

Conditions of the Therapeutic Process according to Rogers

For therapy to occur it is necessary that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. that two persons are in contact
2. that the first person, whom we shall term the client, is in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable, or anxious.
3. that the second person, whom we shall term the therapist, is congruent in the relationship.
4. that the therapist is experiencing unconditional positive regard toward the client
5. that the therapist is experiencing an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference.
6. that the client perceives, at least to a minimal degree, the unconditional positive regard of the therapist..., and the empathic understanding of the therapist.

The Process of Rogerian Therapy

When the conditions for therapy are met, the process of therapy begins which has these characteristics:

The client...

1. is increasingly free in expressing feelings
2. expresses feelings which increasingly have reference to the self, rather than non-self
3. expresses feelings which increasingly acknowledge incongruity between experiences and self-concept
4. is more aware of the disadvantages of incongruence
5. experiences in full awareness feelings that previously were unavailable to awareness
6. is more able to incorporate these feelings into self-concept
7. increasingly feels unconditional self-regard
8. is more and more self-accepting

Discussion points concerning Rogerian Client-Centred Counselling

- This approach is a very optimistic view of human nature. Is Rogers right to assume that we all have this tendency for self-growth?

About the *core conditions*:

- Is unconditional positive regard possible?
- Is it possible truly to empathize with someone or is some of your own baggage inevitable?
- Is congruence itself or congruence in the relationship possible for the therapist?
- 'Person-centred' entails emphasizing the individual rather than the context in which the individual exists. This puts the person back into the picture, something which skills orientated approaches seem to neglect. Is it too individualistic, placing too little emphasis on rights/needs/values of others?
- If the person is not 'fully-functioning' it is seen as the person's problem and the person's responsibility to change personally. Is it appropriate to assume that all restrictions to being fully functioning in society are the individual's problem? Is it appropriate to demand that the system (e.g. relationship/job/society) in which the person is living should change instead?