

16. The Humanists: Maslow and Rogers

Copyright © James S. Fleming, Ph.D.

The science of psychology has been far more successful on the negative than on the positive side; it has revealed to us much about man's shortcomings, his illnesses, his sins, but little about his potentialities, his virtues, his achievable aspirations, or his psychological height. It is as if psychology had voluntarily restricted itself to only half its rightful jurisdiction, and that the darker, meaner half.

-Abraham Maslow¹

I have found that the more that I can be genuine in the relationship, the more helpful it will be. This means that I need to be aware of my own feelings, in so far as possible, rather than presenting an outward façade of one attitude, while actually holding another attitude at a deeper or unconscious level. Being genuine also involves the willingness to be and to express . . . the various feelings and attitudes which exist within me. It is only in this way that the relationship can have reality . . . It seems extremely important to be real.

-Carl Rogers²

I. Abraham Maslow

Peak Experiences

Abraham Maslow is remembered for his many contributions to psychology. Most students learn about his hierarchy of needs in their first psychology course, even, perhaps, in a high school class, and the notion of self-actualization, though not uniquely associated with Maslow, is probably as strongly tied to his name as it is to any other theorist – the possible exceptions being Kurt Goldstein and Carl Rogers. Both of these concepts are considered in due course. But in addition to these, Maslow's (e.g., 1964) concept of the peak experience was and remains one of his most intriguing contributions.

Peak experiences are what they sound like: Something out of the ordinary happens to a person that transcends everyday experience, which leaves a long-lasting and perhaps permanent impression in one's mind. These experiences are characterized by a sense of wonder or of awe. By definition, such experiences occur rarely for most people, yet most if not all people have had them at least once or twice in their lives; although Maslow believed that peak experiences are more common among truly self-actualized people.

A peak experience can be (and often is) one that the perceiver describes as "spiritual," a word that seems to trouble psychologists because it is very hard to define in any objective way. Because such an objective definition is difficult, perhaps some examples will be helpful. The following are descriptions of peak experiences of children, taken from Hoffmann (1992), which describe childhood experiences of a spiritual nature as later recalled by adults.

Example 1: The Wonder of Nature. At age 13 Elaine took an automobile trip with her parents through the Canadian Maritime province of New Brunswick. She was riding in the back seat of her parents' car with her younger brother and sister, who were dozing as her parents were talking to one another in the front of the car. Elaine relates that "I suddenly saw a wide river opening up into a seemingly infinite bay or ocean. The scene's grandeur overwhelmed me. The surprising and dramatic expanse of water reminded me of infinity, of the universe, and of God ... It was an intense and unforgettable moment, but I also experienced a sense of insignificance as a human. I was attracted to the scene by its awesome beauty and simplicity" (Hoffman, 1992, pp. 26 – 27).

But Elaine's further comments seem even more remarkable: "The seeds of my entire outlook on life were planted within me that day...Remembering it still gives me a sense of life's harmony and fulfillment: how life flows naturally to its end, to join in Infinity. The Eternal Presence is always with us." (p. 27).

Elaine further related that: "In retrospect, I only wish that I had shared my thoughts with my parents and siblings, and not felt superior to them because of my experience" (p. 27). But one must

realize that such experiences are seldom shared. It is not so much that it is selfish to keep a peak experience to oneself, but rather it is simply that relating such experiences can at best be appreciated second-hand, and then only by someone who has themselves had peak experiences of their own.

But peak experiences are not always ecstatic; they can arise from harrowing experiences as well, as in the next case.

Example 2: A Near Drowning. Ellen recalled a childhood event at a beach. A very good swimmer, she nonetheless was caught in an undertow which pushed her a lot farther out than she had ever gone before. Only after the second time she was dragged away from the shore did she begin to panic, and to attempt to swim away from the flow as hard as she could.

“...I got scared as I realized that I was in real trouble and there was no one around to save me...I was getting more and more frightened, but I hadn’t panicked yet, probably because I felt that I was such a good swimmer. Suddenly I went under and stayed under longer than I had before, and then I panicked. I was frantic. I felt myself thrashing with fear, and then suddenly I distinctly heard a voice inside me saying, ‘Why don’t you just relax and let the waves carry you? It’s safe.’ The voice had no age or gender...I felt as if – and this will sound strange – the water were talking to me, telling me what to do. Maybe it was a higher wisdom inside myself I felt strongly that if I followed the advice, I would be all right. At the same moment I lost my fear of death: I felt that beneath the rolling waves, which has a kind of violence to them, there was an underlying calm and gentleness...What happened was that I ended up going toward the rocks, and then someone saw me and yanked me in. My body got cut by the rocks, but I didn’t even feel the pain while I was in the water” (Hoffman, 1992, p. 75).

Ellen felt that this was a truly important and meaningful experience in her life. Years later when she was dealing with many tough personal issues as an adult the psychological feeling of “drowning” (in personal problems) came over her, and that is when the message “*Let the waves carry you. It’s safe*” came back over her once again. This message became a kind of mantra for Ellen

that she used to find calmness in her life whenever she found herself in the midst of “a sea of troubles.”

Catching the perfect wave while surfing on a bright summer morning, feeling the magnificence of a sunrise or sunset, or just an overwhelming feeling of being in touch with nature or with one’s deepest self; these are other examples of peak experiences. People sometimes report religious experiences as profoundly affecting them and even changing their lives; hence, these qualify as peak experiences. But Maslow himself, though certainly a spiritual person, was not at all religious in a conventional sense. He believed in no higher being or God, which may strike some people as strangely incongruent, given Maslow’s almost mystical depictions of people’s peak experiences. Yet perhaps this isn’t so strange, given Maslow’s childhood history.

Maslow: A Brief Biography³

Some aspects of Maslow’s past are especially interesting. One is the fact that he became a great success in his field despite a very unhappy childhood during which he lacked parental support, but especially from his mother. Another is how his early interest in behaviorism seems almost to contradict his later humanistic views; yet Maslow found no contradiction between these two tendencies. Still another is the sheer number of illustrious names in psychology that Maslow came to know in the course of his education and in his later years as a psychologist. His views were shaped to a great extent by many of these relationships. The psychologists he was exposed to could comprise a “Who’s Who” of important names in the field who were working in the United States during Maslow’s lifetime – and a great many of these were refugees from Nazi Germany. Despite these many influence on Maslow, his own psychology was ultimately the product of a very independent mind.

Maslow was born in 1908 in New York City of Russian-Jewish immigrant parents and grew up in Brooklyn. He recalled his father as being distant during his early years, but described his mother as downright cruel and sadistic, as well as selfish and narcissistic, and

reported that he kept his sanity only because of the influence of a kindly maternal uncle (Hoffman, 1988). In high school and beyond his cousin, Wil Maslow, became a close comrade and another source of social support. But as a child his mother constantly threatened him that God's wrath would strike him down if he did not toe the line. It does not seem surprising, then, that Maslow rejected religion and became an atheist while only a boy.

In high school Maslow was shy and studious, though he was involved in athletics. Because of his bleak childhood his self-esteem was low and he was also subject to depression. But reading the muckraking author Upton Sinclair inspired him and inclined him toward social activism.

In college he began studying law to please his parents, but did not stay with this field. In a brief stay at Cornell University, Maslow took a psychology course with the structuralist, Edward B. Titchener. By this time Titchener's structuralism had declined in influence in psychology; indeed, Titchener was viewed as a relic by many. Yet he stuck to his views and lectured in full academic regalia, as befit the old school European professorial ideal – but unfortunately for Titchener, such formality was viewed as pompous posturing by most Americans.

Maslow became very interested in behaviorism, inspired by the writings of John B. Watson. At the University of Wisconsin he studied psychology under the influence of the comparative psychologist Harry Harlow, known for his research on primate development. Later he worked with E. L. Thorndike at Columbia University. After completing his doctorate at Wisconsin he found a teaching job at Brooklyn College where he met a number of influential psychodynamic psychologists, including Alfred Adler, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan, and Erich Fromm. Adler was a particularly strong influence on Maslow with his optimistic (especially in comparison to Freud) outlook on humanity, which included an emphasis on altruism and compassion. He was also in sympathy with Fromm because of the latter's social concerns. Maslow was impressed with socialism, whereas Fromm was taken with Marxism. Like Watson and many other social scientists of the times – including B. F. Skinner – Maslow saw the positive side of progressivism; specifically he held the view that science (and

16-5

scientific psychology) could be applied to improve the human condition.

Later, teaching at Brandeis University, he met Kurt Goldstein, who introduced him to his concept of self-actualization. Goldstein held holistic views of human behavior. His studies of brain damaged patients and their lack of wholeness taught him a lot about what it meant to be human. Goldstein was one of the most important influences on Maslow's own developing conceptions of a humanistic psychology.

Maslow was also influenced by the Gestalt school of psychology, which emphasized the "wholeness" aspect of experience, but especially in perception. Maslow knew and was greatly influenced by Max Wertheimer, and studied briefly with Kurt Koffka, both very well-known Gestaltists. Like many important German scientists, these men immigrated to the United States after Hitler came into power. (Gestalt psychology is not to be confused with Fritz Perls and his Gestalt school of psychotherapy. Maslow was actually quite unfavorably impressed with Perls.) Maslow also got to know the renowned cultural anthropologists Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead through Horney's institute in New York.

Maslow died in 1962 of a heart attack while living in semi-retirement in California. He had, unfortunately, suffered ill health for many years prior to his death.

On Humanism

Maslow called Humanism the "third force in psychology because he saw behaviorism as the dominant force in academic psychology for much of the early and mid twentieth century, and psychoanalysis as a second influential force. He viewed both of these movements as *reductionistic*. Behaviorism reduced human understanding to the study of overt behavior in response to environmental stimuli and specifically excluded the study of consciousness and internal states (e.g., needs, motives, values). Moreover, the radical behaviorists such as Skinner who emphasized determinism saw no place for choice in human

behavior. And psychoanalysis saw behavior as controlled by unconscious forces that are largely beyond human control. By contrast, humanism concerned itself more with the conscious mind and with choices influenced by personal values and intentions. In other words, humanism attempted to put the person, as usually conceived, back into psychology.

In the late 1950s Maslow and Clark Moustakas convened invitational conferences to found the American Association for Humanistic Psychology (AHP). Among those participating were Gordon Allport, J. F. T. Bugental, Charlotte Buhler, Maslow, Rollo May, Gardner Murphy, Henry Murray, and Carl Rogers; and notably Maslow, Rogers, and May remained the leading figures in humanistic psychology (AHP, 2001). Reflecting Maslow's views on human nature, "Humanistic psychology...holds a hopeful, constructive view of human beings and of their substantial capacity to be self-determining [Humanistic psychology stresses] choice, creativity, the interaction of the body, mind, and spirit, and the capacity to become more aware, free, responsible, life-affirming and trustworthy" (AHP, 2001). As will be seen shortly, the striving after these values can be summed up in a word: Self-actualization. Maslow's views on self-actualization are best understood in the context of his hierarchy of needs and also by his psychobiographical studies of self-actualized people, which comprise the next two major sections.

Kurt Goldstein and Organismic Psychology

In the holistic health movement the focus is on treating the whole person rather than the specific symptom. Kurt Goldstein (1978 – 1965), a German-Jewish psychiatrist who immigrated to the United States in 1934 to escape anti-Semitism in Europe, learned to view all organisms holistically. Through his studies of brain-damaged veterans of the First World War he observed that aphasia (inability to speak correctly), due to an injury to one part of the brain, disrupted the cohesiveness of the entire personality. He found that aphasics lost some of their abilities to think logically

and abstractly, and consequently they often suffered mental breakdowns from their frustrations in attempting to cope with the environment. Only through time and training could victims learn to compensate for this loss.

From these studies Goldstein came to understand the extent to which the organism cannot be conceived as bundles of separately functioning parts. Each part of the brain is not an isolated unit with a specific function but depends upon its interactions and connectedness with the rest of the brain; and indeed, with the whole of the biological organism. This is the basis of *organismic psychology*, and Goldstein – though not the only organismic psychologist – was its most noteworthy advocate⁴. His conclusions anticipate modern neuropsychological findings that no area of the brain is completely localized in its functionality.

Goldstein's organismic approach stresses the unity and integration of the whole organism as a complete biological entity. Goldstein believed that even a local spinal reflex cannot be understood as an isolated mechanism. And a psychology built upon a series of reflexive associations (i.e., the associationism of Locke and his descendents, the behaviorists) could never completely explain thought or behavior. Hence organismic theory stands in sharp contrast to such atomistic or reductionistic views. It is rather more consistent with the position of the Gestaltists (though Goldstein thought that Gestalt psychology was limited by its focus on mainly perception and consciousness). Goldstein certainly agreed with the Gestalt position that "the whole is more than the sum of the parts." Goldstein's ideas were important influences on both the Gestaltists and the humanists.

For Goldstein the single over-riding motive for all human behavior was self-actualization – an organismic (or holistic) motive – or "...the organic principle by which the organism becomes more fully developed and complete" (Hall, Lindzey, & Campbell, 1997). Maslow admired Goldstein's ideas and hired him to teach at Brandeis University in the 1950s while chair of the psychology department. It is from Goldstein that Maslow derived his own ideas about self-actualization, though his formulation was

somewhat different. Indeed, Goldstein's concept is in actuality closer to that of Carl Rogers.

Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow (1943; 1970) classified human needs into a hierarchical category (Figure 16.1). The needs closer to the base of his pyramid are the most basic survival needs, which are also physiological needs, such as the need for nutrients (food), for water, for oxygen, and for sleep and rest, and for the elimination of wastes. He also included the need to reproduce, or sex, in this category. All of these needs must be met as a minimum in order to simply exist as individuals and as a species.

Closely tied to these basic needs are the needs for safety, security and for shelter, found at the next level. In today's society these needs would include having a residence (as opposed to being transient or homeless), living in a safe neighborhood, perhaps having health and medical insurance, and maybe even some degree of job and pension security.

At the third level from the bottom of the hierarchy or the belonging and love (or social) needs. These include the need for family and friends, love and companionship, and a sense of community. For some people these needs are fulfilled in part by membership in a club, a church or synagogue, a fraternity or sorority, and so on.

At the next level come the esteem needs. Maslow actually divided this level into two tiers, or sub-levels. At the first was the need for esteem from others (reputation), which includes recognition, respect, status, dignity, perhaps deference, or even simple attention. Maslow included the need for self-esteem, and especially of self-respect, at a second or higher level. (Note that personal achievements and accomplishments may impact both of these levels.) Maslow's concept is that the lowest order of needs (toward the bottom of the pyramid) must be satisfied before the higher needs can be properly met. It is hard to experience self-esteem, for example, if you one has no place to live. But all of the needs encountered so far Maslow termed *deficiency or D-needs*,

because without them people are incomplete and unsatisfied. He also claimed that these deficiency needs were *instinctoid*, or instinct-like (Maslow did not think that humans were as strongly motivated by instincts as were other mammals).

At the highest level Maslow placed the need for self-actualization, which he called *being or B-needs* (or alternatively, *metaneeds*). In other words, once all of one's basic needs are satisfied one can endeavor to satisfy even higher human needs which are more intrinsically (internally) motivated and less tied to external desires.

Maslow believed that only a small number of people (about two percent) of the population are truly self-actualized. Self-actualizers embrace *B-values*, which include those values listed in Table 16.1.

Maslow believed that the needs at one level must be at least partially satisfied before one could attend to the needs at the next highest level. If a person's safety needs are not adequately met, for instance, he or she is unlikely to be able to make much headway in satisfying interpersonal needs. There are obvious exceptions, however. Consider as an example a woman who excels technically in her field and who thus receives more than adequate recognition for her work (esteem needs), but who is quite frustrated with her lack of social success (belongingness and love needs). Indeed, achievement at her job might at least partially compensate for her lack of success in the personal sphere.

Maslow also realized that a person could be "stuck" at a lower level in the hierarchy (cf., Freudian fixation). Thus a hoarding tendency might develop in a person who had difficulty obtaining food as a youth.

Characteristics of Self-Actualized People

In order to study self-actualization Maslow (1950) conducted biographical studies (case studies) of the lives of famous people that he believed were self-actualizers. Some of these people were alive at the time Maslow studied them, others were historical figures. Examples included Albert Einstein, Eleanor Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, Jane Adams, Harriet Tubman, William James,

and Henry David Thoreau. He also studied some people who were not well-known whom he believed to be self-actualizers.



Figure 16.1: Maslow's hierarchy of needs pyramid.

Based on these studies Maslow concluded that self-actualizing people shared some common characteristics. But it is important to note that not all of these people share all of these traits, and also that many people who are not self-actualized in Maslow's sense may exhibit some of these traits. These caveats should be kept in mind while considering these characteristics.

A Listing of the Characteristics of Self-Actualized People

In addition to the tendency to have more peak experiences, Maslow also recognized these characteristics of self-actualized people.

Table 16.1
Values (or Metaneeds) of Self-Actualized People (Maslow, 1950)

- Truth (versus falseness)
 - Beauty (versus vulgarity)
 - Goodness (versus evil)
 - Wholeness or unity (versus disintegration)
 - Aliveness (versus ennui)
 - Uniqueness (versus sameness)
 - Perfection (versus haphazardness)
 - Completion (versus incompleteness)
 - Justice (versus injustice)
 - Simplicity (versus unneeded complexity)
 - Richness (versus impoverishment)
 - Playfulness (versus lack of spontaneity)
 - Effortlessness (versus strain)
 - Self-sufficiency (versus dependency)
 - Meaningfulness (versus senselessness)
-
- ***Reality centered:*** Self-actualized people see reality for what it is and are not easily taken in by phoniness or inauthenticity. They are also more comfortable than most in the presence of doubt or of ambiguity.

- ***Acceptance of self, others, and nature:*** They accept their shortcomings as well as their strengths and they are accepting of others as well. Acceptance of people and nature includes the recognition that everyone grows old and dies.
- ***Problem centered:*** Most people tend to see the problems of others and of the world in terms of themselves and their own problems. In this sense, most people are egocentric. But unlike most others, self-actualized people are more detached and objective; and less concerned with trivial aspects of problems.
- ***Spontaneity, simplicity, and naturalness:*** Self-actualizing people tend to act more in accord with their feelings than in accord with convention. It isn't that they are trying to be unconventional; it is merely that their actions are more natural and unaffected by social trends or a desire for acceptance.
- ***Need for solitude:*** Self-actualizers are comfortable in their own company and can even seem detached. They are comfortable with and by themselves as well as in the company of others, but at times they seek and enjoy solitude.
- ***Autonomy.*** By autonomy Maslow meant a resistance to the forces of the external environment, including one's culture. As one example, self-actualized people are not greatly influenced by the latest cultural trends or fads. Thus it follows as well that they also have . . .
- ***Resistance to enculturation:*** Self-actualizers are not aloof (though to some they may seem so) but they are not really anti-social. But they do tend to be independent-minded and are less likely to be influenced by particular cultural mores and practices. They are often social activists who are interested in improving cultural conditions rather than by following the norms of a particular culture or society.

- ***Freshness of appreciation:*** Self-actualized people can see the simple wonders of life and nature with a profound sense of awe – and this applies to not only to new experiences but to familiar ones as well, whether it's enjoying the garden or viewing a flame-red sunset.
- ***Gemeinschaftsgefühl:*** This German word was used by Alfred Adler to connote a sense of social interest or of community. It implies identification with humanity and a sense of compassion toward others. No small thing, this idea!
- ***Depth of interpersonal relations:*** While compassionate and nurturing (*Gemeinschaftsgefühl*), self-actualized people also tend to have very deep relationships with a few people, rather than a number of shallow relationships with many people.
- ***Democracy:*** Given that self-actualizers tend to be compassionate it isn't any surprise, then, that they are also accepting of people of many different backgrounds (today's word is *diversity*). They tend to be accepting of surface differences, and of differences based on ethnicity or culture, and focus instead on what we as people from different backgrounds have in common – our humanity!
- ***Different means-ends perception:*** Self-actualizing people usually have a very discriminating sense of ethics. They have a very clear idea of right and wrong, and therefore do not believe that “the end justifies the means.” There are many different ways of putting this (e.g., “two wrongs don't make a right”), but the essence of the argument is that it is wrong in general to commit a crime or unethical act in order to justify the greater good.
- ***Philosophical humor:*** Self-actualizers tend to have a sense of humor that does not denigrate others or by implication involve a laugh at someone else's expense. They do not relate to put-downs. But they can often find humor in the foibles of human

beings in general, including some of the absurdities in life, or occasionally they may laugh at their own foolish “mistakes” – but without denigrating themselves.

- **Creativity:** Maslow implies that self-actualizers are creative almost by definition. Virtually all of the famous self-actualizing people (as well as the ones who did not achieve fame) were creative in some aspect of life: Art, politics and statesmanship, writing, architecture, and so on.

Maslow and Human Development

Maslow’s theory, though basically one of human needs, also addresses issues in the development of the self. For Maslow, development unfolds as the challenges in life are met per his hierarchy. Thus people in less developed (third world) cultures may have difficulty getting beyond the basic survival and safety needs. In many parts of the world this is true even today. Yes, *Homo sapiens* is a social species, so it is hard to imagine that at least some of the societal needs are not being met in such cultures. But it is also feasible to suppose that most energy is spent in satisfying needs closer to the lower end of the triangle.

In wealthier and more developed cultures children progress through the two lowest stages within the first year or two, and are already learning to satisfy some of their basic social needs while still in toddlerhood. In the main, esteem needs come later – most strongly in adolescence and later life.

Development in humans, Maslow believed, is in response to inner urgings. These urgings are usually deficiency drives, corresponding to the first four levels of his hierarchy, but they can also be being drives, but especially in those who have met most of their basic needs.

Maslow saw most adults as centered primarily at the level of esteem needs and not at the higher level of self-actualization. Yet advancing to the self-actualized level is his ideal for development in humankind. These strivings for self-actualization occur most strongly in midlife (cf., Jung’s midlife crisis, Chapter 15). If not

everyone can reach this level, most people can still benefit from the rewards of satisfying at least some of their *B*-needs.

Critique of Maslow

Research on Self-Actualized People

Maslow's theory of needs seems sketchy and his data somewhat incomplete. After all, his studies of self-actualized people were based on a small, selective sample of people that in his own mind were self-actualized. This makes his reasoning seem circular, in that first he decided which people he believed were self-actualized, then he defined this term according to common characteristics that he identified when studying them. There is indeed much that is subjective in Maslow's methodology.

Bias toward Western Values

A related critique is that Maslow's characteristics of self-actualized people are rather heavily weighted toward Western conceptions of individualism (as opposed to non-Western collectivism; see, e.g., Marcus & Kitayama, 1991). Consider, for example, Maslow's criteria of autonomy, solitude, resistance to enculturation, and democracy. Could one not conceive of a non-Western form of self-actualization, or at least one that is weighted less heavily on individualism? What would self-actualization mean to a Taoist or a practitioner of *zazen* (Zen meditation)?

Art versus Science

Maslow, however, recognized the limitations and shortcomings of his work. If psychology can be an art (think of Erikson, Chapter 9) as well as a science, Maslow saw himself more as an artful practitioner. His extensive background in psychology, including his earlier interest in behaviorism, prepared him to recognize and appreciate the more rigorous, scientific side of psychology. But he chose to be an originator, the founder of a movement, who was more concerned with painting broad brushstrokes in his writing

than with exacting detail. Rather, Maslow hoped that others would eventually close the gaps in his theory and fill in these details. Perhaps it is unfortunate that not much further research has been done with either his hierarchy of needs, nor with the studies of the characteristics of self-actualized people.

Hierarchy of Needs

Also, Maslow's notion that, by and large, lower-order needs need to be satisfied before *B*-needs can be addressed seems contrary to fact. For example, Boeree (1998) gives examples of highly creative and productive people who were self-actualized by many of Maslow's criteria yet who suffered from extreme deprivation of *D*-needs – in fact, they were in German concentration camps! Jacow Trachtenberg developed his method of speed mathematics and Viktor Frankl his existential theory of psychology and psychotherapy, both while in this dreadful environment. The bigger issue is whether or not one can function at a higher level in the hierarchy without having lower levels mostly satisfied; common sense might suggest not, yet counterexamples can obviously be found.

Different Conceptions of Self-Actualization

Most psychologists, including Goldstein and Rogers, consider self-actualization to be a striving within all of us that is met to one degree or another. Just as Jung would say that no one ever achieves total realization of the self⁵, most humanists would agree that it is meaningless to talk of becoming completely self-actualized. Maslow's dichotomy separating "self-actualized" people from the rest of us therefore seems rather artificial.

A Perspective on Maslow's Contributions to Psychology

Maslow is rightly remembered as the prime mover in the founding of the school of humanism – psychology's "third force" – and as such he (along with Carl Rogers and others) influenced the field enormously. The humanists shall always be remembered (at least in American psychology) as the people who put the person back into psychology.

Probably Maslow would wish to be remembered mainly as a “big thinker;” a man who brought a certain philosophical perspective to psychology. And this he did. In fact, Maslow was instrumental in carrying his humanistic ideas a step further. In later life he was co-founded what is now being called a “fourth force” in psychology that takes a step beyond humanism into the realm of the esoteric and even mystical. He was one of the leading founders of *transpersonal psychology (TPP)*. TPP, taking its lead from humanistic, Jungian, and existential psychology, began with a study of peak experiences, meditative states, and other forms of what Maslow called *being-states*. But it includes as well a sense of being that transcends or extends beyond the individual self. One definition of TPP offered by Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan (1993) is: “Transpersonal experiences may be defined as experiences in which the sense of identity of self extends beyond (trans) the individual or personal to encompass wider aspects of humankind, life, psyche or cosmos.” Now that’s a big jump from traditional conceptualizations of psychology!

It would be premature to state that TPP is accepted by mainstream psychology (although it traces its origins to William James, who coined the term “transpersonal” over a century ago; (Ryan, 2008), but just as not everyone embraced humanistic psychology at first – it was seen by many as unscientific and outside of the realm of proper study – it may take some time before these ideas are fully accepted by the field⁶. In any case TPP also reflects Maslow’s legacy, and it comprises an important part of his “Big Picture” of psychology.

II. Carl Rogers

Brief Introduction

Rogers’s name is most often associated with his method of therapy (i.e., client-centered therapy). But Rogers was also a researcher who successfully measured self-concept and was among the first to conduct experimental studies on the outcome of methods of therapy. Thus he injected a needed level of rigor into

humanistic psychology. But like Maslow, Rogers was also concerned with the more subjective side of experience, or phenomenology. He was clearly a self-psychologist and like Maslow was concerned with self-actualization, though his conceptualization of the term was slightly different: Rogers believed that all people possess an *actualizing tendency*, which is the innate tendency to grow and develop to fulfill one's inner potential. As with Rousseau (but very unlike Freud) Rogers viewed people as basically "good," and believed that negative social experiences often presented barriers to achieving this potential. Self-actualization was seen by Rogers as more of a process than a state; and as noted in the previous section, Rogers – in contradistinction to Maslow – believed that all of us are striving toward (and achieving some degree of) self-actualization at every point in our development.

As with many other theorists, it can be insightful to see how the development of Rogers' own life influenced his personal beliefs, and how these in turn influenced his theoretical and applied ideas in psychology.

Biographical Background⁷

Rogers was a sensitive and shy boy, raised in the Midwest by very strictly religious parents who stressed the Protestant ethic of hard work. He loved nature and the outdoors, and originally wanted to be a farmer. Following high school he enrolled in an agricultural program at the University of Wisconsin. There he became involved with religious activities on campus. But a trip to China to attend a student religious conference drastically changed Rogers and as a result he became more open in his thinking, and he began to question the strict values of his parents. He became more independent and even more outgoing as a result of this important journey. The China trip indeed proved a broadening experience for Rogers.

He felt that his parents, but especially his mother, were not very attuned to him as a person and they did not understand him and his goals and interests. They were quite Puritanical in their

beliefs and attitudes. Once as a boy his mother whipped him for just talking with a friend about the sexual behavior that they had observed in animals. His father was also stern and unyielding. Rogers was always afraid his parents would make negative judgments about his life and his decisions so as a result he avoided confiding in them about the decisions he made later in life. Given these events it is no wonder Rogers came to recognize the importance of unconditional positive regard later in his career as a psychologist. This was something he never seems to have received in his own childhood.

He attended Union Theological Seminary in New York for a time, but then changed his career course and went into psychology instead, having been influenced by courses he was taking in psychology at the same time at neighboring Columbia University. There he was influenced by the great philosopher John Dewey, among others.

Although he studied Freud he did not warm up to Freudian psychology. He heard Alfred Adler speak and was impressed with him as he shocked the audience by stating that an elaborate case history for patients wasn't necessary for psychotherapy to be successful. He was also influenced by Otto Rank, another breakaway associate of Freud's who went his own way. Rank was a very strong influence on Rogers because he believed that therapy should be a process in which the client grows when nurtured by the therapist's empathetic understanding and unconditional acceptance. These ideas became key to Roger's approach in his own therapy method, at first called *non-directive therapy* (because the therapist did not attempt to advise the client about how to change his or her lifestyle), and later *client-centered therapy*. But Rogers' views were also shaped by extensive practical experience as a clinical psychologist. In his clinical practice he discovered the importance of just *listening* to people's stories, and providing support for the clients' own abilities to make important decisions about their lives. He also learned the importance of being authentic in the therapeutic relationship, or more simply put, of just being "real" himself.

Rogers wrote extensively. Some of his better-known works include his books *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Rogers, 1942),

Client-Centered Therapy (1951), and *On Becoming a Person* (1961). He worked for twelve years following graduation from Columbia at the Rochester Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. He taught and conducted research for a number of years at the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin. He also practiced and taught at other institutions, including the Center for Studies of the Person – an institute he and a group of colleagues founded in California. Rogers received many honors and awards, including the Distinguished Science Contribution award from the American Psychological Association. He died in 1987.

Theory

The Actualizing Tendency

Rogers (1980) believed that there is a tendency for all things in nature to evolve from simpler to more complex forms. He called this process the *formative tendency*. He believed that this formative principle characterized the entire universe, so his viewpoint is clearly teleological. With people this tendency is obviously seen in the development of the person biologically, from embryo to adult. But in human psychological development consciousness evolves as well, from a primitive unconscious mind at birth to levels of increasing awareness throughout the lifespan. Thus the aforementioned actualizing tendency is a special case of the formative tendency as applied to the development of organisms, but especially to people.

The actualizing tendency is found within each individual. Rogers saw it as the active, creative force that guides a person's destiny to the extent that she or he is not thwarted by external forces (e.g., parents; societal demands for conformity. Here Rogers views are not unlike those of Rousseau⁸, Montessori, and Piaget). It is like a master motive that drives behavior and underlies all other motives. This actualizing tendency is present in all living things, from bacteria to sea slugs to puppy dogs to people. And when people have some perceptual awareness of the actualizing tendency it is called *self-actualization*.

Organismic Valuing and the Fully Functioning Person

Rogers believed that at some deep level all organisms “know” what is good for them – this is built in by evolution. Rogers called the tendency to evaluate experiences in terms of their ability to sustain and enlarge them *organismic valuing* (Rogers, 1959). A *fully functioning person* (Rogers, 1963) is one who epitomizes psychological health and who embodies the following characteristics; such a person:

- trusts in him/herself (i.e., in one’s organismic valuing) and is not dependent on others for guidance in life;
- is not overly defensive but is instead open to new experiences;
- lives in the present rather than dwelling in the past or worrying excessively about the future (Rogers called this *existential living*);
- experiences freedom of choice, and takes responsibilities for his/her decisions;
- is *creative* in a sense that is similar to Erikson’s generativity; in other words acts responsibly and with concern toward others, exhibits social concern, contributes to society through (for example) art or science, or through simple caring and nurturance.

The fully functioning person is a kind of ideal for Rogers. It may be that no real, living human being lives up to such ideals, but this model represents instead a set of goals toward which people may strive. But it is interesting note the similarities of some of these ideal traits with Maslow’s characteristics of self-actualized people.

Self-Regard and the Need for Unconditional Positive Regard

As humans, part of what we value is *positive regard*, or in other words, we all need acceptance and nurturing. People also have a need for self-esteem, and this requires developing a positive self-image, including a certain degree of self-confidence, which he

referred to as *positive self-regard* (compare with Maslow's two levels of esteem needs).

It is important for the developing child to receive acceptance in the form of positive regard from significant others (initially one's parents) in order to develop positive self-regard. Once this sense of positive self-regard is firmly established it is self-perpetuating. In other words, once a strong, positive sense of self becomes established, it is relatively resilient in the face of challenges (e.g., taunts by other children). And the child achieves a certain sense of security and independence; she/he does not require constant reinforcement to maintain this feeling.

But sometimes there are roadblocks in the pathway to achieving positive self-regard. This occurs when parents place *conditions of worth* on acceptance of the child. For example, a boy may only be accepted by his father if he acts like a "little man" who does not cry when hurt or embarrassed. Or a girl may only be accepted by her mother when she acts like a "little lady" who willingly does her share of the domestic chores at home (washing dishes after dinner and so on). Such children feel unworthy or unloved when they fail to meet the expectations of their parents: They feel that their being loved and accepted is *conditional*, based on their meeting these expectations.

Rogers argued strongly that children need *unconditional positive regard*, or complete acceptance by their parents, in order to develop into psychologically healthy adults. Rogers did not mean that parents should ignore bad behavior or that they should fail to apply standards of behavior on their children. What he did imply was that parents must separate the idea of what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable behavior from the idea that a child is loved and accepted for her/himself – not that a child is *only* loved and accepted when she or he conforms to parental expectations. Parents must nurture their children, teach them what behaviors are proper or improper, impart in them some key values – but they must not *mold* them. Children need instead to grow in accordance with their own actualizing tendencies.

For Rogers psychological development can be seen globally as realization of the self's potential through the actualizing tendency. Growth can be blocked when as children parents fail to provide

unconditional positive regard, instead imposing conditions of worth on the child. A lack of acceptance by parents or by others leads to a lack of self-acceptance or a feeling of incompleteness. Such a lack can be overcome later in life, but mainly if the basic “missing ingredient” – unconditional positive regard – can be supplied.

Unconditional Positive Regard Expressed in Poetry? Kahlil Gibran on Parents and Children

*Your children are not your children
They are the sons and daughters of life's longing for itself.
They come through you but not from you,
And though they are with you yet they belong not to you.*

-Gibran⁹

Defense Mechanisms, Anxiety, and Mental Health

Neurosis occurs when the actualizing tendency is stifled; as when a child has failed to fulfill his potential because of having conditions of worth placed on his behavior, or when an adult, having suffered from similar experiences in a relationship or on the job, suffers a major loss to her self-esteem.

Rogers thought that neurosis manifested itself behaviorally in *defensiveness*. This defensiveness is due to anxiety that is related to the fear of negative evaluation (by self or by others). He identified two major stratagems of defensiveness (or defense mechanisms), *denial* and *perceptual distortion*.

Denial has a similar meaning to that in Freud's psychoanalysis: it is the unwillingness to recognize reality. Perceptual distortion corresponds to Freud's rationalization. Both are used to reduce anxiety in threatening situations, also in agreement with Freud. However, Rogers did not stress repression in response to anxiety as did Freud. He viewed these defense mechanisms as protecting the ego, as one might say in Freudian terms, or in Rogerian terms they

allow people to maintain their self-concepts by keeping their perception of experience consistent with their self-cognitions.

Rogers believed that psychosis resulted from a breakdown of defenses. A psychotic person becomes disorganized and fragmented when his or her defenses no longer work to maintain the self-concept.

But it should be noted that Rogers, consistent with his rejection of the medical model, was wary of labels like “neurotic” or “psychotic.” He believed that such labels lead to stereotyping. He preferred instead to state that people differed in the extent of their defensiveness and disorganization.

Client-Centered Therapy and the Growth Process

It is never too late to learn self-acceptance and acquire a sense of positive self-regard. Rogers’ method of therapy is designed to do just that, with the therapist, through his/her acceptance of the client, providing the needed unconditional positive regard.

The person who lacks complete self acceptance was seen by Rogers as *incongruent*, meaning that there is a discrepancy between a person’s real and ideal self-concept. The *ideal self-concept* represents the person one would like to be, as opposed to the person one actually is. Conversely, a person who is *congruent* does not experience such a discrepancy. But how does a person know if she/he lacks congruence? To assess this discrepancy or lack of congruence in his research on self-concept, Rogers employed a method known as the *Q*-technique. A measure of discrepancy between real and ideal rankings is then possible.

The Q-Technique

The *Q-technique* worked like this: the client was given a packet of one hundred cards (like index cards) with statements written on each one. For example, a statement might read “I am physically appealing,” or “I sometimes lack self-confidence.” The client then sorted the statements into several piles ranging from “most like me” to “least like me.” The piles contain different numbers of statements so that the resulting stacks resemble a

histogram approximating the normal distribution, with the number of statements in each equal to 1 (least like me), 4, 11, 21, 26 (neutral), 21, 11, 4, and 1 (most like me). This procedure is called a *Q-sort*. In the next step the client arranged the cards again, this time into stacks according to one's ideal self, or what one desires to be like (the actual statistical procedures for determining the discrepancies need not be of concern here).

An Experiment using the Q-Technique. Rogers and Dymond (1954) used the *Q*-technique to measure the outcome of client-centered therapy. Using both experimental and control groups in a before and after therapy design, which also included a long-term follow-up, Rogers and Dymond found significant decreases in discrepancy (i.e., a greater degree of congruence) for the group who received counseling. Some of this effect persisted in a long-term follow-up (after six months to a year) as well.

It should be noted that the two groups were not assigned randomly; rather, the group receiving the therapy was chosen based on their individual needs for therapy, whereas the "normal" group were not identified as needing therapy. So as might be expected, the pretest discrepancy scores for the control group were lower (i.e., more congruent) than for the experimental group. However, only the experimental group changed significantly over time in the direction of greater congruence.

Essentially Rogers believed that congruence equaled self-acceptance. The real and ideal self discrepancy decreases to the extent that one is either able to change oneself to meet the ideal, or more realistically in most cases, able to accept oneself as is, including one's perceived shortcomings.

Theory Underlying the Client-Therapist Relationship

Rogers developed his own theory of psychotherapy. His theoretical ideas marked a considerable departure from psychoanalysis which, in its varying forms, was the predominant – essentially the only – existing theoretical framework for therapy.

Psychotherapy of course originated with Freud, who first identified the processes of transference, resistance, insight, and so forth. But for Freud the analyst was the expert who interpreted the

patient's dream content and free associations in order to bring about insight in the process of working through the patient's neurosis. Rogers' ideas, however, were much different. He did not think of those who consulted him as patients, but rather as clients. He also did not think of the therapist as an expert whose special knowledge of psychology held the key to the client's improvement. Hence he rejected the *medical model* of therapy in his method.

Real-Ideal Self Congruency: A Self-Assessment Exercise

Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory (ASSEI)¹⁰

Instructions: (A) Rate yourself on how IMPORTANT each of these items is to your own self-esteem by CIRCLING the number on a 0 to 10 scale, then continue on with the instructions at the bottom of the exercise.

1. Looks and physical attractiveness:
0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

2. Physical condition, strength, and agility:
0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

3. Grooming, clothing, overall appearance:
0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

4. Being liked by others, your popularity and ability to get along, your social skills:
0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

5. Being a good person, your friendliness and helpfulness to others:
0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

6. Having a loving, close relationship with someone:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

7. Being a law abiding, responsible citizen:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

8. Being an honest and truthful person in your dealings with others:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

9. Having the courage of your convictions, speaking up for what you think is right, even when it is not popular to do so:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

10. Relationships with your family, being on good terms with your family, having good feelings for each other:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

11. Meeting or having met your responsibilities to your family, i.e., being a good parent, spouse, son, or daughter:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

12. Intelligence, how smart you are:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

13. Level of academic accomplishment, years of education:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

14. Being a cultured and knowledgeable person, knowing about art, music, and world events:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

15. Having special talents or abilities – artistic, scientific, musical, athletic, etc.:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

16. Earning a great amount of money and acquiring valuable possessions:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

17. Being recognized for your accomplishments, earning the respect of others for your work:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

18. Doing what you set out to do personally, meeting the goals you set for yourself:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

19. Having influence over the events or people in your life:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

20. Belief in a higher power, your spiritual convictions:

0...1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9...10

(B) Now go back and rate yourself on how SATISFIED you are with each item by drawing a STRAIGHT line through the appropriate number on the same 0 – 10 scale.

(C) Finally compare each of the two ratings. Look especially for items in which there is a large discrepancy between importance and satisfaction. If you rated any item very high on importance but fairly low on satisfaction then this represents an area of incongruence – something for you to work on!

Instead Rogers believed that the client him/herself was the *only person* responsible for deciding upon the proper goals and directions for his/her future life through the organismic valuing and trusting process. The therapist's role was one of a *facilitator*, not a director. More specifically Rogers believed that there were three necessary and sufficient conditions for a successful therapeutic relationship. These are: (1) the client must be *exposed* to a therapist who expresses three key characteristics of congruence, unconditional positive regard, and empathy; (2) the client must *perceive* these qualities in the therapist; and (3) the therapy must be of some *duration* (i.e., ongoing for a period of,

perhaps, several weeks or months). In more detail, the three important qualities of the therapist are:

1. ***Congruence***: By which Rogers meant that the therapist is authentic and genuine, and able to relate to the client from this perspective. A congruent therapist is not only open and sympathetic, but also a complete person who does not hide her/his feelings nor take on a role as an “expert” or someone not really connected to the present situation.
2. ***Unconditional positive regard***: The therapist accepts the client as another person with warmth and understanding, and without imposing conditions of worth on the client. Note that the term *regard* connotes respectfulness. The client-centered therapy session thus becomes an interpersonal encounter between two persons of equal status.
3. ***Empathy***: The key here is empathic *listening* to really hear what the client is saying. To facilitate empathic communication Rogers often used the technique of ***reflection***, which means that he would *validate* the client’s statements using phrases such as “you seem to be telling me that you felt abused by your employer when she...”, and so forth. But reflection must be based on genuine interest; it is not a mere intellectual exercise. Empathic communication is also enhanced by ***requests for clarification***, such as “I’m not sure I understand your feelings about your relationship with your employer, can you help me to better understand this dynamic?” Note that empathy is not the same as *sympathy*. Sympathy is a feeling *about* the client that may invoke pity, whereas empathy is a feeling *for* the client that is communicated directly to her. It is a form of recognition and validation of the client’s feelings.

Psychological Growth – In and Out of Therapy

Rogers believed that successful therapy led to clients who had more realistic views of themselves and of the world and who were more self-accepting, as the real/ideal self-concepts became more congruent.

If the three criteria for successful therapy sound like a prescription for good relationships Rogers would certainly agree. If two people mutually provide congruence, unconditional positive regard, and empathy, and if these qualities are perceived in the other and held over a period of time, then the relationship is likely to be successful and to foster growth on the part of both parties. But those qualities are useful in every kind of human relationship. Think for example of how these qualities could be helpful to a college instructor, a person who interviews people for a job, or a mediator in a dispute between two parties. The course of any relationship, whether it consists of a single encounter or of a prolonged friendship, marriage, or partnership can benefit from these qualities, which Rogers believed were essential to personal growth. In stressing these qualities Rogers has indeed influenced professionals in every field; his insightful analysis of relationships and the importance of validation of feelings marks a major and lasting contribution to the field of psychology.

Evaluating Rogers

Ahistoric Approach and Neglect of the Unconscious Mind

Rogers did not deny that a person's childhood experiences could influence her/his present state of mind, in fact, he was certain that this was the case. But delving into the past record of his client's lives was not of major concern to him. What he had to offer as a therapist, Rogers thought, was a personal relationship that existed in the here and now, and progress would come through a meaningful encounter between client and therapist. Some thought this approach naïve, and needless to say, many psychologists – but especially practitioners of psychoanalysis – believed this lack of concern for the past to be an important omission in his approach. Also, although Rogers did not deny that there is such a thing as the unconscious mind, he just did not think that this was something that needed to be addressed by the therapist in order to facilitate growth in the client. And here again, many practitioners disagreed with Rogers on the importance of addressing unconscious feelings and motives in the development of personality. Rogers did believe

that part of the organismic valuing process was partly unconscious. But he seemed to view unconscious processes from a more benign perspective than did psychoanalysts.

Is Client-Centered Therapy Appropriate for Treating All Psychological Disorders?

While there is something quite refreshing about Rogers' methods of client-centered therapy, and some evidence that the technique can really help some people, it did not seem appropriate for treating every kind of psychological disorder. An analogy of therapy techniques with auto repair made by one of the author's own mentors¹¹: client-centered therapy might be most helpful when what is needed is a simple "tune up," so to speak, whereas psychoanalysis or other intensive methods of therapy might be more useful when a "complete overhaul" is required.

Client-centered therapy is especially helpful to a person who suffers from low self-concept and/or excessive anxieties and concerns about the judgments and opinions of others. As a technique it can be a useful adjunct to other approaches to therapy as well. But today many psychological disorders are thought to be at least partially due to problems within the brain and nervous symptoms. Schizophrenia and bipolar disorder are examples. But some personality disorders, such as anti-social and borderline personality disorders, might also be poor candidates for client-centered therapy. Although Rogers' very intimate approach to the therapist-client relationship might be helpful, it is probably not enough. Often anti-psychotic or anti-depressive drugs are useful as well, and newer forms of therapy, such as behavioral or cognitive therapies, have also proven to be useful and powerful adjuncts to drug therapy. Indeed, Rogers' ideas about psychosis may themselves be naïve. His notion that psychosis is a break with normal reality due to distorted perceptions may be partly true, but the cause and nature of these distortions is typically not entirely "just" psychological. Increasingly evidence points to biological factors such as genetic inheritance and an imbalance in neurotransmitters as major predisposing factors in many forms of severe mental illness.

Rogers' Methods are backed by Empirical Research

Unlike some therapists Rogers backed up his theoretical ideas with a strong research program. As a professor of psychology he conducted and encouraged research studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of his client-centered approach. In fact, he was a pioneer in the investigation of the effectiveness of psychotherapy in general. As already mentioned Rogers received the American Psychological Association's award for Distinguished Scientific Contribution. He was also president of the APA for a year in 1946-1947, another high honor among many that Rogers received during his lifetime.

It is interesting to note that, though Rogers achieved ample recognition for academic achievements in research, he felt that universities were sterile environments that fostered one-sided people who were too steeped in intellect at the expense of one's feeling nature¹². These views are also clearly in line with Rogers' humanistic perspective.

Impact on the Practice of Therapy

Rogers was the first to present a truly radical departure from psychoanalysis with his client-centered therapy. This applies to both theory and practice. While one may be hard-pressed today to find a "Rogerian" therapist listed in the local phone directory, Rogers impact on the practice of psychotherapy has been enormous, and today many, many therapists are indeed "Rogerian" in their approach to patients – by being congruent, empathetic, and providing unconditional acceptance – while calling themselves cognitive therapists, behavioral therapists, eclectic therapists, or even psychoanalysts.

For Thought and Discussion

1. Think of a peak experience from your own life. Jot down your memories of this experience for class sharing.
2. Compare Maslow and Rogers in terms of the different ways in which they viewed self-actualization. How are Maslow's self-actualized person and Rogers' fully functioning person similar and how are they different?
3. As a self-assessment exercise complete the ASSEI instrument. Then ask yourself whether you learned anything new about yourself.
4. What are the two different senses in which the term "congruence" is used in the section on Rogers? Explain the difference between them.
5. Why was the study by Rogers and Dymond not a true experiment (refer if necessary to Chapter 2)? Why would it have been unreasonable to conduct a true experiment with these participants?
6. If you were to enter therapy would you prefer a therapist who followed the prescriptions of Freud or of Rogers? Why?
7. Think of various teachers or college instructors you have had. To what extent do they exemplify Rogers' three qualities of a good therapist? To what extent do they validate you as a person? (Do not confuse the evaluative process in assigning grades and holding you responsible for your work with validating your feelings or relating to you as a person!)
8. To what extent do you think your parents gave you unconditional positive regard? If you are a parent yourself, to what extent do you put this practice into effect with your own children?

Notes

1. From Maslow (1954, p. 354); quoted in Hoffman (1989, p. 204).
2. Rogers (1961, p. 33).
3. Taken largely from Hoffman (1989).
4. For more of the history of organismic psychology, see the classic Woodworth (1947) test or the first edition of Hall & Lindzey (1957).
5. Jung's concept of individuation (Chapter 15) seems very much present in the concept of self-actualization.
6. I believe that TPP must be eventually be embraced by mainstream psychology. Although it attempts to expand the domain of the field it nonetheless utilizes basic scientific principles, as discussed in Chapter 2. See, for example, Wilber (2000).
7. Taken mainly from Demorest (2005).
8. Unlike Rousseau Rogers did not consider society to be evil. But society implies people and he believed that people facilitated or (more often) failed to provide unconditional positive regard.
9. Gibran (1923/1976, p. 17).
10. This instrument was created by Allana Elovson and James Fleming in 1989; for a description see Fleming & Elovson, (2003). It measures discrepancy between areas of life considered important to self-esteem versus those with which the person is satisfied. The concept is quite similar, though not identical to, real versus ideal self discrepancy. The ASSEI has been used in a number of published research studies, especially in cross-cultural research (see Watkins, 2004, for a summary of these).
11. Robert Rainey, ca. 1962.
12. Your author concurs. See especially the concluding remarks in the chapter on existentialism.

References

- Boeree, C. G. (1998). *Abraham Maslow: 1008-1970*. Retrieved from: <http://webpace.ship.edu/cgboer/maslow.html>.
- Fleming, J., & Elovson, A. (2008). *The Adult Sources of Self-esteem Scales (ASSEI): Development, rationale, and history*. Downloaded from: <http://swppr.org/About> Self-Concept Scales.html.
- Gibran, K. (1923/1976). *The prophet*. New York: Knopf.
- Hall, C. S. Lindzey, G., and Campbell (1997). *Theories of personality* (4th Ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, E. (1989). *The right to be human: A biography of Abraham Maslow*. Wellington, UK.: Crucible.
- Hoffman, E. (1992). *Visions of innocence: Spiritual and inspirational experiences of childhood*. Boston: Shambala.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Maslow, A. (1950). *Self-actualizing people: A study of psychological health*. In: Personality symposia: Symposium #1 on values. (pp.11-34). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, W. (1964). *Religions, values, and peak experiences*. Columbus: Ohio University Press.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. (Rev. Ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Rogers, C. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy: Newer concepts in practice*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of science* (Vol. 3, pp. 184-256. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1980). *A way of being*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C., & Dymond, R. F. (1954). *Psychotherapy and personality change: Co-ordinated studies in the client-centered approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ryan, M. B. (2008). The transpersonal William James. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 40*, 20-40.
- Walsh, R., & Vaughan, F. (1993). On transpersonal definitions. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 25*, 199-07.
- Wilbur, K. (2000). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston: Shambala.
- Walsh, R., & Vaughan, F. (1993). On transpersonal definitions. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 25*, 199-07.