THE ROLE OF THE SELF-CONCEPT IN CARL ROGERS' THEORY OF PERSONALITY.

Thesis written in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Leonard J. Grant MacDonald,

St. Mary's School of Education,
April 15, 1965.

PREFACE

Modern psychology is third-person orientated. Its hypotheses and theories are developed from the viewpoint of an observer and formulated in objective terms. For example, the client may be repressing his subconscious impulses; the id of this brutish criminal may be dominating his behavior; or this woman's behavior may be explained in terms of her death wish. In all cases the man, woman, or child is taken as an object to be explained in terms of his id, ego, and superego, or his collection of traits, or by another theory of human nature. The common element in the popular psychological theories is the method of describing the subject in theoretical terms used by the trained observer and the assumption that what the subject has to say about himself is significant only if it can be interpreted in such terms. Since theory is designed to work in the above manner, there is nothing improper about the application of objective terminology to explain an individual human subject.

In contrast the individual does not describe himself in the objective terms of a disinterested scientific theory. Indeed, in his subjective world, the whole perception of the experience is often entirely different from that seen by an

objective observer. Instead of being deceitful and untruthful, he sees himself as a clever man whom no one can put a thing over on; instead of being cruel or spiteful to his children, he is firm for their own good; instead of being unsuccessful because of lack of energetic ambition and intelligent effort, he is a poor unfortunate dogged by bad luck. From the above observation about people, I found it an easy step to realize that each person has a self-concept. To imagine that an individual could think himself to be a person with certain feelings, a, b, and c, and behaviors, x, y, and z, and not seek to act in conformity with this self-concept seems foreign to human nature. To what extent is the self-concept effective in forming and influencing human behavior? That other factors influence human beings is abundantly clear from the work of psychologists, but nevertheless the self-concept would seem large enough to cover their activities as well. Couldn't physiological drives become part of the self-concept for example?

Having turned my interest to the self-concept, I chose the work of Carl Rogers as the subject of my thesis because the self-concept plays a central role in his theories of therapy and personality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the self-concept as Carl Rogers has conceived it to be. Before one attempts any consideration of the self-concept, the man whose works and thoughts are to be the flesh and bones of this study most certainly is worthy of some attention. Just who is he? What significance does his work have? These questions indicate how pertinent a consideration of Carl Rogers is to a study of his work on the self-concept.

In his book, On Becoming a Person, which he had published in 1961 Carl Rogers states of himself, "Though it shocks me somewhat to say so, I have been a psycho-therapist (or personal counselor) for more than thirty-three years."[1] By this single statement Carl Rogers has revealed the most significant influence on his thought. Out of his experience as a psychotherapist, he has shaped the theories and hypotheses of client-centered therapy. He states that, "Experience is, for me, the highest authority . . . . It is to experience that I must return again and again, to discover a closer approximation to truth as it is in the process of becoming in me."[2]

From his clinical experience and his research, Rogers

has formulated theories and hypotheses on human personality, the therapy of clients, and the teaching of students. He evaluates the position his work occupies at the present time;

> This is a search for a suitable audience for what I have to say . . . . I know that I speak to only a fraction of psychologists. The majority - their interests suggested by such terms as stimulus-response, learning theory, operant conditioning - are so committed to seeing the individual solely as an object, that what I have to say often baffles if it does not annoy them. I also know that I speak to but a fraction of psychiatrists. For many, perhaps most of them, the truth about psychotherapy has already been voiced long ago by Freud, and they are uninterested in new possibilities, and uninterested in or antagonistic to research in this field. I also know that I speak to but a portion of the divergent group which call themselves counselors. The bulk of this group are primarily interested in predictive tests and measurements, and in methods of guidance.[3]

Just who is Rogers' audience? To whom does he speak? He states that:

> though the group to which this book speaks meaningfully will, I believe, come from many disciplines, and have many wide-ranging interests, a common thread may well be their concern about the person and his becoming, in a modern world which appears intent upon ignoring or diminishing him.[4]

A short survey of the career of this somewhat embattled figure will serve to acquaint the reader with the influences that have shaped his professional life and indicate his stature among modern American psychologists.

Upon finishing his graduate studies, Mr. Rogers served an internship at the Institute for Child Guidance, while he completed his doctorate at Teachers College, Columbia University. He then accepted a position as psychologist in the Child Study Department of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, in Rochester, New York. He spent twelve years in

Rochester and in that time became the Director of the Rochester Guidance Center. Out of his work experience, he began to formulate his own views on therapy. In 1939 he published his first book, Clinical Treatment of The Problem Child. He accepted the offer of a full professorship at Ohio State University in 1940. From 1945 to 1957 he served as a professor of psychology at the University of Chicago. He became the Executive Secretary of the Counseling Center at the University of Chicago, and while he was there participated in a five year research project sponsored by the Rockefeller Institute. In 1954 he was the co-editor, with Rosalind Dymond, of a report on this research project, entitled Psycho-Therapy and Personality Change. In 1957 he joined the staff of the University of Wisconsin. He is presently working with the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute in California.

The American Psychological Association indicated the professional stature he had achieved among his fellow psychologists when it honored him in 1956. The association has awarded each year since 1956 three Distinguished Scientific Contribution Awards. His fellow psychologists presented one of the first three awards to Carl R. Rogers.

The thesis begins its study of the role of the self-concept in Carl Rogers' theory of personality by examining how he became interested in the self-concept and how he built up his present formulation. Next we examine the research on which the theory of personality is based.

Since the individual's personality begins to form when he is an infant we examine the characteristics which make him an integrated being capable of responding to his perceptions of reality as a gestalt. Next we examine the formation of the self-concept and the development of the need for positive regard from himself and from other significant people. The above factors make possible the incorporation of conditions of worth which destroy the integrity of the newborn infant's behavior by denying awareness to a portion of the child's personal field of experience. We see how he begins to pursue defensive behavior because he is vulnerable to the incongruence between his self-concept and his experience. We examine how psychotic breakdown occurs when the difference between these two is great and some event occurs with such obviousness that the defenses of the individual crumble and he becomes conscious of his repressed experiences. We see how parents, in attempt to make their children better, may unwittingly set them upon a path which leads to destruction of their self-esteem, of the integrity of their personality structure, and of their dignity as human beings. They turn their child into a pathetic creature who must hide from his own self-experiences and who threatens to go insane when undeniable evidence that he is the person he fears to be confronts him. Fortunately not every child who begins this path reaches the logical end, for many adolescents and adults do find the courage to be themselves. We examine how the process of defensive behavior can be reversed and the individual become

more fully functioning. We look at the characteristics of a full functioning person and conclude with observations from this theory which seem pertinent to the classroom teacher.

CHAPTER II

THE SELF-CONCEPT IN A CLIENT-CENTERED THEORY OF PERSONALITY

The client has always remained Carl Rogers' primary interest. He writes:

> The persistent influences . . . is the continuing clinical experiences with individuals who perceive themselves, or are perceived by others to be, in need of personal help. Since 1928, for a period now approaching thirty years, I have spent probably an average of 15 to 20 hr [sic] per week, except during vacation periods, in endeavoring to understand and be of therapeutic help to these individuals. To me, they seem to be the major stimulus to my psychological thinking. From these hours, and from my relationships with these people, I have drawn most of whatever insight I possess into the meaning of therapy, the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, and the structure and functioning of personality.[5]

He is closely associated with the development of the theory of client-centered therapy. He writes, "...although the client-centered orientation has become very much of a group enterprise in every respect, I, as an individual, carry a considerable responsibility for its initiation and for the beginning formulation of its theories."[6]

Since Rogers' theory of personality has grown directly from his field of experience, this thesis will begin its study of the self-concept with a consideration of its role. Such procedure is desirable because:

> A slight error in a theory may make little difference in providing an explanation of the observed facts out

> of which the theory grew. But when the theory is projected to explain more remote phenomena, the error may be magnified, and the inferences from the theory may be completely false . . . . Thus every theory deserves the greatest respect in the area from which it was drawn from the facts and a decreasing degree of respect as it makes predictions in areas more and more remote from its origin. This is true of the theories developed by our own group.[7]

The Development of the Theory of the Self-concept

Men have always looked to the past as a means of understanding the present. Carl Rogers' construct, the self-concept, has a history of development behind it. The offspring of men's minds require much labor before they may take their place in the sun because men are not gods that their ideas should spring full grown and perfect in detail in one tremendous moment of creation. No, the struggle toward creative thought leaves its traces which others may study.

Carl Rogers at the beginning of his career, thought that the "self" was not a fit subject for scientific psychology; that it belonged to the bygone era of the introspectionists. Gradually the recognition forced itself on him that when he permitted his clients to express their attitudes and ideas in their own terms, they tended to talk in terms of the self.

> Characteristic expressions were attitudes such as these: "I feel I'm not being my real self." "I wonder who I am, really." "I wouldn't want anyone to know the real me." "I never had a chance to be myself." "It feels good to let myself go and just <u>be</u> myself here." "I think if I chip off all the plaster facade I've got a

> pretty solid self - a good substantial brick building, underneath.[8]

Scientific ideals or no scientific ideals, his clients persisted in being self-orientated. Obviously the self had existence in their minds.

Carl Rogers' clinical experience led him to formulate his theory of client-centered therapy. At first he had only his clinical experiences to support his theories; gradually research projects were designed which strengthened the foundation on which his theory stood. These research projects also enriched and elaborated Rogers' understanding of the changes which occur in the self-concept during therapy. Clinical experience contributed further insights into its nature.

It became evident to Rogers that the self-concept was a gestalt; a configuration in which the change of one tiny aspect can completely alter the whole pattern:

> . . . it was not at all uncommon to find violent fluctuation in the concept of the self. A client during a given interview, would come to experience himself quite positively. He felt he was worthwhile, that he could meet life with the capacities he possessed, and that he was experiencing a quiet confidence. Three days later he might return with a completely reversed conception of himself. The same evidence now proved an opposite point. The positive new choice he had made now was an instance of silly immaturity; the valid feelings courageously expressed to his colleagues now were clearly inadequate. Often such a client could date, to the moment, the point at which, following some very minor incident, the balance was upset, and his picture of himself had undergone a complete flip-flop. During the interview it might as suddenly reverse itself again.[9]

Clinical experience also indicated that the self-concept was the criterion by which awareness was granted or denied

to experience. The theory which explains repression of experience as an attempt to escape forbidden or socially taboo experiences is clearly inadequate. Often the most deeply denied impulses and feelings are positively valued by society - such as love, tenderness, or confidence in self. Rogers found that experiences which would tend to contradict the existing self-concept are distorted or otherwise denied to awareness. By these devices the organism manages to maintain the self-concept against threat; the self-concept certainly is threatened because it must change if this experience is accepted in awareness. This screening-out process may be explained also in terms of perception. An individual will perceive objects according to his mental set; in a similar way experiences are also determined and modified. Clearly the self-concept largely determines what shall enter awareness.

Drawing together both what he has learned from clinical experience and what research has revealed about the self-concept, Carl Rogers defines the self, the concept of self, and the self-structure:

> These terms refer to the organized, consistent conceptual gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the "I" or "me" and the perceptions of the relationships of the "I" and "me" to others and to various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions. It is a gestalt which is available to awareness though not necessarily in awareness. It is a fluid and changing gestalt, a process, but at any given moment it is a specific entity which is at least partially definable in operational terms by means of a Q sort or other instrument or measure. The term self or self-concept is more likely to be used when we are talking of the person's view of himself, self-structure when we are looking at this gestalt from an external frame of reference.[10]

Research on the Self-concept

Since we know that Carl Rogers' work has won him the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award, it should be no surprise that he did not abandon scientific methodology when he began to consider the self-concept of his clients. However, the self is the most subjective of subjects while scientific research demands objective observation. The problem facing Rogers may be stated this way: how can one be objective about a subjective experience? At first glance the problem seems insurmountable; the self should be dismissed from scientific study as an impossible subject that can not be measured by existing research tools. Carl Rogers did not discourage so easily.

Carl Rogers' client-centered theory has had great success in stimulating research into changes that occur in therapy. In 1940 no research had been done on recorded therapy sessions nor any attempt made to study the changes that occur in the subject during therapy. In 1953 nearly fifty research projects based on client-centered therapy had been completed. Five years later 122 client-centered research and theory constructions were completed. Beyond question, the theory and practical use of client-centered therapy has encouraged a number of objective investigations. Why should this be?

The theory of client-centered therapy has encouraged research because the theory has never been viewed as dogma

or truth, but rather as a statement of hypotheses whose purpose was to advance knowledge of psycho-therapy. Rogers held that each hypothesis should be held up to research and testing in order to separate it from prejudice and wishful thinking. He supports the type of research in which another investigator, who collects the data in the same way and performs the same operations, will reach the same conclusions on similar findings. Rogers encourages the application of such research to his own hypotheses.

Research was also encouraged because Rogers and other supporters of client-centered therapy held that the essence of the scientific method is its movement from crude observations of experience to more sophisticated laboratory techniques, more exact measurements, more definite and securely based theories and hypotheses, and eventually toward more general and exact findings. All sciences have a natural history of development; some are further along the road to maturity than others. Nevertheless, all are sciences despite their differences if they share the common direction of science. Research workers in the field of psycho-therapy were encouraged to make a beginning with crude instruments designed to test their tentative hypotheses. Gradually they have produced instruments of increasing refinement, capable of measuring with finer accuracy the self-concept and the changes which occur in the person during therapy.

A third factor which encouraged research is Rogers'

policy of formulating his theory in terms of constructs which can be operationally defined. For example, he defines the self-concept as limited to awareness because there is no way of knowing its various unconscious elements. Consequently a definition, according to Rogers, is operational when it can be practically tested by research. It can moreover be studied by various tools of research of which the Q-sort is the more refined. All the constructs of Rogers' theory yield readily to verification because they were formulated with the needs of research in mind. Any unconscious elements in a person's self-concept, if there are any, were struck from the definition as being operationally undefinable. Such a procedure is tailor-made for research because the self-concept is totally available to the client's awareness though not necessarily in his actual consciousness and this knowledge may be communicated to the researcher with the help of suitable research instruments.

The use of operationally definable terms has made possible suitable criteria for research into therapy. Using the constructs of client-centered therapy, researchers make specific predictions and then attempt to confirm or disprove their prediction. Such procedure avoids value judgments about behavior and what changes in therapy can be considered "success" or "failure", "good" or "bad". By establishing a suitable criterion, Rogers has eliminated one of the major barriers to progress in research concerning

the changes which occur in a client during therapy.[11]

From the beginning of his research into psycho-therapy, Carl Rogers has worked as part of a group. The contributions of his fellow researchers have influenced his theories. In addition, every researcher who completes a research project on psycho-therapy may either confirm a hypothesis or challenge its validity. A paper on Carl Rogers' theory may deal only with Carl Rogers; however, when a study turns to his research it must expand its scope to include research on aspects of the client-centered orientation because to Carl Rogers, or to any scientist, all research in his field must become "his" research or his work will lose its scientific orientation.

In 1940 at Ohio State University, a group which included Carl Rogers, recorded a complete therapeutic interview. The latter's study of the self-concept had begun. A mass of recorded data had to be reduced to elements which could be handled objectively. The client's statements were organized into crude categories of self-referent attitudes which possessed a sufficient degree of reliability to be useful as scientific constructs. The researchers had several workers use the categories to classify self-referent attitudes and the degree to which they agreed in their placement of attitudes in the categories, determined the degree of reliability. This research and similar projects confirmed that changes occurred in self-referent attitudes during therapy as the researchers had hypothesized they would.

Carl Rogers describes a project which illustrates the procedures used in early psycho-therapy research and makes some personal comments on the subject. In 1949, N. J. Raskin completed a study on the sources of values in clients who undergo therapy. He wished to establish whether the degree to which a client's values and standards depend on the judgments and expectations of others become less under counseling and whether he increases the extent to which his values and standards depend on his own experience.

In order to make his study objective Ruskin set out to establish first that values and standards could be discriminated. He asked three judges to select independently of each other from the self-referent statements of several recorded therapy interviews the portions which indicate the client's source of values and standards. He found more than eighty per cent agreement among the selections. He concluded that he was dealing with a discernable construct.

Before he could proceed Ruskin had to devise an instrument which would measure the locus of evaluation in his research subjects. He selected twenty-two of the previously selected statements, being careful to secure a wide range of sources of values in the choice, and then gave the data to twenty judges. He asked the latter to place the statements in four piles. From the results Ruskin used the twelve items which were rated most consistently to form and illustrate a scale of locus of evaluation. The steps of the scale had values from 1.0 to 4.0. The first step was complete dependence

on the evaluations made by others. Step two included statements in which the subject was principally concerned with the opinions of others but seemed somewhat dissatisfied with the result. Step three on Ruskin's scale was reserved for statements which showed that the client depended as much on himself as upon the opinions of others. These conclusions show that the subject was aware of the distinction between self-evaluation and dependence on the opinion of others. Step four was used only for self-referent statements which contained clear evidence that the basic source of values was the subject's own experience and judgement.

Ruskin now applied the scale which he had devised to fifty-nine interviews in ten fully recorded cases which had already been used in other research. Before analyzing his ratings he demonstrated the reliability of his judgements by selecting at random one item associated with the locus of values from each of the fifty-nine interviews. A judge who knew nothing of the source of these statements rated each. The correlation between these items was .91 which is a satisfactory degree of reliability.

Ruskin now tried to establish whether there had been any change in the locus of evaluation during therapy. He found that the average score for the first interviews was 1.97 on his scale and for the final interview the score was 2.73. A significant degree of change had occurred. Since these ten cases had been studied before, Ruskin knew

which cases had been considered the more successful. He found that for these cases the average score of the first interviews was 2.12 and the final average score was 3.34. The shift in the five more successful cases is greater than in the other cases. The project upheld the theory of client-centered therapy on locus of evaluation.

Ruskin's study is typical of a large number of research projects in that it starts with one of the hypotheses of client-centered therapy, and devises an instrument to measure varying degree of the construct; the instrument is then tested to establish if it does measure what it claims to, and whether any qualified person can secure the same result if he uses it. The researcher then applies the instrument to the data of therapy in a manner which he demonstrates is unbiased. The data which the instrument has provided is then analyzed to see whether it supports or contradicts the hypothesis with which the project is concerned.

Rogers tells us that though the number of studies was small and the period of therapy was brief, there were no other major flaws in this study. Consequently the study is more satisfactory than the crude early studies but falls short of the standard of the carefully designed recent studies.[12]

From 1950 to 1954 Carl Rogers and his fellow researchers carried out a massive research project at the University of Chicago. It consisted of thirteen completed studies on a group of twenty-nine clients. The project was a

milestone in psycho-therapy research because of its criterion, its design, and the degree of progress it made in objectively measuring subjective phenomena.

How the use of operationally definable hypotheses based on client-centered therapy provide a more suitable criterion for psycho-therapy research has been explained: the researcher has only to confirm or reject his hypothesis by using a suitable research tool.

Since this particular research project has revealed much about the self-concept, it deserves closer study. Carl Rogers tells us that the research design itself was an important factor in its success. The project sought to gain objective knowledge about the process and end result of one particular form of psycho-therapy, namely the client-centered method. The research workers planned to determine more precisely what measurable changes accompany a period of client-centered counseling.

To achieve this purpose, a series of objective research instruments were selected which measured various characteristics of a group of clients. This battery of testing instruments was applied to the subjects before therapy, after the completion of therapy, and at a follow-up period from six months to a year later. The subjects were typical clients who came to the Counseling Center of the University of Chicago. The research planners decided to collect all data including the complete recorded interviews for twenty-five clients. They planned to make an extensive study of

a moderately sized group rather than perform a superficial analysis on a much larger group.

The researchers set up controls to establish that the changes which they were measuring actually occurred because of therapy. A control group was selected from the research-clients and the latter were tested sixty days before their therapy sessions began. They were re-tested immediately before therapy and the two sets of testing data were correlated to determine if changes occurred during the waiting period. This procedure checked the possibility that changes could occur because of a client's motivation for therapy or because a client had a certain kind of personality structure. If such a change should happen, it should be detected by the research instruments during the waiting period.

Another control group was set up by the research planners as a second safeguard. These people were roughly equivalent to the therapy group in socio-economic status, in the proportion of men and women, in the number of students and non-students. This group was tested at the same time intervals as the research subjects. The workers reasoned that if changes occurred in people as the result of passing time or as a result of repeated testings then such changes should take place in this group. If the changes which took place in the therapy group was greater than in either control group then these changes must be the result of the therapy sessions.[13]

The University of Chicago research project made its progress in measuring subjective phenomena through the use of suitable research tools. The most sophisticated instrument that the researchers developed to measure the self-concept was the Q-sort. It was devised from the Q-technique developed by W. U. Stephenson.[14]

Rogers describes the Q-sort:

> A large "universe" of self-descriptive statements was drawn from recorded interviews and other sources. Some typical statements are: "I am a submissive person"; "I don't trust my emotions"; "I feel relaxed and nothing bothers me"; "I am afraid of sex"; "I usually like people"; "I have an attractive personality"; "I am afraid of what other people think of me". A random sample of one hundred of these, edited for clarity, was used as the instrument. Theoretically we now had a sampling of all the ways in which an individual could perceive himself. These hundred statements, each printed on a card, were given to the client. He was asked to sort the cards to represent himself "as of now", sorting the cards into nine piles from those items most characteristic of himself to those least characteristic. He was told to place a certain number of items in each pile so as to give an approximately normal distribution of the items. The client sorted the cards in this way at each of the major points, before therapy, after, and at the follow up point, and also on several occasions during therapy. Each time that he sorted the cards to picture himself he was also asked to sort them to represent the self he would like to be, his ideal self.
>
> We thus had detailed and objective representations of the client's self-perception at various points, and his perception of his ideal self. These various sortings were then inter-correlated, a high correlation between two sortings indicating similarity or lack of changes, a low correlation indicating a dissimilarity, or a marked degree of change.[15]

The high standard of research demanded by Carl Rogers and the techniques developed under his direction have furthered our knowledge of the self-concept enormously. A theory that permits subjective phenomena to be defined with a view to research conditions, to suitable instruments for

measurement, to research designs, and statistical methods, all have combined to raise the level of psycho-therapy research to standards comparable to the most demanding scientific investigations.

Preliminary Constructs of Rogers' Theory of Personality

Carl Rogers' theory about the self-concept is developed from several postulates about human personality. Without an understanding of these basic suppositions, Carl Rogers' ideas would be removed from their context.

Perception of experience. - By experience Rogers means all that is contained in the organism at any given moment which is at least potentially available to awareness. The field of experience is limited to the present moment because this serves to make an operational definition possible. Synonyms for experience are "experiential field" and "phenomenal field"; he also uses the terms "sensory and visceral experiences" and "organic experiences" in an attempt to clarify this concept. The crucial point of the definition locates experience in the individual rather than outside himself. Rogers admits that outside events are perceived by people but he does not extend his definition of experience to include any reality outside the individual. He justifies his definition by pointing out that the perceived reality is always the effective influence on behaviour; the individual acts on what he perceives to be real rather

than on any objective knowledge of the subject of perception. The individual thinks that his perception of reality is accurate. He says, "this is an ashtray"; but if he should doubt the accuracy of his perception, his statement will change to, "this looks like an ashtray", which he thinks is more accurate. In either case he will react to it in terms of his perception. When Rogers states that an infant's reality is his "experience", he means that the infant makes no distinction between his perceptions and reality; his perceptions are reality, and he reacts in terms of his perceptions. A small baby who cries when a stranger tries to make friends clearly illustrates this point. The infant's reaction is based on his subjective perception of a frightening experience rather than the objective reality of a friendly stranger who has just picked him up.[16]

Carl Rogers' definition of experience limits it to a meaning which will help understand his work; in no way does he intend to deny the truth of other possible definitions. He admits that outside stimuli affect the individual's perception but he is much more interested in the fact that behavior is a response to the perception of stimuli rather than a response to the stimuli themselves. Often a high degree of correspondence between perception and reality exist but not always so. In cases where a discrepancy between perception and reality itself exist, since all a person knows of reality is his perception of it, he will

act in terms of his subjective perception because he knows nothing else. Reality is at that moment, for him, his perception of it; on the other hand, objective experience may in the future change this perception. An individual's perceptions are modified by evidence from an objective reality, but any action of the individual is taken in terms of his present subjective perception.

From the various ways of understanding experience, Rogers has chosen a limited meaning because it fits the context of his theory. He does not deny other definitions; rather, he tries to show the special sense in which his theory explains experience, and its significance for client-centered therapy. The reader should keep in mind Carl Rogers' restricted sense of the term otherwise there will be danger of misunderstanding client-centered theory.

The human infant is the seedbed in which the self takes root and develops. To return to the characteristics which Rogers postulates are to be found in the infant, since the infant's perceptions are his own personal reality, he possesses a greater potential awareness of this subjective cosmos than any other person could have. No other person may assume what Rogers calls his "internal frame of reference".

Awareness. - Rogers means by awareness the symbolization of some of our experience (not necessarily in verbal form) with various degrees of vividness. Symbolization and consciousness are synonymous with awareness.[17]

All the conscious details in the mind are drawn from an individual's field of experience because the latter includes everything contained in the organism and available to the mind. The individual's perceptions of outside reality are also part of experience; they are certainly in the organism and are available to awareness. A valid inference at this point is that the details of consciousness are as accurate in the individual as his corresponding perceptions of reality. Awareness is the portion of his experience which has reached consciousness, the rest of experience remains, at the moment, unavailable to the individual.

Internal frame of reference. - To explain what he means about this term, Rogers writes:

> This is all of the realm of experience which is available to the awareness of the individual at a given moment. It includes the full range of sensations, perceptions, meanings, and memories, which are available to consciousness.
>
> The internal frame of reference is the subjective world of the individual. Only he knows it fully. It can never be known to another except through empathic inference and then can never be perfectly known.[18]

Tendency toward actualization of the organism. - The human infant has a built-in tendency to actualize his organism; to develop his capacities in ways that serve to maintain and enhance his entire being, that is to say, his total organism. Rogers writes:

> This is the inherent tendency of the organism to develop all its capacities in ways which serve to maintain and enhance the organism. It involves not only the tendency to meet what Maslow terms "deficiency needs" for air, food, water, and the like, but also more

> generalized activities. It involves development toward the differentiation of organs and of functions, expansion in terms of growth, expansion of effectiveness through the use of tools, expansion and enhancement through reproduction. It is development toward autonomy and away from heteronomy, or control by external forces.
> . . .
> It should be noted that this basic actualizing tendency is the only motive which is postulated in this theoretical system. It should also be noted that it is the organism as a whole, and only the organism as a whole, which exhibits this tendency. There are no homunculi, no other sources of energy or action in this system. The self, for example, is an important construct in our theory, but the self does not "do" anything. It is only one expression of the general tendency of the organism to behave in those ways which maintain and enhance itself.
> It might also be mentioned that such concepts of motivation as are termed need-reduction, tension-reduction, drive-reduction, are included in this concept. It also includes, however, the growth motivations which appear to go beyond these terms: the seeking of pleasure tensions, the tendency to be creative, the tendency to learn painfully to walk when crawling would meet the same needs more comfortably.[19]

The organism does not tend to actualize itself in a random fashion; on the contrary, its direction is always discernible. Each being moves toward maturation peculiar to its species. Every capacity does not necessarily develop to its fullest degree. Human beings, for example, do not seek to develop their capacity for fear. In all instances, however, organisms do tend to develop differentiation of organs and of function. They expand through growth, through the use of tools, and through reproduction. Self-actualization is one form of this tendency in human beings. The organism liberates itself from control by external forces to an ever increasing degree of autonomy. This direction may be discerned equally well in Man's unconscious organismic functions or his uniquely human intellectual operations. The period of maturation in the human child is in the direction

of socialization. In short, the tendency to actualize moves the infant along into mature adulthood.[20]

Rogers indicates the strength of this innate tendency:

> The whole process may be symbolized and illustrated by the child's learning to walk. The first steps involve struggle, and usually pain. Often it is true that the immediate reward involved in taking a few steps is in no way commensurate with the pain of falls and bumps. The child may, because of the pain, revert to crawling for a time. Yet, in the overwhelming majority of individuals, the forward direction of growth is more powerful than the satisfactions of remaining infantile. The child will actualize himself, in spite of the painful experiences in so doing. In the same way he will become independent, responsible, self-governing, socialized, in spite of the pain which is often involved in these steps. Even where he does not, because of a variety of circumstances exhibit growth of these more complex sorts, one may still rely on the fact that the tendency is present. Given the opportunity for clear-cut choice between forward-moving or regressive behavior, the tendency will operate.
>
> One puzzle that is not adequately solved by this proposition is the question. "Why must the factors of choice be clearly perceived in order for this forward-moving tendency to operate?" It would seem that unless experience is adequately symbolized, unless suitably accurate differentiations are made the individual mistakes regressive behavior for self-enhancing behavior.[21]

The inborn tendency of every being in the material world is to maintain and develop itself. The more complex the creature, the more complex the forms of actualization the organism may pursue. In man the tendency realizes itself through a range of physical, emotional, spiritual, mental, and social developments; his tools, his property and even his self-concept may serve this purpose. Though every individual in a species thus tends toward his own maturation it does not follow that the more complex expressions of the actualization trend proper to the mature human adult always occur. Undoubtedly, the individual is still seeking to actualize himself in the direction of maturity even though

he has chosen an immature form of behavior under the mistaken belief that his choice was truly self-enhancing. Always, when an individual perceives a clear-cut choice between an immature and mature choice of action, he will choose the more mature. Unfortunately perceptions of such clarity are not always available and people frequently choose regressive behavior.

Behavior of the newborn infant. - In his explanation of behavior Rogers combines his concept of experience and awareness with the motivational drive toward actualization. The infant interacts with his perceived reality, according to the dictates of his actualization tendency.

> Behavior is basically the goal-directed attempt of the organism to satisfy its needs as experienced, in the field as perceived.
>
> This proposition becomes somewhat modified in the human organism, as we shall see, by the development of the self. Let us first consider it as it applies to organisms in general, and in the human infant before the self comes to play an important role in the regulation of behavior.
>
> All needs have a basic relatedness, . . . in all that they all spring from and have reference to, the basic tendency to maintain and enhance the organism. These needs occur as physiological tensions which, when experienced, form the basis of behavior which appears functionally (though not consciously) designed to reduce the tension and to maintain and enhance the organism. The need itself is not necessarily consciously experienced; there are seemingly different levels of description. In hunger, for example, stomach contractions occur which ordinarily are not directly experienced. The excitation which is thus set up may be experienced vaguely and below the conscious level, nevertheless bring about behavior which is in the direction of food, or it may be symbolized and perceived on the conscious level as hunger.[22]

Since the needs of the infant are biologically based

and occur as physiological tensions, is one justified to generalize and make the statement that all human needs originate from physiological tensions? Rogers states that:

> the work by Ribble . . . and others would seem to indicate that the need for affection is a physiological need, and that the infant who does not have adequate close physical contact with a mother-person is left in a stage of unsatisfied physiological tension. If this is true of the infant, then it is easy to see how this need, like all the others, becomes elaborated and channelized through cultural conditioning into needs which are only remotely based upon the underlying physiological tension. Much more work needs to be done in this area before we have any deep understanding of this problem. The research to date is poorly planned and poorly controlled.[23]

He stresses the fact that the individual reacts to reality as it exists in his subjective experience. It is in terms of this subjective cosmos, that he seeks to actualize himself, rather than reality itself. The closer his subjective world is to the real world, the more appropriate his reactions will be and therefore more successful; on the other hand the more inaccurate his perceptions are the less satisfactory his reactions become. Rogers writes:

> The reaction is not to reality, but to the perception of reality. A horse, sensing danger, will try to reach the safety and security which he perceives in his stall, even though the barn may be in flames. A man in the desert will struggle just as hard to reach the "lake" which he perceives in a mirage, as to reach a real water hole. At a more complex level, a man may strive for money because he perceives money as the source of emotional security, even though in fact it may not satisfy his need. Often, of course, the perception has a high degree of correspondence with reality, but it is important to recognize that it is the perception, not the reality, which is crucial in determining behavior.[24]

In his theory of motivation and behavior, Carl Rogers places all effective elements of behavior in the present.

> Behavior is not "caused" by something which occurred

> in the past. Present tensions and present needs are the only ones which the organism endeavors to reduce or satisfy. While it is true that past experience has certainly served to modify the meaning which will be perceived in present experiences, yet there is no behavior except to meet a present need.[25]

The organism reacts as an organized whole. - Rogers tells us that whatever the degree of maturity of the organism, it reacts to its field of experience as an organized whole- as a gestalt. He confirms this opinion by several examples such as the following. Animals which have had their posterior lobe removed and who are thus deprived of the mechanism which maintains water balance in the body, increase their water intake and so maintain a satisfactory water balance. A girl who has talked to a therapist for an hour about her feeling toward her mother finds that a persistent asthmatic condition has improved. Another, who feels that his security at work is being threatened develops ulcers. All these can only be explained satisfactorily by the hypothesis that the organism is a totally organized system, in which change in any part produces changes in the total organism.[26]

The organismic valuing process. - The organism places values on its experience in terms of its actualization tendency. Even an infant will value positively experiences which are perceived as maintaining and enhancing the organism and will value negatively experiences which are perceived as a threat to the maintenance and enhancement of the organism.

Obviously since Rogers is talking about infants and a variety of other organisms this valuing process cannot take place on an intellectual plain. Rogers states more precisely what he means:

> This concept describes an ongoing process in which values are never fixed or rigid, but experiences are being accurately symbolized and continually and freshly valued in terms of the satisfactions organismically experienced; the organism experiences satisfaction in those stimuli or behaviors which maintain and enhance the organism and the self, both in the immediate present and in the long range. The actualizing tendency is thus the criterion. The simplest example is the infant who at one moment values food, and when satiated, is disgusted with it; at one moment values stimulation, and soon after, values only rest; who finds satisfying that diet which in the long run most enhances his development.[27]

The infant reacts with adience to experiences he values positively and tries to avoid negatively valued perceptions. The infant uses his organismic valuing system as a guidance system which enables him to satisfy his needs as he experiences them.

The Development of the Self-concept

Before the infant begins to develop his self-concept, Rogers postulates that the infant possesses the following characteristics which it shares in common with other organisms. It perceives its inner experiences as reality; his perception, grasp, understanding or misunderstanding of reality is reality itself for the infant. The infant reacts to subjective experiences, not objective reality. The latter may and does shape and modify subjective experiences but it is the subjective experiences that the infant knows and reacts to.

Just as a man may see himself in a mirror, so an organism knows reality through the subjective experiences which reflect reality. If reality is imperfectly perceived by an individual organism, then its reactions will be correspondingly inappropriate. Rogers does not want to establish how reality is known, but he does wish to establish that each person does know it differently because an individual's reactions are only understandable to the degree that one may experience in himself the other's subjective picture of reality. Each infant has its own internal frame of reference and on this assumption one can come to see reality through his eyes. In each infant is an inherent tendency to actualize himself, to develop to maturity as an adult human. The strength of the tendency to actualize may be gauged from the pain and difficulties the individual is willing to overcome in his pursuit of maturity. According to Rogers, the actualization tendency is the basic motivational force of all life. Every living being seeks to maintain and enhance itself in order to survive. The infant interacts with his perceived reality in terms of his basic actualization drive to preserve and increase his organism. His behavior is goal directed to satisfy experienced needs in the reality he perceives. It is quite possible for the infant to pursue a goal which will harm his organism because he has made a mistake in perceiving reality. Every so often an infant decides that a good drink of gasoline is just what his organism needs to satisfy his thirst; especially since it is available on the back

seat of the car. How much more often do adults pursue goals under the mistaken belief that such goals will satisfy their needs? In his interaction with his perceived reality, the infant acts as an organized whole. He is a gestalt; an organized whole in whom a change in part makes a change in the whole. As in all organisms, an organismic valuing process takes place in the infant. Experiences that he perceives as satisfying or as fulfilling the tendency to maintain and enhance the organism are valued as desirable and the infant behaves with open acceptance and moves toward these experiences. On the other hand, experiences which he perceives as a threat to the maintenance and growth of the organism are valued as undesirable and the organism seeks to avoid such experiences. Every organism is able to satisfy its needs because it is provided with a motivational system, which is its drive to maintain and develop itself, and a regulatory system, which is its organismic valuing process. The valuing process evaluates every experience of the creature. For example, a sparrow evaluates its perceptions as its flies along. Suddenly it perceives a grub which it values positively or desirable because it is hungry and so it behaves with adience toward it; it eats it. When the need for food is satisfied, the sparrow will stop valuing grubs positively and cease eating them. In the same manner the human infant is able to satisfy its needs.[28]

The gestalt nature of the newborn infant's behavior is of basic importance to the theory of personality which

Rogers proposes . The organismic valuing process balances all the needs of the organism as a whole. The entire field of experience is available to the infant in his choice of a course of action, so that his behavior will be completely appropriate to his needs, if his experiences are accurate with reference to reality. The newborn infant is an integrated being in whom all experience is available to consciousness. However the emerging self-concept sets up a process in the infant which destroys the gestalt nature of the human being's behavior by dividing his field of experience and denying consciousness to significant experiences. Rogers' theory is very much concerned with the manner in which the integrity of human behavior is broken.

The self-concept develops as a result of the actualization tendency which is common to all organisms, and which moves each species toward whatever maturation is proper to it. The human infant develops in a different direction from other organisms; it develops into an adult human being. Carl Rogers posits that one direction of the actualization tendency is toward differentiation in the infant which means that one part must become distinguished from another. Even as a child can tell the difference between his hand and his foot so he selects from his total field of experience certain experiences which he can symbolize in consciousness as an awareness of being in existence and of functioning. When the human infant has achieved this awareness, he has departed from

the common path travelled by all other organisms and is experiencing a distinctly human experience. He has achieved self-experience which is the raw material from which the self-concept develops. The portion of the infant's perceived reality which is set aside in consciousness as self-experiences becomes in time symbolized as the self. Conversely any portion of his perceived reality which is not consciously identified as self-experience can not become part of the self-structure. Rogers' whole theory of personality disorders centers upon self-experiences which have not been consciously assimilated into the self-structure because the individual can not consciously admit ownership to himself. Experiences of the organism which are denied awareness are not part of the self, according to Rogers' theory; but they can become part of the self-structure if the individual becomes able to consciously accept them.

The young infant is completely open to his self-experiences at first and he does not reject from consciousness any experiences of himself until he develops certain conditions which make him defensive. And so the young infant begins to form his self-concept by being aware of acting and of existing and through interaction with his environment he is able to elaborate this awareness into his concept of self. The environment is particularly effective in shaping his concepts about himself when it is made up of significant others such as his parents, peers, and teachers. The self-concept becomes a perceptual object in the individual's personal field of

experience and as such part of the personal reality to which he must react. His concepts about himself are as real to him as more concrete realities outside himself. Both have equal claim to reality in his private world of experience.[29]

The self-concept begins to form in the infant as a result of the actualization tendency but several aspects of the child's environment facilitate the differentiation of self-experiences from other experiences of the infant. For example, the physical limits of the body can be distinguished by the senses as separate from the rest of the world. The child can also use his name as an aid to distinguish himself as an individual unit, because this part of his perceived reality can be labeled "John's", while the rest of his experiences can be labeled "not John's". In addition, every time he is held responsible for his actions he is being taught that his actions are his as well. Also when he is told that this is his and this is someone else's, he is being taught to distinguish between himself and others. Such evidence which will compel the child to differentiate himself from his other perceived experiences abound in his daily life.

The Need for Positive Regard

The context of the self-concept is not the totality of self-experiences because some self-experiences are not consciously recognized as part of the self or even admitted to

conscious awareness. To understand how certain experiences can be denied and distorted in awareness, one must begin with an understanding of the need for positive regard.

When an individual achieves self-experience, he develops a need not shared by other organisms; he develops the need for experiencing positive regard for himself from others. The need becomes active between any two people who experience at least minimum psychological contact which Rogers defines as existing in a human relationship when one person makes a perceived, or at least a subceived which means beneath the threshold of perception, difference in the subjective field of the other. All human beings experience the need for positive approval from those people with whom they have formed a relationship.

An individual experiences positive regard when he perceives himself as making a positive difference in the experiential field of another. The feeling includes such attitudes as warmth, sympathy, liking, respect, and acceptance. The satisfaction of this need involves inferences about the experiential field of others and so it is often ambiguous. The individual must infer that he has made a positive as opposed to a negative difference in the subjective world of the other person. The individual may also satisfy his own need for being positively liked by perceiving that he has satisfied another's need for affection. Clearly the effect of the individual's need for positive approval is pervasive and persistent because a wide range of experiences can be associated with the

need for love or for less intense similar human feelings. Behavior is modified and determined by the pursuit of satisfactions for this need. If one perceives an experience to be positively valued by another, one may seek to repeat the experience as a means to win positive approval from the other. For example, a parent may value academic success and the child perceiving the parental attitude may seek such success as a means of winning the positive regard of his parents.

The human child continues to behave as a gestalt; the self-experiences and the interrelationships associated with the approval of another person form an organized whole, a gestalt, which Rogers calls the regard complex. Positive affection shown to a child by a parent for a specific behavior serves not simply to reinforce the behavior pattern but strengthens the whole pattern of love which had previously been perceived as coming from that parent. Rejection, on the other hand, even though it be shown for a specific behavior, serves to weaken the total gestalt of affection associated with that parent.

The strength of the need for love and approval is clearly indicated when one realizes that when it comes to a choice between satisfying the needs of the organism and winning approval from significant social others, such as parents, peers, and teachers the child will seek to satisfy his need for approval.[30]

The Development of the Need for Positive Self-regard

As the child matures, he begins to value his self-experiences for himself by assuming the role of a parent of some other significant adult without the other person being actually present, and in this way he develops the capacity for self-regard. The child experiences approval or rejection associated with his behavior and so he comes to learn that certain forms of self-behavior will win positive approval from his parents and other self-experiences frustrate his need for affection, and by association, the child comes to experience positive feelings toward himself for the same self-experiences which won him expressions of love from his parents. Even as he needs expressions of affection from his parents, now he needs to experience self-love from himself. The child is now capable of experiencing positive or negative attitudes toward his self-experiences independently of the opinions of any other person, and so experiences which the child perceives as maintaining or enhancing his own self-esteem become worth pursuing. Now he seeks to win positive approval from himself. In effect he has become his own significant other and he must behave toward himself as he behaved toward his parents, peers, and teachers doing what he perceives will win him acceptance, approval, and love. He passes judgments on specific self-experiences; each positive self-judgment strengthens the total complex of positive self-attitudes because the child behaves as a gestalt, and each

negative self-judgement weakens the complex of positive self-attitudes in the child. The weight of these self-judgements decide whether the child shall value his self-concept positively or negatively.[31]

The Development of Conditions of Worth

The child at this point in Rogers' theory remains completely open to his field of experience and so is a completely integrated organism whose behavior responses are appropriate to his total needs in the light of his perceptions. However when the child develops conditions of worth he is set on the road to defensive behavior which may also lead to psychotic breakdown. For most people, if not all, conditions of worth develop as a consequence of the need for positive regard from oneself and from others. When significant others discriminate a child's behavior as being more or less worthy of positive regard, the child comes to view his self-experiences in the same light; certain self-experiences win approval from him while other self-experiences have the opposite effect. If the child's habit of stretching the truth fails to win warmth and affection from his parents, the child will come to experience rejection toward this particular behavior. The child has acquired a condition upon which he evaluates his behavior when his sole motive for seeking or avoiding a particular self-experience is the extent that the self-experience is worthy of positive self-regard. The child perceives himself

as worthy of love only under certain conditions of worth which he has learned from significant others in his environment, his parents, teachers, and peers.

The power of conditions of worth can be better understood when one remembers that the child behaves as a gestalt. The child has an overwhelming need for positive regard from significant others; in infants this significant other is the mother. The expressions of approval or disapproval by the mother toward certain actions of the child is taken by him as disapproval or approval of himself in general. The child needs positive regard or love from the mother and this need is so powerful as to outweigh other needs of the child. Every expression of affection strengthens the pattern of love and every rejection weakens the pattern of love between mother and child. Thus what more powerful influence could the child experience than the positive approval of mother for certain self-experiences and the loss of her love for other self-experiences? The infant quite understandably will seek to fulfill the conditions which will win him mother's love and to avoid the self-experiences which he has learned will cost him mother's love. As a result the infant comes to behave in a manner likely to win him maternal affection and to ignore or avoid behavior which would serve to maintain and enhance the organism. For example, the process of socialization that takes place in each child can be explained by the need for positive regard from mother.

Each child learns to behave in a socially accepted manner

despite the urging to the contrary by his organismic valuing process. An example of this type of learning is toilet training. The organismic valuing process favours immediate bowel movements whenever the physiological tension urges because such behavior enhances and maintains the organism. This tendency is overcome and regulated by more powerful needs, that of positive regard of the parent or, at a more mature stage of the child, by positive self-regard. The child finds it very satisfying to hit his baby brother but soon he gives it up because it does not satisfy the more powerful need of gaining mother's positive approval but in fact has had the opposite effect. Remember that each time mother disapproves of hitting baby brother, the child reacts as though mother were disapproving of him personally.

As the capacity for self-regard develops in the child, the youngster assumes as his own the conditions of worth which he has learned from significant others, most often the parents for younger children. He evaluates himself in the light of his conditions of worth; the more conditions of worth he is able to satisfy the more he likes himself but to the degree he is unable to meet the conditions of worth to that degree he is dissatisfied with himself. However the child behaves as a gestalt; he is either satisfied or not with himself as a whole according to the balance maintained by his various conditions of worth. Remember that the child has a need for positive self-regard. Of necessity he must live in accordance with the terms of his conditions of worth. He must now

pursue behavior that will win positive self-regard and seek to avoid behavior that has the opposite effect. The child must behave in a manner which will win positive self-regard because of the strength of this need which is more powerful than the organismic valuing process.

The conditions of worth which the child tries so hard to satisfy are learned from parents and other significant people in his environment. The organismic valuing process acts to maintain and enhance the organism but conditions of worth are related to only one need of the child, the need for love. In fact they may act in a manner contrary to the dictates of the organismic valuing process; yet such is the strength of the need for positive regard by self and others that the good of the organism is ignored. For example, a young woman may assume a strict and exaggerated standard of behavior between men and women as a condition of personal worth and as a result finds herself unable to enter into a marriage relationship and thus satisfy her experienced organic needs as an adult woman.

Conditions of worth are not necessarily realistic or easy to live up to. A child may have to satisfy a personal standard that demands that he do well in school, or that he be a good athlete, or that he be handsome. Obviously some children would find it impossible to satisfy such criteria for estimating one's worthiness to receive love; and yet the child may well have assumed such a criterion as the standard he must meet to satisfy his need for positive self-regard,

and quite likely he had already received considerable rejection from his parent in association with this particular self-experience. The results are obvious and sometimes tragic. How can such children have the healthy positive self-regard that they so desperately need?

The crucial point of Rogers' theory has been reached; the child is about to move away from the state of integrity in which all his field of experience is available to awareness. In an attempt to live up to his conditions of worth, the child must sometimes ignore his organismic needs, and so an imbalance is set up in the child. Self-experiences which are rejected by his assumed conditions of worth are denied consciousness. In effect, the child has denied part of himself. He ceases to be a fully functioning person because his organismic valuing process is overwhelmed by the need for either self-esteem or positive regard from people important to him. The child is unable to satisfy his genuine needs either because he has rejected any awareness of them or because he feels guilty about the behavior needed to satisfy them. A child may, for example, deny to awareness any feeling of aggression toward a younger brother because of the condition of worth of brotherly love. Another may need to conceal his lack of any success in athletics because of an incorporated standard of self-esteem by emphasising his lack of stature or by denying any interest in the game. No matter what the particular form their influence may take conditions of worth limit behavior by permitting the individual to function with full awareness

of himself only in association with positively regarded self-experiences. As a result many talents and potential interests never reach the level of awareness because they are associated with denied self-experiences. Consider how many great works of art never came to be because the potential artist considered himself a man of action and had no time for such "idleness".

Carl Rogers speculates about how the breakdown of the integrity of the child's perception can be avoided because then he would be far better equipped to meet the problems of life. Obviously the crucial point consists of avoiding the formation of conditions of worth in the first place. Their formation can be avoided if the child is made to feel loved under all circumstances even when he behaves badly, and if his parents do not react in horror whenever he announces his latest feeling such as if he wishes his sister dead. Parents must avoid making it clear to a child that if he wishes to be loved he must feel, think, and act a certain way. If they do treat him this way he will come to feel that he is only worthy of love or self-respect if he feels, thinks and acts the way that others expect him to. On the other hand, a child whose parents do not punish him by withdrawing love will feel he is worthy of love and self-respect even when he knows that his behavior is bad. Since the sole reason in Rogers' theory for a person to reject his thoughts, or his feelings, or other self-experiences is the pursuit of a pathetic desire to make himself more worthy of love, the latter child who is not compelled to reject part of himself is better off. However Rogers

believes that all of us develop conditions of worth to a greater or lesser degree.[32]

A study by John Butler, from the University of Chicago, and Gerald Haigh, from Springfield College, contributes further insights into the role of the self-concept in the valuing process which results in self-esteem. Their study was part of the research project undertaken in the University of Chicago in 1950-54.

The research instrument that Butler and Haigh chose consisted of one hundred self-referent statements which the clients sorted into nine piles according to how well the statements described them. They named it the Q-sort. In order to provide a normal distribution of the statements the number of each pile was fixed; the numbers were 1, 4, 11, 21, 26, 21, 11, 4, 1. The client placed the items along the scale from the one most like him to the one least like him. The client himself sorted and located every item. Butler and Haigh now had a detailed reproduction of the self-concept as it existed in the client at the time of the sorting in terms of one hundred carefully prepared items. The same items were used every time the client used the Q-sort and Butler and Haigh noted the changes in sorting and classifying. Such changes should indicate changes in the self-concept.

Butler and Haigh had the same client sort the same one hundred self-referent statements into nine piles with the same distribution but the second time the client placed the items in the piles according to how they described the person he would most like to be. By this method Butler and Haigh

secured a detailed reproduction of the client's ideal-self; the self he would most like to be and the self he would least like to be. At various stages of therapy the clients could re-sort the statements and Butler and Haigh could note any changes in either the self-concept or the ideal-self that occurred during therapy.

The self-concept and ideal-self sort may be compared with each other because they use the same self-referent statements. Butler and Haigh postulated that the degree of discrepancy between the two would indicate the client's self-esteem which they could determine by mathematical correlation of the two sorts. They set out to establish whether client-centered therapy would produce significant change in the correlation between self-concept and ideal-self and whether this change would be in the direction of increased self-esteem. They used the Q-sort technique on twenty-five clients in their research project. The client group before counselling had a zero correlation between their ideal-self Q-sort and their self-concept Q-sort, which indicates a low degree of self-esteem. The mean correlation for the control group, on the other hand, at the outset was .58. Butler and Haigh found that the mean correlation for the control group at the end of the project was .59 which is not a statistically significant change. The client group used the Q-sorts after their therapy treatments and at a follow up period. The correlation between their self-concept Q-sort and ideal-self sort had changed significantly. They also found that clients whose

improvement was confirmed by independent tests, had gained a more positive correlation between their self-concept Q-sort and their ideal-self Q-sort.

The foregoing indicated that a low level of self-esteem grows out of a serious degree of discrepancy between the self-concept and the ideal-self. An individual's attitude toward any item of his self-concept will depend on how closely it agrees with his ideal-self. If the self-regard complex of an individual is unfavorable because his concept of self disagrees seriously with his ideal-self he will find it difficult to satisfy the need for positive self-regard.[33]

Does Carl Rogers state that all the conditions of worth, which the child incorporated into himself as a result of the attitudes of parents toward his behavior, remain with him into adulthood and continue to influence his behavior? Carl Rogers has not mentioned this problem directly but he certainly does imply that some conditions of worth formed in infancy remain in the individual since his method of therapy in theory at least seeks to dissolve those self-regarding elements which inhibit a client's behavior. In addition, Carl Rogers does clearly state that they may be eliminated if the subject experiences unconditional positive regard from some significant person.[34] If an individual is able to perceive that certain self-experiences, which he thinks make him unworthy of positive regard, actually do not prevent some significant person from feeling positive regard for him then the reason for supporting a condition of worth is eliminated. For example, a young boy

may come to feel that fighting with others is undesirable because his parents disapprove; however if the same behavior wins a degree of positive regard from his peers, the child may reject the belief that fighting will make him unworthy of approval.

From the foregoing positive regard clearly influences an individual's personality in two ways; if a child perceives that certain self-experiences win him positive regard from people important to him and that other self-experiences cause him to be regarded negatively by the same people, the child will form conditions of worth which limit his behavior. On the other hand, if others can compensate for this negative response the inhibition can be removed and personality growth in the blocked area released. Who can estimate the beneficial effect of being liked by a friend, being approved of by a teacher, or being loved by a spouse?

The Development of Incongruence between Self and Experience and of Discrepancies in Behavior

Conditions of worth have a impact on the personality structure and the behavior of an individual. They force him to pursue behavior patterns which conform with his interjected standards. However to keep his self-concept consistent with his conditions of self-esteem he must deny to his consciousness contradictory experiences. The repressed self-experiences and needs still demand satisfaction. Thus at times unconscious experiences may take over control of the

person and force him to pursue behavior contradictory to his conscious self.

An individual reacts to his experience in various ways. He may ignore aspects of it because they have no perceived relationship to his self-structure. Examples of this behavior are very easy to find; each of us select from our phenomenal field those aspects which are significant to us. For example, a man does not consciously register each and every store as he walks down Main Street, nor does he attentively listen to every sound, or study every face that passes by, unless there is a need to be satisfied. One is conscious of only a portion of the everyday events that go on about him but there is no doubt that these occurrences which he has not consciously registered do in fact exist in his field of experience. A man walking down the street may never really notice the postal box on the corner, but today he has a card to mail. Now, he remembers there is a box on the corner which he passes everyday. People constantly remember details which they had not consciously noticed before, provided they answer a felt need.

Other portions of an individual's experience become available to consciousness when they meet a need of the self or are consistent with the conditions of worth in the self-concept. Consequently Rogers signifies by <u>available to consciousness</u> those experiences which can freely elude the level of awareness, because the symbolized details in the mind are not always consciously present. A man may perceive himself as strong but he is not continuously repeating to himself,

"I am a strong man". Only when his thoughts turn in this direction does this awareness arise. Hence, experiences which are available to consciousness because of their relationship to the self become conscious when the individual has the occasion to perceive them.

Various explanations may be offered on why certain experiences are symbolized in awareness and others are not. Certain experiences are symbolized because they satisfy the needs of the individual, or are related to his needs. A teacher will notice books, or clippings, or articles related to the subject he teaches; a soldier will notice movements which may indicate a threat to his life; hungry travelers will notice the restaurants and food-stands along the highway. Other types of experience are symbolized in awareness because they are consistent with the self-concept and serve to strengthen it. A girl who thinks of herself as socially awkward or gauche will tend to experience whatever confirms her self-concept. She will be conscious of her low marks in Science and Mathematics, of her inability to sew, and of her lack of friends. Later, if her self-concept has changed, she may advert to her good marks in History or Literature, to her success in a new project, or to the approval in a new friendship.

On the other hand many experiences are completely denied to consciousness or are perceived in a distorted fashion because they are inconsistent with the self-concept. The individual may be somewhat aware that he is rejecting a certain experience. A client whose self-concept was negative was well

aware that others thought her to be intelligent but she knew they were wrong; how could they know the truth about her? She didn't want to believe them. She would accept the opinion of any person who depreciated her ability but could not accept the contradictory evidence of praise. She selected and concentrated on perceptions that would serve to maintain her self-concept such as the inability of people to know her really well. Every one, to a more or less degree, denies the truth of certain perceptions in this way.

Experiences may be denied to consciousness in another much more significant manner. The individual is not aware of what he is denying, nor that he is even denying anything at all to consciousness, because the experience is so totally at odds with the self-concept. For example, a person who had a strict moral climate in childhood will have developed a concept of herself reflecting certain conditions of worth from childhood. Let us suppose that she experiences strong desires for sexual satisfaction with her marriage partner. To permit these organic cravings to appear in consciousness would be in severe contradiction to her self-concept. The woman is powerless to prevent the organic experience from occurring but she can and does repress any conscious knowledge of it. A young man may experience anger at overly protective parents but his self-concept of a dutiful son who should feel gratitude will not permit him to be aware of his anger. He may deny his emotion any consciousness expresion but, even though he undergoes the physical changes which accompany anger,

he may symbolize his organic sensations in a distorted fashion consistent with his self-concept such as a bad headache.

Conditions of worth compel an individual to perceive selectively all experiences associated with them. The need for positive self-regard tends to distort one's subjective cosmos. Experiences which satisfy conditions of worth are symbolized accurately in awareness, but not so with experiences which the idea of worthiness condemns. Unwelcome experiences of this kind are either wholely or partially denied to awareness, or, if defense is ineffectual, the individual may perceive the experience either selectively or in a distorted fashion in order to lessen the contradiction.

The foregoing analysis suggests that the self-concept is made up partially of distortions of experience and so is to a degree inaccurate. The growing child perceives himself as lovable, worthy of love, and engaging in an exchange of affection with his parents. The feeling of being loved is a central and significant factor in the development of the self-structure. In early infancy the organic satisfactions such as anger, bowel movements, hitting other people are patiently accepted by mother and father, and as a result, these actions are in no way inconsistent with the concept of self as a lovable individual. But in the fullness of time the actions of parents begin to indicate that this formerly satisfying behavior is bad; he is bad, and he is neither loved or worthy of love when he behaves that way. Consequently

the child experiences a deep threat to his self-concept, for, if he admits to awareness his satisfactions experienced from the forbidden behavior, he will cast strong doubts upon his self-concept of being lovable and loved. The inconsistency between the self-concept and experience produces adverse results in the ordinary child. He denies to awareness the satisfactions that he feels, and he distorts his perception of the parents' behavior towards him. He does not perceive that his parents find his own behavior unsatisfactory to them. In order to maintain the self-concept, he symbolizes the behavior itself as unsatisfactory. In this way, the parental attitudes are assumed into the self structure but, more significantly, because of the distortion, their undesirable reactions are experienced as if they were based upon the individual's own judgment.

The child may come to feel that expressions of anger are bad, even though anger may actually serve to satisfy a need or to enhance the child's development. Accurate representations of experience do not easily enter awareness because they tend to contradict the distorted self-concept, or, if they reach awareness he experiences anxiety at the inconsistency he must entertain within himself. The child or adult finds himself caught in a dilemma because he has a distorted self-concept and he finds it very difficult to become aware of evidence which will permit him to substitute a more accurate concept. Remember that perceptions are excluded from awareness because they contradict the self-concept and not

because they are derogatory. As a result it is as difficult to accept experiences which will make the self-concept more worthy of positive regard as to accept evidence which supports a very inferior self-concept if either perception contradicts the present self-concept. Clients with a negative concept of themselves reject contradictory evidence as strongly as people, who feel they have superior ability ignore evidence of their mediocrity.[35]

Carl Rogers has come to believe that people can reject from awareness contradictory experiences or distort their symbolization without ever becoming for an instant aware of the experience itself. He writes:

> At this point a number of clarifying studies began to come from the laboratory. Growing out of the work of Bruner and Postman on the personal factors influencing perception came certain findings bearing directly upon the problem we have just defined. It began to appear that even in the tachistoscopic presentation of a word the subject "knows" or "pre-perceives" or responds to the positive or negative value of the word before the stimulus is recognized in consciousness. . . . With an increasing weight of evidence, based upon increasingly crucial studies, it seems the following conclusion is justified. The individual appears to be able to discriminate between threatening and nonthreatening stimuli, even though unable consciously to recognize the stimulus to which he is reacting. McCleary and Lazarus, whose study is much the most carefully controlled of those made to date, coin the term "subception" to describe this process. The individual "subceives" a word as threatening, as indicated by his galvanic skin response, even when the exposure time is too limited for him to perceive it. Even though he perceives the word wrongly in consciousness, his autonomic reaction tends to be a response to a threatening situation, as revealed by the GSR. The authors conclude that "Even when a subject is unable to report a visual discrimination i.e., he reports incorrectly when forced to make a choice he is still able to make a stimulus discrimination at some level below that required for conscious recognition."[36]

The foregoing analysis indicates that all conscious elements of the individual are incorporated into the self-structure. Consequently most of the behavior adopted by an individual is consistent with his self-concept. A person who thinks of himself as honest will find it difficult to strive for achievement through means which he feels are dishonest. When the self-concept lacks all forms of aggression toward others, the subject finds it difficult to satisfy such a need by direct means. The only avenues open to him for satisfaction are those consistent with the organized self-concept, except for certain significant exceptions which occur despite the self-concept.

In most cases the need which the individual is satisfying can be admitted to awareness without any distortion, but in some cases the need itself is not symbolized accurately because it contradicts the self-concept. For example during warfare men with self-concepts that involve courage and fearlessness experience at the physiological level fear and the need to escape danger. Since this need does not agree with the self-concept it does not reach the consciousness of the soldier. However he can satisfy his needs by perceiving himself ill with an upset stomach or by discovering that his tank engine is not really working properly, and for these reasons he is able to abandon his dangerous task. Many examples of this type of behavior may be found. For example, most neurotic behavior satisfies an experienced need which cannot be admitted to consciousness by behavior consistent with the

self-concept and thus is acceptable to the individual.

On the other hand, many forms of behavior which do not seem to be related to the self structure at all, come under its influence when such behavior would contradict the self-concept. For example, a mother generally will sleep because of the need for rest, but all hope of sleeping disappears when her self-concept of responsibility for her teenage daughter becomes involved and she lies awake until she hears the door open and shut, and she listens to the girl's footsteps on the stair. To fall asleep would be inconsistent with her self-concept. For the same reason a man who views himself as a conscientious and responsible individual will rise at an early hour no matter how tired he may be.

Behavior may on the other hand be caused in an individual by organic experiences and needs which have not been consciously symbolized and such experiences may be inconsistent with the self-concept. In such instances, the self-experiences associated with inconsistent behavior are not accepted into the self-structure. In a moment of great danger a man may perform a deed of prodigious strength or heroic bravery, but afterwards he will say that he wasn't himself or he didn't realize what he was doing. His conscious self feels no control over those actions and so the behavior is not accepted as part of the self.

The same behavior occurs when many of the organic needs and experiences are refused consciousness. The pressure of the need can become so great that the organism brings about

the satisfaction of the need without attempting to relate the behavior to the self-concept.[37]

Carl Rogers writes:

> Thus, a boy whose upbringing created a self-concept of purity and freedom from "base" sexual impulses was arrested for lifting the skirts of two little girls and examining them. He insisted that he could not have performed this behavior, and when presented with witnesses, was positive that "I was not myself." The developing sexuality of an adolescent boy, and the accompanying curiosity, constituted a strong organic need for which there seemed no channel of satisfaction which was consistent with the concept of self. Eventually the organism behaved in such a way as to gain satisfaction, but this behavior was not felt to be, nor was it, a part of the self. It was behavior which was dissociated from the concept of self, and over which the boy exercised no conscious control. The organized character of the behavior grows out of the fact that the organism on a physiological basis can initiate and carry on complex behavior to meet its needs.
>
> In a great many cases of psychological maladjustment, one of the causes for concern on the part of the individual is that certain types of behavior go on without his control or the possibility of his control. "I don't know why I do it. I don't want to do it, but yet I do," is a common enough type of statement. Also, the notion, "I'm just not myself when I do those things," "I didn't know what I was doing," "I have no control over those reactions." In each case the reference is to behavior which is organically determined on the basis of experiences denied accurate symbolization, and hence is carried through without having been brought into any consistent relationship with the concept of self.[38]

An individual frequently develops a discrepancy between his self-concept and his actual experience. He sees himself as having characteristics a, b, and c, and experiences feelings x, y, and z. If his symbolization had been accurate he would perceive that he really has characteristics c, d, and e, and experiences feelings v, w, and x. As a result of the incongruence between self-concept and experience the individual finds himself in a state of tension and internal confusion because his behavior makes him aware to some extent of the

contradiction. At one time the behavior may be a function of the actualizing tendency and at another, the self-actualization tendency may be dominant. Neurotic behavior is an example of behavior which is due to the actualization tendency and for this reason it is incomprehensible to the individual himself; it disagrees with what he wants to do on the conscious level, namely to actualize a self that is no longer an accurate symbolization of his self-experiences.

Rogers examines the various states of mind the individual may find himself in as a result of incongruence. An individual is in a state of psychological maladjustment when there exists a discrepancy between his self-concept and his organic experiences. When the individual is unaware of this state of affairs in himself he is vulnerable to anxiety, threat, and disorganization. If any significant experience demonstrates the discrepancy so clearly that it must be consciously symbolized, then the individual will be threatened and his self-concept will be disorganized by the contradictory experience which will not assimilate into the gestalt. If the individual senses this incongruency he will become anxious, but if he becomes conscious of the discordance he will experience disorganization. Such an individual's self-concept is based on a very insecure foundation.[39]

The Experience of Threat and the Process of Defence

Since a person can not tolerate for long a state of

anxiety and discordance in his personality he resorts to defensive behavior which serves to protect his conscious self-structure from the disturbing experience.

An individual throughout his life continues to experience himself and the world. When an encounter is incongruent with the self-concept's conditions of worth, it is subceived to be threatening. The threat lies in the fact that the self-concept would no longer be a consistent gestalt if the experience were accurately symbolized in awareness. Should the experience enter consciousness the conditions of worth would be violated and the need for self-regard would be frustrated. The individual experiences a state of anxiety, and resorts to a process of defence to prevent these events from happening to him. The defence may concentrate on certain perceptions, or it may distort the experience in consciousness or else it may deny either the whole or part of the experience to awareness. By these means the defense against a subceived threat manages to keep the conscious perception of the experience consistent with the self-concept and the conditions of worth.

The effect of the defence against threat is to make the change of perception difficult because of the necessity of distortion in order to serve the self-concept's needs. Consequently the individual tends toward intensionality, which means he is inclined to see his experience in unconditional terms, to overgeneralize, to be dominated by his beliefs or concepts, to confuse fact and opinion and to rely

upon abstractions rather than upon the testing of his ideas in reality situations.

Because the state of incongruence in an individual influences his behavior, Rogers divides abnormal reactions into defensive and disorganized behaviors. Defensive behaviors include neurotic reactions such as rationalization, compensation, fantasy, projection, compulsions, phobias, and such psychotic behavior as paranoid behaviors and perhaps catatonic states. Disorganized behavior includes the irrational and the acute psychotic forms of behavior. Rogers believes that his classification is more fundimental and fruitful for treatment than the popular division. He warns that the concept of neurosis and psychosis as entities in themselves is a misleading conception with unfortunate consequences.

To review our progress, Carl Rogers' theory of personality thus far can apply to every individual in a greater or lesser degree. Everyone has neurotic behavior but not all have the extreme crippling varieties. We all can rationalize to make our behavior consistent with our self-concept; we all can engage in fantasy, constructing a dream world where we are the heroes and painful reality is excluded. We may project unto others the evil which is inconsistent with the self-concept, so that we may attack it as happens so often in cases of prejudice. To the extent that we have discrepancies between our self-concept and our field of experience we all engage in defensive behavior.[40]

The Process of Breakdown and Disorganization

For certain unfortunate people Carl Rogers' explanation of behavior is not finished for their behavior ceases to be only defensive and they cross the threshold of a complete psychotic break. Breakdown on the self-structure only occurs under certain conditions which make it possible. The individual must have a significant degree of incongruence between his self-concept and experience, and a significant experience which demonstrates the discrepancy must happen suddenly or with a high degree of obviousness; as a consequence the individual's process of defence is unable to successfully adapt the experience to the self-concept and its conditions of worth. As the person subceives the incongruence in himself he experiences anxiety. The extent of the self-structure which is threatened determines the degree of anxiety which he experiences.

Since the process of defence has failed, the experience becomes accurately symbolized in the individual's consciousness and the gestalt of the self-structure is broken because he is now conscious of experiences in himself which are incongruent with the self-concept. He becomes disorganized, and in this state behaves at times in a manner consistent with the experiences he has formerly distorted or denied to awareness, and at other times he will behave in ways consistent with his self-structure. The tension between the self-concept with its distorted perceptions and the experiences

which are not accurately symbolized or included in the self-concept expresses itself in a state of disorganization in which the organism regulates itself first by one and then by the other.

Carl Rogers indicates how psychotic breaks occur with several examples. A client undergoing therapy is enabled to express more and more of himself, until he comes almost to the point of expressing a truth which flatly challenges his self-concept. He experiences anxiety but if conditions are right the anxiety is only moderate and the session becomes constructive. However there is always the danger that a therapist may bring the client face to face with more of the suppressed experiences than he can handle and a psychotic break occurs. This has happened when a client received counselling from several sources at the same time. It also occurred in the early experiences with sodium pentathol therapy, in which a client revealed many of the experiences which he has denied to his consciousness. When he was faced with the material in his normal state he was unable to deny its truth, his defences collapsed, his self-structure was broken, and he underwent a psychotic break.

Acute psychotic behavior appears often to be behavior consistent with the denied experiences of the patient. For example an individual who has rigidly kept his sexual impulses under control and denied them any symbolization in his self-concept, may in his disorganized behavior make open sexual overtures to people who come in contact with him. Rogers

thinks that many of the so-called irrational behaviors of psychotic patients can be understood as a reversal of the level of control from the conscious self-concept to the denied aspects of a patient's self-experiences. The patient still strives to defend himself from the painful experience of incongruency for in cases where the denied self-experiences are dominant, the person now defends himself against awareness of the self.

When the self again becomes the factor of control, the self-concept has greatly changed. The patient now sees himself as a crazy, inadequate, undependable person who has impulses and forces beyond his control. In this way the self-concept and actual experience are brought closer together. Little confidence is felt in the self-structure. Rogers warns that this aspect of his theory is new and needs much more study before it can be considered accurate and adequate.[41]

The Process of Reintegration

The conditions which produce discrepancies in behavior, the experience of threat, and defensive behavior may be reversed and the degree of congruence between the self-concept and the organic experiences increased. Two conditions must be met before a threatening experience can be accurately symbolized in awareness and incorporated into the self-structure; the conditions of worth must decrease and unconditional self-regard must increase. Rogers defines

unconditional self-regard as a state in which an individual can not perceive any self-experience as more worthy of positive regard than any other self-experience.

The conditions of worth may be eliminated and the degree of self-esteem increased if the individual is able to experience the unconditional positive regard of some significant person in his environment. However unconditional positive regard means little to a person unless it exists together with empathic understanding. Rogers defines the latter as the understanding of another person's internal frame of reference with accuracy together with its emotional context as if one had become the other person. Should this "as if" become lost one is identified with the other person rather than experiencing empathy toward him. If a person knows little about another, his unconditional positive regard toward him can be dismissed as meaningless because further knowledge can change one's feeling of positive regard. But if someone knows you thoroughly, and empathically understands many of your feelings and behaviors, and still you perceive that he entertains unconditional positive feelings toward you, then the existing conditions of worth are weakened and dissolved. One can imagine the sense of surprise when an individual reveals one of the bad qualities which he has tried to hide even from himself, braces himself for rejection and loathing, and finds that the friend still prizes him as much as ever. How can he have the same degree of faith in that condition of worth when someone knows the worst about

him and it doesn't destroy the relationship but indeed has the opposite effect? As a result of being totally accepted by those who know him well, the man is able to increase his own unconditional positive self-regard. Since he is now able to add to his self-concept details which he was formerly forced to deny or to distort, he becomes less vulnerable to threat because many threatening details have taken their place in the self-concept, and are now congruent with it.

The process of reintegration may occur at any time these conditions are met; that an individual feels he is prized by another who knows him with no strings attached. Consequently constructive changes may be brought about in a person if he can be liked for himself. Many an understanding friend or a member of a family has reversed the process of defence and set a young man or a woman on the path toward a happy and fruitful maturity.[42]

CHAPTER III

A THEORY OF THE FULLY FUNCTIONING PERSON

The young man or woman, having departed from the integrated behavior of infancy because of cultural conditioning from his parents, peers, and other significant people, must strive to incorporate a sufficient degree of self-experiences into the self-concept to function successfully. Just what characteristics might one expect to find in an individual who achieves complete openness to all his experiences? Carl Rogers' theory of the fully functioning person answers this question. The essence of the fully functioning person as defined by Carl Rogers' theory is his freedom to behave in the way he chooses. A defensively organized person finds that he is unable to behave in the manner he wishes. Both a fully functioning person and a defensively behaving person are in one sense determined by the facts of life around them and it would be nonsense to claim absolute freedom of behavior for either. In what sense does Rogers mean that a fully functioning person is free? He can make the effective choice by symbolizing in awareness all significant relative data. In contrast distorted perceptions and lack of knowledge about himself and his environment rob a defensively organized person of his freedom of choice. In Rogers' theory a fully functioning

man is free to know what are his best interests and is free to pursue the most effective means to realize them. Such a person is certainly much better equipped to handle successfully the trials of life.

Carl Rogers does not fear that a man who has released the hidden portions of his self-experiences and has added them to his consciousness, will turn into a monster. In fact he feels the opposite is true, namely that a man will be better for knowing himself more completely:

> It will be evident that another implication of the view I have been presenting is that the basic nature of the human being, when functioning freely, is constructive and trustworthy. When we are able to free the individual from defensiveness, so that he is open to the wide range of his own needs, as well as the wide range of environmental and social demands, his reactions may be trusted to be positive, forward moving, constructive . . . . Man's behavior is exquisitely rational, moving with subtle and ordered complexity toward the goals his organism is endeavoring to achieve . . . . The only control of impulses which would exist, or which would prove necessary, is the natural and internal balancing of one need against another, and the discovery of behaviors which follow the vector most closely approximating the satisfaction of all needs. The experience of extreme satisfaction of one need (for aggression, or sex, etc.) in such a way as to do violence to the satisfaction of other needs (for companionship, tender relationship, etc.) - an experience very common in the defensively organized person - would be greatly decreased. He would participate in the vastly complex self-regulatory activities of his organism . . . in such a fashion as to live in increasing harmony with himself and with others.[43]

How does the fully functioning person develop?

Initially he possesses an inherent tendency to actualize himself, to develop into a mature human being. Consequently he has the capacity to symbolize his experiences accurately in his consciousness and as a result he is also capable of

keeping his self-concept congruent or in essential agreement with his experience. Very early he feels a need for positive regard from significant others, such as his parents, and soon after he also develops a need for positive self-regard. All human children have these capacities and these needs, yet not all become fully functioning. Why is this so? The answer is simple. Unless a child, or an adult for that matter, experiences unconditional positive regard from the significant people in his life whom he feels know him thoroughly he will become defensive. The need for unconditional approval can be satisfied by any person who is able to achieve empathic understanding of him and to communicate his genuine feeling of acceptance to him. The need for positive regard from others and of self-esteem is consequently met in as full a degree as possible since no conditions are attached to the approval. The individual is enabled, to the fullest extent of his ability, to actualize himself, to know his experiences accurately and to include in his self-concept his total self-experiences. The fully functioning person is one who has met the above conditions to the maximum degree. The degree of freedom from defensive behavior determines the capacity for behavior as a fully functioning person.

A fully functioning person will have these characteristics. He will be fully open to his experience. because he does not have to deny or distort his self-experiences or his perceptions of the world to avoid incongruence with his

self-concept. He will exhibit no defensive behavior because he needs none. All his experiences will be available to his consciousness whenever they become significant to his behavior. He may still make mistakes in symbolizing data but the error will be due to the ambiguity of the experience and not to the needs of the perceiver. His self-concept will be congruent with his experience because it will be based on an accurate perception of all his self-experiences. As a result his self-concept will be a fluid gestalt which changes freely as he assimilates into it all new and related experiences. He experiences himself as the locus or site of evaluation. Consequently all his principles and standards of behavior will have his own personal stamp of approval and will not be the incorporated values of others which are distortedly perceived as if they were his own. As a result, he will be able to balance all his needs against each other and choose the best possible course of action to satisfy these needs without frustrating any. In contrast, the defensively organized person finds his valuing process disturbed because certain needs are distorted, or denied to consciousness, or exaggerated to serve the needs of an inaccurate self-concept. The fully functioning person has no conditions of worth, hence he is able to experience positive self-regard under all conditions. He can disapprove of his actions in any particular case without at the same time rejecting in a sense his own self.

Such a person will meet each problem of life with

behavior which is a fresh creative solution to life's demands. Defensive people are bound by the patterns of their former behavior and like blind mice keep running in the same fruitless circles. On the other hand, freely functioning people find their organismic valuing a reliable guide because all pertinent data becomes available to consciousness and may be used in deciding on a course of action because all self-experiences reach consciousness undistorted. The results of behavior, moreover, reach consciousness undistorted so that behavior may be evaluated for its effectiveness in reality. He will tend to live in the maximum degree of harmony with others because it is as rewarding to love others as to have others love you. He will enjoy fulfilling the needs of others for affection. Consequently the fully functioning person will be able to act in a much more effective and socially satisfying manner because of his freedom of choice of behavior.[44]

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, several points of Rogers' theory demand the attention of parents, teachers, and adults who work with children because of the serious implications involved.

Parents, teachers, and youth workers should consider the role of significant people in shaping conditions of worth because they do become sufficiently important to make a difference in the experiential field of their little charges. This psychological relationship can come to exist between teacher and child without the former being aware of it. Consider how many times the responses of people to the behavior of children have been inappropriate. How many times has mother become angry, or declared the child was bad, or said she hated him, or struck him, or in other ways has shown her displeasure because she was annoyed? How many times has the child been made to feel that he cannot be loved when he behaves this way or actually has been told that "Mommy and Daddy can't love you if you hit your brother, or lie, or steal, or are bad"? How many times in a classroom has a pupil been attacked personally with ridicule, or sarcasm, or humiliated, or beaten, or given detentions for

petty misdeeds? Whenever the child is rejected for overt behavior, he develops conditions of worth which make him defensive, and destroy his integrity as a fully functioning person. The possible consequence is serious personality disorders and perhaps personality breakdown.

A further conclusion is that the discipline should never involve rejection of the child. Beyond doubt the child must be disciplined for behavior which is antisocial or objectionable, but there is no reason to label the child personally bad. Many parents and teachers confuse the behavior with the child, and strike out in anger at both. In a sense they are willing to throw out the baby with the dirty water. It is more desirable to make the child feel cherished for himself even while he is being punished in order to avoid developing defensive behavior. Teachers should always keep the possible consequences of their discipline well in mind and consciously seek to avoid the natural pitfalls of rejecting or disliking troublesome children.

Children come to a teacher with already formed conditions of worth which make their behavior to some extent defensive. Certain children because of their past history have a high degree of incongruence between their self-structure and their experience. As a consequence they are extremely vulnerable to threatening experiences. The teacher should beware of forcing certain issues because the dividing line between sanity and insanity for such people

lies in the ability to deceive themselves. A teacher who has such a strongly disturbed pupil would be rash indeed to destroy any of his illusions. For many such people it will remain only a matter of time before their defences crumble and a psychotic break occurs. A teacher can do a great service by recommending therapy which will reduce his vulnerability before running into a conscious, overpowering experience.

A teacher thus is in an extremely strategic position for constructive service to his students since he can establish psychological contact with them and become a significant person in their experiential field. He can do much to satisfy the need for positive regard in pupils who have not received it from their parents and contribute to personality growth. The formula is simple; he merely has to like them and let his attitude show. Unfortunately, many teachers would never consider establishing such a relationship with their pupils because they do not realize the impact it can have on his defensive behavior, or because of the popular belief that teachers should maintain a distance between themselves and their pupils, or simply because they fear discipline problems. Too often teachers let slip away the golden opportunity to set a youth on the road away from defensiveness and toward maturity because they do not have the courage to look at the child as an individual and esteem him for himself.

Rogers' work and similar research is extremely per-

tinent to the classroom situation. It contributes to a teacher's understanding of his pupils' problems and clarifies the dynamic influence simple human affection has on the personality structure and behavior patterns of people.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming A Person (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), vii.

[2]Ibid., pp. 23-24. [3]Ibid., viii-ix. [4]Ibid., ix.

[5]Carl R. Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-centered Framework," Psychology: A Study of a Science, ed. Sigmund Koch (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), III, 188.

[6]Ibid., p. 185. [7]Ibid., p. 191. [8]Ibid., p. 201.

[9]Ibid. [10]Ibid., p. 200.

[11]Rogers, On Becoming A Person, pp. 244-46.

[12]Ibid., pp. 248-50.

[13]Carl R. Rogers and Rosalind Dymond, eds., Psychotherapy and Personality Change (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 413-14.

[14]Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 232. [15]Ibid.

[16]Rogers, Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships, p. 197.

[17]Ibid., p. 198. [18]Ibid., p. 210. [19]Ibid., p. 196.

[20]Carl R. Rogers, Client-centered Therapy (The Riverside Press; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951), pp. 488-89.

[21]Ibid., pp. 490-91. [22]Ibid., p. 491. [23]Ibid., p. 492.

[24]Ibid. [25]Ibid. [26]Ibid., pp. 486-87.

[27]Rogers, Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships, p. 210.

[28]Ibid., pp. 222-23. [29]Ibid., p. 223. [30]Ibid., pp. 223-24.

[31]Ibid., p. 224. [32]Ibid., pp. 224-26.

[33]John M. Butler and Gerald V. Haigh, "Changes in the Relation between Self-concepts and Ideal Concepts Consequent upon Client-centered Counseling," Psychotherapy and Personality Change, eds. Carl R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 55-76.

[34]Rogers, Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships, p. 230.

[35]Rogers, Client-centered Therapy, pp. 499-506.

[36]Ibid., pp. 506-07. [37]Ibid., pp. 507-09.

[38]Ibid., pp. 509-10.

[39]Rogers, Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships, pp. 203-04.

[40]Ibid., pp. 227-38. [41]Ibid., pp. 228-30.

[42]Ibid., pp. 230-31.

[43]Rogers, On Becoming A Person, pp. 194-95.

[44]Rogers, Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships, pp. 234-35.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rogers, Carl R. Counseling and Psychotherapy. The Riverside Press; Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-centered Therapy. The Riverside Press; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Rogers, Carl R. and Rosalind F. Dymond (eds.). Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rogers, Carl R. A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-centered Framework. Vol. III of Psychology: A Study of a Science. Edited by Sigmund Koch. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming A Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Rogers, Carl R. The Actualizing Tendency. Vol. XI of Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.