation of what she/he experienced I do get uncomfortable when that person can so **definitely state "what happened"** and then answer very affirmatively that the "general answer" is "**to be free to be themselves.**" And for me the question is how is it that people are free to be themselves. The answer again for me is in/through relationship with another.

(continued on page 5)

A Response to Jerold Bozarth's Article continued

At one point Jerold states "considerable dissatisfaction was expressed during the 1995 workshop when I did not go to the community meeting one day. — The concerned group met for the entire night and the next day and had changed their view of having had a very positive workshop experience."

This may be subject to many varying interpretations and assumptions. From "setting up" such an "experience" for a group of unsuspecting participants to letting people alone to fend for themselves.

I will admit I agree that if I bring together many (how many I don't know) intelligent, learned, well motivated people of like (similar) minds they will usually produce something. AND usually be satisfied — even enthusiastic about what they have produced.

If this group is made up of not so learned persons/or learned on another subject matter, who are at this gathering with their own agenda the result will likely be quite different.

Cruel, "ego-centered", selfish, uncaring people do exist. Many come to workshops with many "hidden agenda." — Usually to make their own agenda primary to the groups, whatever the agenda is there. We want to prove something for ourselves — we want others to approve of what we want to prove.

In Jerold's revision of the several axioms he presents, I truly attempt not to be sarcastic or demeaning as I agree that I want "to perpetuate the nature and destiny of humans —". We are becoming more God-like with the ability to decide on Life and on Death. AND to be God-like we need to learn a great deal and to make choices — **for ourselves and for others**. We have no other alternatives — these choices will consist of times when I know and times when I want others to know. Denying that I know may or may not enable the other to eventually know. Denying I know can result in no one knowing or making an inferior or immoral or inhuman response which lacks in positive human growth.

Silent, empathic acceptance does not get the job done. If someone remains non-verbal, or smiles, or frowns or does not show up the next time I am where we have committed ourselves to be I am free to make whatever interpretation of that behavior that my "organic self" decides.

When I hear "best" I immediately ask myself "Best for what?" This is such a strong statement for individual rights, I find it scary. The direction of human growth (I believe) is for **mutual** concern and caring. While I could say that you won't kill me **many** times; that once your "best growth mode" appears I will be safe, I'll be OK. Of course, by that time I'll be dead — you will have grown — and I will be elsewhere.

Learning by imitation is extremely impossible to avoid. Whether I am imitating you or me. Whether I am "portraying"

what I think I should do or what I think I saw someone else do. If I already knew my way around a laboratory, or computer, or courtroom, I would not have to initiate or portray. In learning any activity (mental or physical or spiritual) I have experienced some type of behavior. How I perform that behavior is dependent on many variables — only one of which is to be free to do what I want to do because it is my best way of being.

I will have to admit that I agree with Martin Buber "I want to change everyone I come into contact with." Or at least everyone I have a relationship with. AND Buber goes on to state that the other is invited, expected to change me also.

(to be continued in the next issue of Renaissance)

Advertising of ADPCA

In Tampa, a decision was made to advertise ADPCA membership and conference information. A budget of \$1,500.00 was allocated to me to do this on behalf of the Association membership. A one half page ad membership ad was placed in the JHP, as was a conference announcement in the bulletin board section. Ads were also placed in the APA Monitor. The total bill for these ads came to \$679.20. In the next few weeks I will be placing membership ads in American Counseling Association publications, and will send the balance of the \$1,500.00 back to Julia Rabin. I will pass on information to ADPCA 1997 organizers, Bruce and Yoko should they wish to use the balance to advertise the Las Vegas Meeting. It's difficult to say whether the ads were "worth it." I responded to approximately a dozen calls/e-mails, some of whom attended Kutztown and/or are now members. The ACA ads will probably yield greater response.

Jo Cohen

A Sense of Community (Barbara Hunter) continued

identified with me, and, in expressing my thanks for her empathy, I began to cry! Recognizing instantly how deprived of such understanding I'd felt earlier, I asked gently if she would mind telling me why she hadn't said anything in the meeting. She graciously answered and what she said made perfect sense.

At that point I was aware that I clearly had some painful feelings that needed my attention, although I had only a vague sense of what they were; the understanding woman was, however, not available to help me just then. Two other members of the community were talking nearby. I excused myself, mentioned to them that I was in some pain, and asked if I could talk with them. They agreed.

As we spoke, it became clear that I had felt emotionally abandoned at the meeting, the reason I was feeling such pain. They, too, were perfectly willing to explain to me why — although both of them had also understood my comment in the meeting — they had not expressed this then; their explanations, too, made sense to me. So: THREE people at the meeting had understood me accurately and not conveyed this for three perfectly understandable ('I woulda done the same if it'd been me') reasons! I hadn't been abandoned by them. And, I saw, if I'd felt abandoned by the community when three members of it hadn't abandoned me, then this might have been a misperception of others as well — maybe a whole big bunch of others.

Once I had this understanding — in addition to the empathy and support of the two people helping me — I felt much better, very relieved, and very grateful and close to my two helpers as we said good night and hugged each other (at my request). The next day, Saturday, as I wended my way to breakfast, I was overcome by an unexpected sense of serenity, peacefulness, and calmness. I remember being amazed to find myself thinking, 'This really is a community! People really care about one another!' Next, I remember puzzling about where that thought was coming from, since it had not been the community, but rather three individuals who had comforted me.

The answer seemed to jump up: they *were* individuals, individuals who were members of the community. "The community" had indeed comforted me — just not the *whole* community and not at a meeting. I thought, "So that's what a 'sense of community' means"; I had never 'gotten it' before. It felt as if I'd been initiated into a brand new (for me) sphere of human experience — one that almost everyone had already 'gotten'. No ritual, no public display, just a very private, very quiet initiation that was nevertheless of truly historic proportions for me.

Next, still going to breakfast (the thinking proceeding, of course, much faster than this recounting), I realized that I was feeling completely, positively, and inexorably a part of that

community. I had an irrefutable, palpable sense of belonging, a sense for which I'd been longing ever since my realization — some years earlier — that I lacked such a sense. I had been my absolutely totally authentic self with a group of 100 people and I had an absolutely undeniable sense of belonging among them! It seemed a miracle.

And, while I realized I had been present for myself and had the help of others who were similarly present for me, it suddenly felt incredibly easy. And natural. As if the sense had been there all the time, mine for the...for the what? The taking?? The asking?? The recognition?? What? What had obstructed my experiencing this wonderfully comforting sensation all the previous decades of my life? The answer to this was obvious: I 'simply' had to take the risk of trusting, trusting some others (not only close friends) enough to be my true self with them, too. Clearly, this isn't really 'simple' and yet, I could see and can say now: what really is more simple than being oneself?

Sometimes, when I get new awarenesses, and maybe more so with joyful ones, I lose the initial sense of excitement in a matter of hours. This is apparently what happened when, many hours later, I tried to describe in the community meeting all that had happened for me early that morning. So it was with a bit of a start, mixed with deep gratitude, that I heard another member of the community ask, after I finished speaking, if he had heard correctly — that this was the first time in my life I'd ever felt a sense of belonging.

As I answered yes, along with my gratitude that he had not gone along with my burying this marvelous new experience, I also felt some embarrassment. I assumed — partly, but not entirely, from the question — that it was most unusual to have lived to middle age without ever having had this sense, probably essential to being comfortable in human form. I was so glad he agreed to my giving him a hug after the meeting.

When Sunday, the last full day of the 1996 meeting, arrived, I was pleasantly aware of having received many gifts from this year's meeting. Many people, including many I didn't know, had approached me at various times throughout the weekend sharing with me again and again positive and affirming responses to my shares. Just what I said I'd hoped for at this year's first community meeting! And all just for being myself: amazing. I guess I felt that I'd gone through all the changes I would this time around, but I was wrong.

One additional but hardly surprising thing I realized that (Sunday) morning was that what I'd been afraid of in the Thursday and Friday night community meetings was being abandoned — the feeling which triggered my tears at the woman's expression of empathy following the Friday meeting. On Sunday morning it occurred to me that not only had the

(continued on page 7)

A Sense of Community (Barbara Hunter) continued

community not abandoned me (despite my perceiving it as having done so due to getting essentially no response to my request in the community meeting); it couldn't possibly abandon me: I was a part of it. It could no more abandon me than I could abandon one of my toes. It wouldn't be the same community without me any more than I'd be the same if I lost one of my toes.

I'm not sure everyone will agree with this, but, regardless, that was and continues to be my opinion. It was (and is) so comforting and reassuring. It leaves me feeling so safe(!). Will this feeling of safety continue next year? I say, 'who knows?', 'who cares?' What a transformation in a weekend! What a community!

Never having written anything for *Renaissance* before, I doubt I would have written this either, except for my awareness that so many people seemed to have such a different experience of the community than I did. I know I saw a certain amount of yelling, lack of empathy and seeming lack of unconditional positive regard in more than one community meeting. I saw community members feeling hurt and feeling angry (or maybe feeling hurt and sounding angry). On the other hand, there was also my experience in the community which was not private or secret; while possibly no one knew all the details I've written, some people knew and witnessed much of my experience.

Still I have the impression that those who maintain the position that those community meetings were — or community meetings in general are — either dangerous and/or destructive are somehow overlooking what they heard and knew of my experience. I guess I've written these remarks with the hope in mind of presenting to those with such views that a different one is possible. Mine is different, and I did have the experience of attending every community meeting for the entire length of each as well as having felt very hurt and abandoned following one of them. Although these last few lines have a tone that bothers me, I don't know how to say what I'd like to say differently.

I know I lack understanding of the perception that the community meetings are basically or largely destructive. I know, too, that I will not gain that understanding by writing this. Perhaps that will be possible one day, when I'm more proficient with my computer and can send and receive e-mail. I'm not a correspondent, but if someone wishes to contribute to my understanding by writing *to* me (though I probably won't reply), that would be welcome.

REFERENCES

- 1) Sanford, Ruth (1992). "Purpose and Value of Community in Person-Centered Groups." *Renaissance*, 9:4.
- 2). *Ibid.*, p. 6.

RESPONSE TO "A SENSE OF COMMUNITY..."

By Ken Newton

I feel Barbara's "SENSES" are so valuable I want to add my "understanding" of what Barbara experienced at our last annual meeting in Kutztown, Pennsylvania. "Belonging to a community" is what our annual meetings are all about. It is "one" of our goals, and perhaps our "main" goal.

And it is so important for each individual to examine and reflect upon his or her presumptions regarding her or his role and behavior at the community meetings; in that each of us is responsible for the others who are there as well as for themselves.

However, a "commitment to patience" with the process can so easily result in a *laissez-faire* reaction to our community by the majority of the participants if everyone is following this "patience" and not behaving in such a way that a feeling of acceptance and/or respect is created.

Undoubtedly a very commonly shared feeling with most of us at the community meeting is "fear of being judged, of how will I be looked at, of how I would be seen." And maybe most common of all is that I would be ignored and/or not responded to.

Conversely being attended to, being accepted and respected is the "nurturing and support" I need for my personal growth and development. And this the members of my community can provide me! Although this community is not the ultimate cause of my "fear" the climate it provides at this time can be growthful and changeable for me.

Yes, when another offers me empathic understanding, acceptance in a genuine manner ("she had completely identified with me") I am truly "there," I feel like a valued and valuable person.

And as *three* participants offered Barbara these same reactions to her she felt even more satisfied, more cared for and not ignored or "emotionally abandoned."

Throughout this article Barbara describes very dramatically what the person-centered experience can do for others. These human interpersonal relationships can be/are extremely positive for our personal growth and self esteem.

Thanks, again, Barbara for this very important, personal description of what a person-centered experience can do for our intrapersonal development.