

## ROGERS AND THE SELF THEORY

por  
ERMELINDO M.B. PEIXOTO \*

### Sumário

Neste trabalho, o autor ocupa-se do estudo da teoria do *self*, entendida na perspectiva de Carl Rogers. Através da apresentação de alguns dados biográficos iniciais sobre este teórico e psicoterapeuta procuramos esclarecer a sua opção clara pelos princípios da psicologia humanista, com destaque para a abordagem fenomenológica do comportamento e da experiência humanas. Essa opção de fundo de Rogers reflecte-se ainda nos pressupostos que enformam o seu próprio modelo terapêutico. Este, de natureza não-directiva, e centrado exclusivamente na pessoa do cliente, é objecto de breve caracterização, antes da introdução e desenvolvimento dos postulados da teoria propriamente dita. Procura-se, assim, situar cronologicamente o aparecimento da teoria em relação à prática clínica, sendo, essencialmente, a partir desta que aquela se desenvolve. Daí o estabelecimento, que se segue, dos pontos de ligação entre a teoria do *self* e a terapia não-directiva, entendida, quer no plano individual, quer no plano dos chamados grupos de encontro. Referem-se finalmente algumas das implicações educacionais decorrentes da aplicação ao ensino dos princípios da teoria em apreço.

### Résumé

Dans ce travail, l'auteur étudie la théorie du *self*, selon la perspective de Carl Rogers. Par la présentation de quelques données biographiques initiales sur ce théoricien et psychotérapeute, on a cherché à rendre évidente son option en faveur des principes de la psychologie humaniste, et tout particulièrement son approche phénomé-

---

\* Professor Associado da Universidade dos Açores.

nologique du comportement et de l'expérience humains. Cette option de fond de Rogers se reflète également dans les présupposés qui informent son modèle thérapeutique. Celui-ci, de nature non directive, et centré exclusivement sur la personne du patient, est l'objet d'une brève caractérisation, précédant l'introduction et le développement de la théorie proprement dite. On cherche, ainsi, à situer chronologiquement l'apparition de cette théorie par rapport à la pratique clinique, celle-ci étant le point de départ de celle-là. D'où l'établissement, ensuite, des points de liaison entre la théorie du *self* et la thérapie non directive, entendue tant au plan individuel qu'au plan des «groupes de rencontre». Enfin, on évoque quelques-unes des conséquences éducationnelles découlant de l'application à l'enseignement des principes de la théorie en question.

Carl R. Rogers was born in Oak Park, a suburb of Chicago, on January 8, 1902. His family was described as close knit and his parents devoted and loving with strong religious sentiments (Rogers, 1961). The many changes which Rogers went through in the course of his formal education has lead Snelbecker (1974) to suggest that the diversity of personal and professional plans made by Rogers during his university years «reflect, and even may have caused, some of his views about psychology and education» (p. 485).

Consistent with his endeavours to pursue a farm-related career, Rogers enrolled in an agricultural programme at the University of Wisconsin, but he was soon to make other plans as he decided to enter the ministry. Rogers changed his undergraduate major to history and graduated from the University of Chicago in 1924 with a single psychology course to his credit. He then entered the Union Theological Seminary in New York. By the time he was again ready for a change, he had been confronted with a liberal, philosophical outlook on religion (Rogers, 1961) which contrasted sharply with his own conservative background (Snelbecker, 1974).

Rogers received his Ph.D. from Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1931. Consistent with his specialization in guidance and clinical psychology, and in keeping with work done earlier with delinquent and underprivileged children,

Rogers took a position at the Rochester Guidance Center, in New York State, where he became director. He went on to become a professor at various Universities before being appointed resident fellow, first at the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, in 1964, and then, since 1968, at the Center for Studies of the Person in La Jolla, California. Rogers has published extensively during his lifetime.

### Humanistic background

The basic conviction that each person has the capacity and the desire to adequately develop his/her human potential, together with the view that psychological theory should purport to describe the whole, normally functioning man, have placed Rogers amongst the heterogeneous group of psychologists and educators who subscribe to the humanistic psychology approach, that which Abraham Maslow has called the «third force» in American psychology (Nye 1975).

Convinced of the positiveness of human nature, Rogers sees in humans a natural tendency towards actualization. He contends that man is basically good and that, through personal growth and fulfilment of basic potentialities, he will invariably live to enhance himself and society, if he is not forced into socially constructed molds of behaviour.

From a phenomenological standpoint, Rogers (1959) stresses the importance of the individual's immediate conscious experiences in determining reality. He thoroughly emphasizes the notion that individual perceptions of reality are necessary conditions for the understanding of human behaviour. Subjective awareness of ourselves and of the world around us determines how we behave generally. The person will react, not on the basis of a so called 'objective reality', but on the basis of how he/she views that reality.

Rogers' optimistic views about human nature reflect his preference for studying and dealing with man individually, in

his own terms. According to Rogers' clinical conceptions, the person is not to be studied from the outside «as an object under the observer's knowing eye» (Bavelas, 1978), but rather from the standpoint of his/her own self. By probing at consciousness, it becomes possible to gain an understanding of how a particular person sees both him/herself and the world. As such, Rogers began to take exception to the assumption that the therapist should play the major role in directing the therapeutic process. In doing so, he was basically questioning whether such a practice was of any value for facilitating changes during psychotherapy (Snelbecker, 1974).

Rogers believes that openness and responsiveness to inner experiences (such as thoughts, sensations, feelings...), and to the external environment, will maintain each individual on a satisfactory course towards actualization. As such, the therapeutic process should provide for the kind of emotional climate in which the client takes the initiative of helping him/herself become a more fully functioning person, able to cope with life's demands. The primary focus is on the client's unfolding discovery of his/her own inner experiencing, as a condition for the resolution of discrepancies arising from the alienation of the individual from his/her organismic experiencing and organismic valuing process.

For Rogers, the therapeutic relationship, the pace at which it develops and the direction it takes are all guided by this unfolding discovery. The main responsibility in this process then rests with the client, for it is the client who must ultimately rediscover his/her own inner experiencing and become sensitive to the directions of the organismic valuing process. Hence, Rogers' case for the use of non-directive therapy, first presented in his book *Counselling and Psychotherapy* (1942). Nine years later, Rogers (1951) was referring to his approach as *client, centered therapy*. He was now theorizing and formulating research-derived principles on the kinds of practices he believed essential for effective therapeutic relationships. However, he left no doubt as to the nature of his

emerging theory: client-centered theory and therapy are not to be thought of as a fixed or rigid school of thought, but should be noted for their «growing, changing... [and]... developing quality» (Rogers 1966, 183). It can be easily gathered from the above that, much in the same way as Freud, Rogers' first interest is clinical psychology.

In the process of treating clients, Rogers, quite naturally, began to make certain inferences about the nature of their problems. This later amounted to an informal theory of personality (Bavelas, 1978).

«Although a theory of personality has developed from our experience in client-centered therapy, it is quite clear... that this is not our central focus... [but rather]... the manner in which change comes about in human personality... It seems... that far more intelligent and answerable questions can be raised in regard to the process of personality change than in regard to the causes of the person's present personality characteristics.» (Rogers 1959, 194).

Following from this, Rogers did not evolve his theory from predetermined conceptions about human personality. In fact, the opposite occurred. His personality theory has developed from clinical practice. The basic principles of selftheory were derived from an experience of process.

### Rogers' Theory of Development

Rogers first presents his theory developmentally in 1959, tracing the course of normal and abnormal personality development from infancy. Since Rogers' ideas developed to a great extent in the context of client-centered therapy, referring to his personality theory as «humanistic phenomenology», as Nye (1975) has done, should surprise no one. To Rogers, man has «a tendency to strive for growth and fulfillment and... must be understood in terms of... [his]... particular conceptualizations of reality» (Nye 1975, 84). In this view, personal and interper-

sonal functioning (actualization) is necessarily growth oriented and greatly dependent upon subjective awareness, both of oneself and of the world. Interactively, only restrictive and corrupting social influences may interfere with this growth and fulfilment. Ability to avoid these influences implies freedom from the distortions of reality, which prevent personal growth (actualization) and enhancement (Rogers 1959).

As the real importance of inner experiencing is stressed in this context, it becomes evident that freedom of choice, based on the totality of individual experiencing, will direct human behaviour. The open, responsive individual has a full (subjective) awareness of existing internal and external factors, and, as a result, will act in accordance with his/her own conceptualizations of reality. Perceptions of self and of world with which one interacts are unique to each individual. Each person will, therefore, choose to act in accordance with his/her experiencing. But individual choice will be determined by *all* relevant conditions that exist<sup>1</sup>.

The conscious mind and the underlying notion that behaviour is a function of personal choice, or free will, are, in sum, important foundations upon which Rogers' (1959), theory of personality builds.

Stating that most experience is conscious, Rogers postulates the existence of a phenomenal field in which individual

---

<sup>1</sup> This brings us to the outstanding issue of determinism versus freedom and the possible evaluation of Rogers' theory on the basis of whether it subscribes to the kind of approach most consistent with well established scientific inquiry procedures. To some authors (e.g. Nye, 1975), the existing paradox between free will and determinism has no reason for being in this context. In Rogers' theory the individual is free to act but he or she will take a particular course of action because, in the presence of all available stimuli, certain behaviours will be more satisfying than others (both from the subjective and objective points of view). This being the case, then the issue would be one of free will plus determinism. Rogers himself has referred to the usefulness of both assumptions stating that determinism is of vital importance in the scientific analysis of behaviour while the notion of freedom remains a necessary condition for effective and interpersonal functioning.

experience operates. To Rogers, the world of the infant is its own experiencing. In other words, the infant's reality is what it experiences. Emphasizing the positiveness of human nature [see also Goldstein (1940), and Maslow (1962)], Rogers (1959) postulates that each infant will develop, within the world of its organism, a tendency toward *self-actualization*. Such tendency, positive and additive by nature, constitutes the individual's basic motivational force in the path to personal growth and fulfilment. The *organismic valuing process*, which acts in this setting, will serve to direct each individual's behaviour to the goal of his/her own self-actualization.

### **The development of self-concept, positive regard and self-regard**

Rogers asserts that, as the child grows, the actualizing tendency will lead to the differentiation and refinement of experience (cf. Bavelas, 1978). As the child's awareness of his own being starts to unfold, and as a clearer picture of his/her functioning begins to develop, a so called sense of *self* begins to evolve. This process is, according to Rogers (1959), dynamic and greatly dependent upon individual perception of experience. It comprises perceived experiences of the individual's own being and functioning within his/her environment. One's own perception of experience is, therefore, a necessary condition for the development of the *self-concept*. Because the child begins to see him/herself as being important in the phenomenal world, individual awareness of the self becomes differentiated from the remainder of individual experiencing.

There is a self within each person's existing phenomenal field. This concept is of such importance to Rogers that his theory is often referred to as «*self theory*» (Bavelas, 1978).

But, according to Rogers (1959), individual perception of experience is also influenced by one's own need for *positive regard*. This is so because, as one's awareness of the self grows,

it becomes important to determine how the self is being valued by others.

In Rogers theory, the need for positive regard constitutes a second motivational force which may compete with, or even override, the actualizing motive. Eventually, when positive regard from others becomes independent and incorporated into the self (e.g. the teacher thinks I'm smart, therefore «I'm smart») *self-regard* is experienced. In this case, the individual will come to evaluate the self after he perceives others as evaluating it. In Corsini's perspective, self-regard is «a learned sense of self based on... [the person's]... perception of the regard he has received from others... [Self-regard]... becomes a pervasive construct influencing the whole of the organism... [It]... has a life of its own, independent of actual experiences of regard from others» (1979, 143).

### **The development of conditions of worth**

Since the individual tends to strive for experiences which yield esteem from significant others, the development of *conditions of worth* becomes a natural consequence of the need for positive regard. Conditions of worth may be referred to as contingencies which must be met in order for positive regard to occur. This means that one's own worth can be determined by introjected values. The individual «becomes, in a sense, his own significant social other» (Rogers 1959, 224).

Although inevitable in the course of human development, Rogers contends that conditions of worth can be damaging because, as the individual strives to maintain self-regard, he/she develops a tendency to think, feel and act in certain ways. As such, the person's self-regard system will begin to incorporate discriminations between those experiences which are worthy of regard from significant others and those which are not. In this way, certain self-experiences may be excluded from the organism's repertoire even though they may have

actualizing value through their relevance to the organismic valuing process.

Values, thoughts, feelings and actions which are not accepted by significant others become unworthy of the person's regard and, as such, tend to be excluded from the self-concept so that self-regard is maintained. In this sense, behaviours which are not organismically experienced as satisfying may still be regarded positively by the person. Conversely, the individual may regard other behaviours negatively, even though they are not personally experienced as unsatisfying. When the person acts in accordance with introjected values, he/she is considered as having acquired conditions of worth (Bavelas 1978).

### **Conflict between self-regard and organismic needs: implications for the actualizing tendency**

It follows that a conflict may develop between self-regard needs (now impregnated by conditions of worth) and basic organismic needs. But this doesn't imply that the actualizing tendency will shatter as conditions of worth develop in the self-regard system (Rogers, 1959).

The actualizing tendency still remains the individual's basic motivational force. The individual in effect has the choice of acting either in accordance with his/her organismic urgings or in accordance with learned conditions of worth. If the individual behaves in accordance with the latter, a need for the maintenance of positive regard is reflected. That is, the person's need for self-regard overpowers his/her organismic needs.

«At these choice points... [the individual]... may come to believe that his organismic urges are bad and contrary to his being a good person, and, therefore, contrary to his self-actualization» (Corsini 1979, 144). As such, the individual may come to distort or deny reality in order to satisfy interiorized



conditions of worth, notwithstanding the fact that organismic urges do not cease upon being denied to awareness:

«Experiences which are in accord with conditions of worth are perceived and symbolized accurately in awareness. Experiences which run contrary to conditions of worth are perceived selectively and distorted as if in accord with the conditions of worth, or are, in part or whole, denied to awareness» (Rogers 1959, 226).

That is, the individual either relates, or keeps entirely from awareness, those feelings and behaviours that threaten his/her self-regard. «The individual begins to perceive selectively and drives a wedge of incongruence between self and experience» (Bavelas, 1978, p. 68).

#### **Incongruent and congruent functioning**

A state of *incongruence* develops between the self and experience whenever the individual's perception of his/her experience is distorted or denied. Rogers has suggested that the alienation of the self from natural organismic experiencing is the «basic estrangement of conscious man» and that such estrangement begins when conditional self-regard is experienced. Not being part of man's nature, the estrangement of conscious man from his directional organismic process «... is learned, and learned to an especially high degree in Western Civilization. The satisfaction or fulfillment of the actualizing tendency has become bifurcated into incompatible behavior systems. This dissociation which exists in most of us is the pattern and basis of all psychological pathology in man» (Rogers, cited in Corsini 1979, 144).

Experiences which disagree with the person's concept of self are regarded as a threat. The accurate symbolization of such experiences in one's awareness interferes with the make up of the self-concept by contradicting incorporated conditions of worth. Thus, those actions and thoughts that violate previous

conditions of worth will precipitate states of *anxiety* which only such defense mechanisms as rationalization, projection or fantasy can reduce.

Defense mechanisms have the effect of either distorting or denying experience. They serve the function of maintaining the individual's consistent perception of self. Even normal human beings maintain self-regard by blaming others, by denying their fantasies or by imagining better outcomes. It is important to note that, whereas man is not, by nature, rigid in his perceptions, rigidity of perception should, nevertheless, occur whenever the need arises to defend against accurate perception of experiences which contradict existing conditions of worth (cf. Corsini, 1979).

When the self-concept becomes incongruent, the implication is that a state of incongruence will also develop between the self-actualizing tendency and more basic actualizing needs, each of which will work at crosspurpose from the other. This is so because the actualization of the incongruent self is no longer in keeping with the actualization of the organism in that self-actualization toward some introjected value may not be in keeping with one (or more) of the person's basic needs (Rogers, 1959).

As the person loses freedom of choice based on the totality of his/her own inner experiencing, serious psychological problems (e.g. psychosis) can result. The inner beacon (the organismic valuing process) no longer signals the path to actualization. Such maladjustments can, however, be overcome should *congruent* functioning be restored (Rogers, 1966). It implies the revision of the self-concept in the direction of greater consistency with one's own organismic experiencing (Nye, 1975).

### Link between self theory and client-centered therapy

Rogers' client-centered therapy is a form of intervention aimed at the incongruent self. It purports to restore congruent functioning through the correction of existing discrepancies between the experiencing organism and the concept of self. Rogers non-directive therapy is, therefore, concerned with solving problems arising from the alienation of the person from his/her organismic experiencing and organismic valuing process.

Intervention becomes necessary when the individual disfunctions as a unified, integrated being.

In the therapeutic setting, the client is encouraged to risk awareness of previously distorted or denied organismic experiences. In an atmosphere of empathic, non-judgemental understanding, where unconditional positive regard is of the essence, the individual should come to incorporate previously denied urges or feelings into his/her concept of self. As Corsini puts it, ideally, in the course of therapy, «the individual exchanges his conditions of worth for a trust and valuing of the wisdom of his developing organism in its entirety» (1979, 145).

In effect, the adverse influence of social norms and standards, to which the person is subjected as a result of the need to maintain positive regard and self-regard, is overcome by the unfolding discovery of one's inner experiencing. Such congruence, in the therapeutic process, is achieved primarily through *unconditional positive regard*, an important construct in Rogerean psychology (Rogers, 1966).

Through unconditional positive regard, the client is prized for «what he/she is or may become» (Nye 1975, 95). That is, the person's full range of self-experiences is valued equally, with no conditions of worth imposed. The client will perceive that the whole of his/her self-experience (values, feelings, thoughts, drives, sensations...) is equally worthy of positive regard from significant others, in this case the therapist. The reasoning is that, as the person is accepted and prized,

he/she is valued unconditionally<sup>2</sup>. As such, it is no longer necessary to distort or deny specific aspects of one's own experiencing in order to acquire and maintain positive regard from significant others. The full range of the person's experiencing is now within the reach of his/her awareness<sup>3</sup>.

At this point the individual begins to choose and decide on the basis of inner evaluations of the gestalt of existing factors, both internal and external, including considerations about the social consequences of behaviour. This happens, according to Rogers (1959), because the enhancement of the self incorporates the effects of one's behaviours on social others.

### Other attitudinal conditions which facilitate clinical personality changes

Rogers has formulated two other general attitudinal conditions which he believes important for bringing about clinical personality changes: *Therapist's congruence* and *sensitively accurate empathic understanding*.

In order to meet the first condition, the therapist must show harmony and consistency between what he/she feels and what is communicated to the client. In the therapeutic setting, the therapist does not mask his/her feelings behind set professional roles. Feelings that relate to the actual interaction are

---

<sup>2</sup> Unconditional positive regard is not an all-or-nothing concept in the absolute sense of the term. It exists to greater and lesser extents in interpersonal relationships. One may never experience total acceptance or prize. Unconditional positive regard can, however, be increased — specially in therapeutic relationships.

<sup>3</sup> As a person is accepted or prized, it is possible not to value his/her values equally. In fact, expressions of displeasure are not uncommon, but the behaviour which causes them should not be made to interfere with the significant others' overall 'love' for the person, nor with the acceptance of the individual's feelings.

conveyed in an open, consistent, and genuine manner. This is to facilitate the creation of an atmosphere of warmth and acceptance in which the client can overcome fears of feeling or acting according to his/her self experiences (Rogers, 1966).

*Empathic understanding* also contributes greatly to the creation of an atmosphere of warmth and acceptance as the client realizes that the therapist understands his/her feelings and concerns. As the empathic and congruent therapist unconditionally accepts the client, the conditions for facilitating increasingly closer contact with the latter's organismic experiencing have been realized (Rogers, 1966).

As a mere facilitator of congruent functioning, the therapist will not dictate, but tentatively suggest, so that the final judgement may ultimately rest with the client.

There remains no doubt that the main responsibility in the process of client-centered therapy rests with the client. The desired outcome of client-centered therapy is the development of a more fully functioning person, one which will progress from the rigidity of incongruence to the degree of sensitivity which characterizes total experiencing and functioning (Rogers, 1951; 1966).

### **Beyond individual-type therapy situations**

Although the core of self theory relates primarily to client-centered therapy, Rogers' concerns transcend individual-type therapy situations. Since 1940, Rogers has been progressively interested in how people relate to themselves and others in settings of intense interaction. His emphasis has been on the facilitation of deeper and more meaningful interpersonal relationships as a means of providing for greater individual functioning. But, regardless of whether Rogers' contributions are seen from the standpoint of *encounter groups*, or in the perspective of the dynamics of *intimate relationships* (Rogers, 1972), the fundamental ideas behind his one-to-one

type therapy approach are still present. This is also the case of *student-centered teaching*, where the primary focus of the learning process is placed upon the student (Rogers, 1967, 1969, 1971 a,b.).

The widening of Rogers' interests, from individual to interpersonal areas of human experiencing, is consistent with the phenomenological nature of self theory — which is also concerned with the person's view of the world. The potential for combining the personal and social dimensions in a setting where the self and the world count the most is obviously great. In a sense, the theorist is free to emphasize one or the other of these dimensions, as he/she sees fit.

Interpersonal settings have been primarily established to improve the level of functioning of the so called fully functioning person (which, in most cases, does not function to potential).

*Group therapy* situations have also been used on occasion to meet the collective needs of persons with more serious problems of alienation from natural experiencing. Still, as in individual-type situations, group therapy evolves from a climate of mutual acceptance and empathic understanding.

It should be said that Rogers has never been overly confident about the possibilities offered by intensive group interactions, even though he contends that they can lead to increased awareness of inner experiencing and to the development of more fully satisfying interpersonal relations (Nye, 1975).

These interactions are mainly suggested as a means of reducing interpersonal and intergroup conflicts in areas such as government, schools, and families.

### **Education**

Of even greater impact have been, perhaps, Rogers' contemporary views on education and educational practice. His approach places primary emphasis upon the facilitation



of affective experiences aimed at the total involvement of the student in the learning process. Rogers stresses the need to create an emotional climate in the classroom consistent with his envisioned freedom to learn approach. His ideas in this respect are clearly borrowed from client-centered therapy (Snelbecker, 1974).

Rogers aims at the total emotional involvement of the student in the learning process and, as such, parts with conventional structured learning which, to him, implies controlled instances of reinforcement or, at best, guided discovery or purely cognitive learning (Rogers, 1967).

At the root of Rogers' views on education lies the notion that real and meaningful learning involves self-discovery, self-appropriation and self-initiation. Learning is subjective and experiential. In this sense, personal significance as well as emotional and cognitive relevance become necessary for personal involvement in the process of learning (Rogers, 1969).

To Rogers, meaningful learning can only occur if it totally involves the student as a person who seeks enhancement and self-actualization. Such supportive learning evolves from natural motivation and is facilitated by an emotionally supportive climate which serves to cushion the effects of any changes in self-structure brought about by the integration of new information and ideas as part of the student's perceptual world. In this sense, the real concern shifts from the organization of subject-matter to the facilitation of the kind of experiences likely to yield positive changes in one's total functioning (Rogers, 1967; 1969).

Rogers nurtures the assumption that experiential learning is attained only to the extent that the student is actively involved in the learning experience. Implicit in this assumption is the belief that students will only learn effectively those things which are of personal relevance to them. But a need for the self-evaluation of experience can also be sensed in Rogers' assumption. In fact, Rogers clearly states that experiential learning will be facilitated and creative learning realized

«when self-criticism and self-evaluation are basic and evaluation by others is of secondary importance» (Rogers 1969, 163).

It is relevant to note that, as Rogers progresses from his basic assumptions to the discussion of means for facilitating experiential learning, he becomes somewhat eclectic in his views about instruction (Snelbecker, 1974). Provisions ranging from student's choice in extent of structure to a special instance of contracting, in which grades are used as a reward, perhaps reflect Rogers' realization that students differ in their ability to respond to the type of non-directive approach which he proposes (Rogers, 1969).

### Concluding comment

It would be unfair to dismiss the relevance of Rogers' contributions to the furtherance of knowledge in the field of human behaviour. Rogers has perhaps contributed more than any other psychologist to the sustenance of existing interest in the concept of self, which ascribes to the qualities of man.

Whereas psychoanalysis insistently points out man's irrationalities, client-centered therapy empathically asserts the importance of the individual as a person who is naturally oriented towards growth and fulfilment of basic potentialities. In this respect, Rogers gives a ray of hope to mankind when, traditionally, the tendency has been to dwell on the malleability of man or to explore his darker aspects (Nye, 1975).

Even though some psychologists (Bavelas, 1978) emphasize the need to empirically test Rogers' theory in accordance with the objective requirements of the logic of science, the fact remains that there is no one path to scientific truth. To this extent, Rogers' contention that personal and scientific knowledge can best be acquired through a variety of perspectives and techniques reflects the underlying notion that the full range of human abilities (subjective, empathic and objective) may «legitimately» be applied in the pursuit of knowledge.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAVELAS, J.B. (1978). *Personality: Current theory and research*. Monterey California, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- CORSINI, R.J. (1979). *Current psychotherapies*. Itasca, Illinois, F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- NYE, R.D. (1975). *Three views of man*. Monterey, California, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- GOLDSTEIN, K. (1940). *Human nature in the light of psychopathology*. Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- MASLOW, A.H. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, New Jersey, D. Van Nostrand.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1972). *Grupos de encontro*. Lisboa, Moraes Editores.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1971). Can schools grow persons. *Educational Leadership*, 29, 215-217 (a).
- ROGERS, C.R. (1971). Forget you are a teacher. *Instructor*, 81, 65-66 (b).
- ROGERS, C.R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1967). The facilitation of significant learning. In L. Spiegel (Ed.). *Instruction: Some contemporary viewpoints*. San Francisco, Chandler.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1966). Client-centered therapy. In S. Arieti (Ed.), *American Handbook of psychiatry*. New York, Basic Books.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client centered framework. In S. Kosh (Ed.). *Psychology: a study of Science* (vol. 3). New York, McGraw-Hill.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin.
- ROGERS, C.R. (1942). *Counselling and psychotherapy: newer concepts in practice*. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin.
- SNELBECKER, G.E. (1974). *Learning theory, instructional theory and psychoeducational design*. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company.