

## THE ELUCIDATION OF EMOTIONAL LIFE: A PHILOSOPHICAL, ECLECTIC APPROACH TO PSYCHOTHERAPY

Rashmi Rathod\*<sup>1</sup>

\*<sup>1</sup>Shree Jain Vidya Prasarak Mandal College Of Education, Pune, India.

### ABSTRACT

“Many people often experience emotions without a clear understanding of their meanings, the contexts in which they emerge, and how they ultimately affect their daily lives.” Accordingly, Reuther discusses Rogers’ “reflection of feelings” responses and how these responses elucidate the emotional experience of the counselee; and he shows how Rogers’ view of emotional life can be expanded to include Martin Heidegger’s ideas of mood and being-in-the-world. With Heidegger’s philosophy as a backdrop, he shows how these responses are used to elucidate the implicit contextual aspects of the client’s emotional life and how the client’s emotional world can be reconstructed within the therapy room through a mutual, hermeneutic process between the therapist and client. Reuther concludes with a discussion of how these responses can be used as a foundational perspective and integrated with other psychotherapies, such as cognitive behavioral therapy.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Human beings are emotional beings. The experience of emotions and related phenomenon—such as feelings, moods, and affects—are central features of the human condition, as they situate us with ways of interpreting, understanding, and connecting with how things we experience are meaningful. In many ways, they set a tone that texturizes the world around us. It is to this end that the understanding and expression of emotional life is core to being human. However, many people often experience emotions without a clear understanding of their meanings, the contexts in which they emerge, and how they ultimately affect their daily lives. This is especially problematic when emotions lead to negative or undesirable consequences in everyday living. As a result, people will often present for psychotherapy and counseling in order to improve their understanding of the distressful, unclear, and/or ambiguous emotional experiences that impact their overall functioning. It is by no coincidence that psychotherapy, counseling theories, and interventions focus on helping people clarify and become more aware of their emotional lives.

Carl Rogers, one of the most influential psychologists of the 20th century, is most notable for his work with human emotions. In psychotherapy, he emphasized the importance of attuning to these emotional experiences of the client, which he referred to as “feelings,” in order to gain a better understanding of who the client is in the world. He considered closely listening to and reflecting back the client’s emotions and personal meanings as not only central to true empathic understanding, but essential in the change process. As such, Rogers’ “reflections of feelings” response captured this process and provided a way in which the therapist could connect with, verify, and truly understand the client’s experience for an overall better grasping of personal meanings and ways of being.

#### Rogers’ “Feelings” and Reflection of Feelings

Prior to discussing what his reflection of feelings responses actually are, we need to clarify what Rogers means by “feelings” in the first place. Despite its common use in everyday language, “feelings” remain a conceptually vague term. Rogers viewed feelings as emotionally based experiences that contained the most personal of meanings. In order to further flesh out his notion of feelings, Rogers used the philosopher Eugene Gendlin’s concept of “experiencing.” Gendlin stated that there is an ongoing flow of experiencing which is always occurring in the person; an always presently “felt sense” that is “implicitly meaningful.” Furthermore, many different explicit conceptualizations and understandings may arise from experiencing, and these “conceptualizations can be checked against its implicit meaning.” With Gendlin’s notion embraced, to Rogers, feelings are an ongoing inner psychophysiological flow with personal meanings that may be (and often times are) unclear, ambiguous, unarticulated, and/or uncertain. Consequently, these “unclear but sensed experience(s)” are the true referent of the reflection of feelings response and the focal point of Rogers’ therapeutic approach.

The reflection of feelings response remains a cornerstone piece in his work within the fields of psychotherapy and counseling. For Rogers, the reflection of feelings response was the facilitating process that led to the larger therapeutic endeavor of allowing the client to be heard and understood. It is the ongoing practice of taking the client's feelings and the expressed meanings, and reflecting them back to better ensure that the understandings of the client's beliefs, meanings, and values are accurate within the context of his or her world; and if not, inviting the client to correct, clarify, or deny. Furthermore, this process involves an active opening up to and tuning into the client's inner (psychophysiological) experiential flow and the language that symbolizes and represents the (often) raw and/or primitively known experience in order to carry it forward and further develop it through accurate reflections. While the emotional experiences the client conveys will often be based on past events, Rogers' emphasis was on how these emotional events affect the client in the here-and-now and how they flow from moment to moment. Ultimately, the reflection of feelings is intended to demonstrate and maintain the ongoing way of relating to the client, a way of orienting to and being with the client in his or her world.

Although, in the practice of using reflections, therapists often get caught in communicating back the words of the client's narrative (almost verbatim) and not the message of the feelings as Rogers intended. Indeed, many therapy and counseling students early in their training would simply parrot back what the client said, engaging in a mechanistic reflection of content, disconnected from the person and devoid of the innermost experiential process and content. Accordingly, Rogers emphatically expressed grave concern that therapists were attempting to identify a "correct," highly intellectualized reflection, and that the concept was being taught as a technique. In clarifying his intention, Rogers specified that he is not merely "reflecting feelings" but rather investigating his understandings of the person's inner world. What is emphasized is moving beyond reflecting the client's verbalizations toward a reflection of the embodied here-and-now experience that resonates with the therapist. This also includes the client's nonverbal mannerisms, posturing, and affect, as well as the actual process occurring between the client and therapist.

Given this, it is by no surprise Rogers mentions that understanding the client's innermost emotional world and accurately reflecting it is a "vastly complex process." In order for the client's world to be accurately understood and reflected, Rogers suggested the necessity of three core conditions; which include empathic understanding, congruence, and unconditional positive regard. Rogers defined empathy as:

[S]ensing the feelings and personal meanings which the client is experiencing in each moment, when he can perceive these from 'inside', as they seem to the client, and when he [sic] can successfully communicate something of that understanding to his client.

As such, empathy is an experiential understanding of the client's emotional world as if you were the client. A way in which you can fully engage with the client without losing your grounding, in order to be a "confident companion to the person in his or her inner world." Empathy can also be seen as a general receptive openness to the client's experience. Congruence is seen as a genuine presentation of oneself to the client. This involves a deep awareness of the feelings one has (Rogers, 1961) and the ability to experience and communicate them in an appropriate fashion. Essentially, this can be viewed as providing a consistent and honest base for the therapeutic relationship to grow from. Unconditional positive regard is defined as a warm acceptance of all aspects, including behaviors, thoughts, and emotions of the person's experience (Rogers, 1961), as a human being. For example, the therapist may not agree with a client's behavior, but ultimately preserves an overall respect for personal agency within the human condition.

The maintenance of empathy is always a constant task. Practically speaking, it is also difficult and likely improbable to remain congruent all the time, as well as to exercise complete unconditional positive regard. However, Rogers suggested the more the therapist is able to maintain his or her empathy, congruence, and positive regard towards the client, the greater likelihood of experientially connecting and being helpful. Hence, the implication is that these concepts are not meant to be absolutes, but rather exist on a continuum bound up in the therapeutic process. It is also the case that these terms are not completely separate in practice; for example, being empathic presupposes some degree of unconditional positive regard for the client. Although, empathy, congruence, and positive regard are needed in the therapeutic encounter for accurate reflections, the reflections also provide a way of demonstrating and maintaining the core conditions, particularly empathy.

Consequently, the three core conditions not only share an intimate and reciprocal relationship with his reflection of feelings response, they are all fundamentally embedded component aspects of the same therapeutic process that seeks to elucidate emotional experience and understanding.

### **Human Emotional Life: Integrating Rogers and Heidegger**

The topic of how to understand human emotions has a rich intellectual history, which continues to attract attention from philosophers, psychologists, and neuroscientists. Most recently, inquiry into emotions has centered on brain structures and neural pathways. With the burgeoning development of technology and ever more sensitive instruments to measure discrete and localized brain function, science has been driven to identify specific neural and psychobiological basis of emotional experiences. Although this focus is relevant due to our biological natures, the question remains as to how understanding neural and psychobiological activity can capture the complete experience of an emotion. Notably, Carl Rogers and Martin Heidegger both view human beings as irreducible to biological and neurological processes, and theorize toward a more holistic and contextual perspective. The remaining part of this section seeks to briefly outline both perspectives and integrate them, with the task of expanding Rogers' perspective through Heidegger's, while also addressing a few apparent issues.

Within his theory, Rogers advocated for the importance of the person as an organized whole within a "phenomenal field," which represented the subjective experience of the person. The person's experience constitutes his or her reality, and Rogers suggested that each person is at the center of his or her phenomenal field, which is continuously changing as the person moves through the world. Emotions are central to the field and facilitate a person's experience and how it is organized and understood. Seemingly, the person's experience is a part of the larger context of the phenomenal field, as the field contains all constitutive aspects of the person's life. In this way, human experience is seen as a contextual totality. Through the interactions with other people and the world, a person's sense of self is formed as well as notions of subjectivity such as "I" and "me." Since emotions and feelings have a central role in organizing a person's behavior and thoughts, Rogers believed that understanding a person's emotions, feelings, and moods is to know his or her unique way of experiencing the world.

Heidegger also forwarded a contextualized version of emotional life in his conception of "mood." Based in the ontological structure of *Befindlichkeit* (translated as "situatedness" or "affectedness"), which is meant to position that human beings are always already affected by the world—moods, according to Heidegger, are the actual experiences that attune us to the world in the most fundamental ways. He asserted that moods "assail" us, and we often find ourselves in situations affected in certain ways. Moods are, to Heidegger, an extensive term covering many different types of experiences, ranging from the "gloom" atmosphere seemingly felt in the air at a funeral to common individual experiences of emotions such as joy, sadness and anger. Moreover, they are active and ongoing modes of experience that reveal the possibilities of things mattering that primordially orients and situates us with others in the world. Consequently, being angry, sad, or frustrated involves a situated relationship with the world. Heidegger states that moods "neither come from the 'outside' or 'inside,' but rather arises from being-in-the-world, as a way of such being."

For Heidegger (*ibid*), being-in-the-world is a compound concept that describes a "unitary phenomenon," one that depicts human existence as embedded in the world, prior to any subject-object, internal-external distinction. As such, moods along with other aspects of emotional life such as emotions, feelings, and affects are not isolated events that only belong to the individual, but rather arise out of the situations in which they occur. They are deeply embedded in our everyday practical activity. That is, human beings, or *Dasein*, (translated as being-there to emphasize the inseparable and mutual co-constitution of human beings and the world) are seen as revealers of the world based on these attunements or moods, disclosing things as knowable, and thus rendering a human social world drenched in human meanings.

It is clear that to both Rogers and Heidegger, emotions situate and provide meanings to a person's experiential world. As Gendlin pointed out, with Rogers in accord, the "experiencing" of feelings are raw, psychophysiological embodied experiences, a "felt sense," saturated with implicit meanings that pervade and anchor our entire being. This is generally one conception of what Heidegger is striving towards in the

individual experience of “mood.” Considering Rogers puts human beings at the center of the phenomenal field from which they discover and interpret their surroundings, we can see general similarities to Heidegger’s Dasein, as the discloser of a knowable human world.

However, while both Rogers and Heidegger would have generally agreed on the contextual totality of emotional life, Rogers emphasized the person’s “inner” or innermost experiences, something Heidegger would outright reject. Furthermore, Heidegger would not consider Dasein a subjective entity, but rather the ontological character of human beings openness to revealing the world. Given this divergence, how can we account for these inner experiences and the type of subjectivity Rogers seeks to bring forward within Heidegger’s philosophy of emotional life? As mentioned before, human beings exist within relational contexts; that is, they are always with others in a humanly constructed social world. Moods and emotions are a function of the totality of a contextualized situation that rises out of this social activity. Take, for example, an argument with a significant other: a person might feel angry at the other person, and may describe his or her emotional experience as arising from “inside” them, as a seemingly private subjective experience. The anger might “feel” as though it arises from inside the person, consequent to physiological sensations; although, this is only part of the total picture. Supportively, Lou Agosta claims:

If you want to find out about your mood, do not look inward, look at the situation you are in, look at the ‘there’, look at the context. The mood is the displaced sensory-affective experience about how and why situations matter.

The moods, emotions, and feelings these “inner” experiences describe are not really in the person at all. Moreover, Charles Guignon suggests “there is no way to demarcate the ‘subjective’ side of things from the ‘objective’ features of the context” and, thereby, mood and emotions arise from the totality of the entire situation. It should be noted, however, that there is no intention to throw out or deemphasize the client’s inner or subjective emotional experiences, which Rogers clearly favored, but rather to recast these concepts, and human beings more generally, as primordially being-in-the-world. Rogers stated that the self and subjective concepts such as the “I” and “me” are constituted by interactions with the environment and others, which fits with Heidegger’s idea that human beings are constituted by pre-reflective engagement in sociocultural practices. In this way, similar to how Rogers suggests the self and the related “I” are formed as differentiated portion of the phenomenal field, inner emotional experiences can be conceptualized as an abstraction from a person’s being-in-the-world to demarcate a constituted “personal” vantage point. Consequently, inner experiences along with subjective basis of the phenomenal field can be seen as derivative of the primordial position of the emotionally saturated contextual activity of being-in-the-world. Therefore, therapeutically, the client may describe inner and/or subjective experiences, but it is important to consider the contextual backdrop in which these experiences fall (and arise from); that is, how they are situated in everyday sociocultural practices, engagements with other people, and historical experiences.

### **Elucidation of Emotional Life**

We do not have privileged access to a person’s thoughts, sensations, and feelings as we neither share bodies with the client nor have exactly the same experiences. Given this, how do we go about understanding the client’s emotional world? Is it even possible? Clients have immediate access to their raw, bodily-felt emotional experiences, which anchors their interpretation of the world surround. It is to this end that they can be said to have implicit and pre-reflective knowledge of how the world is meaningful. However, this privileged access to their everyday experience does not necessitate explicit self-understanding particularly when these tacit emotional experiences are not reflected upon and the relational meanings remain phenomenally ambiguous, unclear, or unarticulated. Interestingly, following Heidegger, since we do exist in a humanly created world of shared practices (presumably along with the client) we are exposed to and subsequently take up the meanings based on certain feelings, moods, and emotions that are available depending on the sociocultural context. That is, we learn at very early ages how to identify what types of feelings look like and mean in certain contexts. For example, we can generally recognize when we or someone else is upset, and the types of things a person would be upset about. These shared practices and concepts, which also include a common language (needed to symbolize experiences), allow the existence of commonalities for there to even be a therapeutic engagement. In describing their emotional experience, the clients, while having a primordial and orienting sense of emotional



experiences, may not be aware of the specific moods and contexts they describe, let alone their embedded meanings, understandings, and belief systems. Additionally, they may be even less aware of their affect, facial expressions, and nonverbal mannerisms when discussing certain topics, which are in many ways more available to the therapist.

These positions allow for the possibility to recognize and understand the experiences of others and in some cases the ability to have a better understanding (or, at least, different perspective). Despite the aforementioned positions, it is quite unrealistic to suggest that the therapist always knows the exact qualitative experience of the client, as there is always the potential to be inaccurate. Moreover, we would be foolish to assume that we go into any situation of understanding things, whether of people or otherwise, without the inclusion of prior insights, perspectives, biases, or assumptions—regardless of our best efforts to “suspend” these preconceptions. Rogers makes this clear when he suggested his responses are for the purpose of “checking understandings” and “testing meanings.” He emphasizes the importance of making sure he is sensing things correctly, using his humanness, that is, his human experiential being, to connect with the experience. He continues by stating “the feelings and personal meanings seem sharper when seen through the eyes of another, when they are reflected.” Clearly, his reflection of feelings response serves the function of checking current understandings of the client’s described meanings, and when accurate, helps to make the contextual picture sharper and more robust. What appears to be occurring is the fluid and dynamic process of description, revision/affirmation, and movement towards mutual meaning and understanding.

Consequently, a hermeneutic approach, specifically the use of the hermeneutic circle, is useful in understanding Rogers’ reflection of feelings process. Rogers never extensively incorporated hermeneutics into his writings and only mentioned it explicitly in a later article, calling it “another of the new methodologies,” and specifically in the context of psychotherapy research. His view of hermeneutics was basic in that it was an approach used to interrupt older texts. He noted that “its central point is that, for the proper interpretation of such ancient material, one must immerse oneself in the history of the time, the customs, the values, the beliefs, the symbols, the ways of expressing meaning.” Hermeneutics has expanded past the interpretation of texts into other areas of human life and it poses a fascinating and insightful perspective when applied to understanding human experiences. Borrowing again from Heidegger, the hermeneutic circle is the way in which the totality of the contextual situation is understood by the experiencing of certain parts. In this case, the client will describe his or her feelings and related meanings to the therapist who is simultaneously forming an understanding. The reflection of feelings is the attempt for the therapist to move towards the client’s meanings embedded in his or her emotional experience, with the client then confirming, denying, or revising the therapist’s reflections. This ongoing embodied dialogical process facilitates movement from the parts of the experience, organized by both the therapists and client’s sociocultural histories towards a reconstructed joint understanding of the contextualized totality of emotional life within the therapeutic encounter. As an ongoing and flowing process, even if a decisive emotional meaning is identified within the context, this approach always provides room for revision and further development. Thus, a hermeneutic approach is a relevant and helpful way of understanding how Rogers engages with his clients and appears to coincide with the process he describes in his reflection of feelings responses.

### **Understanding the Client’s Emotional life: Reconstruction**

Martin and Dawda contend that through the dialogical nature of psychotherapy, the therapist will push towards a “reconstruction” of the implicit, mostly unreflective, and primordially known positions that situate the client’s experience in the world. These reconstructions of the emotional life through dialogue “must always be sensitive to the client’s implicit mode of self-understanding, which may be sensed imperfectly in the therapist’s lived perceptual encounter with the client.” Hearing the client’s message and putting together the client’s emotional experience through reflections starts the hermeneutic process, as it allows the client to experience back what the therapist empathically heard and sensed in that particular context, for the client to affirm, deny, or revise in order to reconstruct the experience and move towards a more explicit understanding of his or her particular being-in-the-world. How might this look?

Consider the following example of a client who noticeably gets upset (e.g., elevated voice, intense-looking affect, etc.) when she describes interacting with her significant other about a certain topic. Any time her significant

other gets brought up the client “finds” herself upset. First of all, it is important to note that the resulting emotional experience arises from the context of the interaction. The client does not turn inward, but rather gets a feel of the situation—the total picture—arising as one of the emotional possibilities of being attuned. In many ways, these emotional experiences transform the world, changing her relationship to it, affecting the way in which events are experienced and interpreted. They become repetitive and occur without the client identifying the pattern or topic. The therapist, by growing up in shared sociocultural practices alongside the client, has knowledge of “being upset,” such as how it can present, the associated facial expressions, body posturing, and the possibilities/limitations it presents to the client. When the significant other is brought up from her description of an event, in a way, she is immediately thrown into experiencing that context in the present moment. Her fervidness—the elevated voice and the intensity of the affect—is clearly observed and literally felt by the therapist in the room. By reflecting to the client the current mood, such as “you get very upset with significant other...you even appear to feel upset right now” she becomes oriented to her present and in-the-moment experience of the mood. The therapist is not grossly interpreting the client’s emotions, but rather communicating back what is sensed, making it explicit through expressive language. As an active participant in the ongoing therapeutic discourse, the client is free to revise, correct, affirm or add to the encounter—further contextualizing the situation and facilitating meanings. Returning to the example, the client may try to clarify by saying “upset is an understatement, I get angry when [significant other] does....” What is used here in this reflection is not an overly cognized understanding of the client’s emotional life coming from an isolated therapist and client, but rather emerging from the dialogical client-therapist encounter. What is revealed from that position is reconstruction of the client’s contextual experience, making explicit her way of being in that particular situation.

Having the client reconnect to the totality of his or her emotional experience and make the emotional experience explicit can be helpful in understanding his or her world. As mentioned before, affect and nonverbal mannerisms are oftentimes displayed with little awareness by the client. In this situation, the therapist has access to part of the client’s emotional experience the client may be closed off from. Another example is of the client who verbally communicates intense emotions of anger, hate, and/or rage, yet does so in a rather casual fashion with unchanging affect (or perhaps incongruent affect). While the client is describing intense emotions she is cut off from the totality of her experience, that is, the affective aspect. Reflecting to her “you talk about very intense experiences in a very casual way” can reveal her experiential disconnection, and perhaps help her attune to what is presently happening—introducing the possibility she was closed off to that part of her experience. This approach follows a hermeneutic method and forwards a mutually occurring process that works toward a more explicit understanding of the client’s emotional world.

#### **A Brief Note On The Therapeutic Relationship In Context**

It is important to consider that when clients walk into the therapy or counseling room, they are not only bringing their emotional experiences, but also their relationships within their social world. Even though a large part of therapy consists of clients describing emotional experiences with significant others in their life, it is important to remember that the therapeutic relationship is also a relationship that exists in the world, and the one that is most presently available for that time period. The moment a client walks through the door both the client and therapist are already affecting each other, and as such, both co-constitute a certain contextual atmosphere of feelings, moods and the like in the room. Supportively, Doi and Ikemi suggest that “the presence of the therapist already affects the client, while the presence of the client already affects the therapist. The two become a happening together.” Consequently, what is revealed in the therapy room must also be considered in the context of the therapeutic relationship—specifically, what the therapist and client mutually co-constitute.

This brings up an interesting point on transference, and how emotions arise from the dialogical engagement with the therapist. Rogers (1989) addresses this point, and further breaks down transference into two different categories. The first type of transference relationship consists of feelings related to the actual relationship, such as the client feeling grateful towards the therapist for helping him or her. The other type of transference entails the feelings that certain aspects of the therapist, such as mannerisms, expressions, words, or even biological sex pull from the client due to previous significant relationships. This type of transference in particular is the usual

source of psychodynamic work, specifically in interpretation, which (hopefully) would lead to some level of client insight.

Given the first type, does this imply that the actual emotional experiences of the client with others are obfuscated, since they arise in the context of the therapeutic relationship? First and foremost, a client is more likely to reveal the most intimate experiences if he or she feels safe and secure in the therapeutic relationship. In this way, the client's positive feelings can be seen to facilitate client disclosure. Indeed, this experience in and of itself can be therapeutically beneficial, especially considering it if it is a novel and corrective one. The latter type can be a bit more difficult to handle, but nevertheless supplies a great source of valuable information. Rogers, in this case, would reject broad interpretations of parental conflicts even though it is likely that some frustration or anger a client might be directing at the therapist may be about the client's father, with whom he or she had troubled relations. In both types, Rogers emphasizes the importance of the here-and-now and that he or she ought to be treated the same way. He proposes that reflecting what is going on in the relationship allows for the processing and the working-through of real emotional experiences. Overall, the therapeutic relationship is often viewed as a microcosm of the client's emotional world, resulting in the likelihood that the experiences the client is having with the therapist occur in other aspects of the client's life, potentially revealing an implicit way of being-with others, given a certain context.

### **Compatibility with Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy**

It is apparent the current discourse in clinical psychology and counseling supports cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) and related cognitive-based approaches. This section is not intended to supply an extensive overview of CBT theory and intervention strategies, but to rather briefly position it within the offered framework in this paper. Briefly, CBT is seen as an amalgamation of cognitive and behavioral perspectives used to conceptualize and treat emotional problems. The cognitive component emphasizes the concept of cognitive schemas, or alternatively core beliefs which are mental structures that contain belief and value systems that are said to organize the way a person behaves in the world. Schemas are identified as belonging to a person and are formed as a result of environmental, interpersonal, and historical interactions, particularly early in development.

The central idea is that people may develop maladaptive schemas through difficult experiences, leading to emotional problems in life. For example, a person who is reared without consistent parents or is maltreated may develop an overarching schema of "worthlessness," which may subsequently pervade his or her everyday experience and impact relationships in the future. The behavioral component, rooted in behaviorism and behavioral therapy, emphasizes the behavioral or action-oriented aspect of how we operate and is usually incorporated to conceptualize how schemas are reinforced or from an intervention standpoint of introducing/altering behaviors to help change his or her usual experience and alter cognitive schemas. Given this, how can CBT fit with the perspective discussed in this chapter?

Using Heidegger's philosophy as a foundational position for understanding the implicit nature of attunement through moods, Rodrigo Becerra points out how a person's mood-saturated being-in-the-world (he discusses it as "clearing") is actually a "pre-cursor" of cognitive schemas/structures. He also discusses how through reflections, these embedded and tacitly experienced moods are constructed or brought into awareness through the therapeutic encounter. Using Rogers' reflections of feelings responses situated in Heideggerian thought allows for a hermeneutically influenced method to elucidate the phenomenology of the emotion; that is, a way in which the client's situational specific and tacit pre-understandings become explicitly clear through the dialogical therapeutic relationship—thereby gaining ontological standing. The schema itself is, therefore, situated in a larger historical and experiential context, is a derivative of that context. After the schema is revealed and conceptualized as part of a person's being-in-the-world, CBT interventions can be utilized and applied accordingly.

## **II. CONCLUSION**

As this chapter emphasizes, Rogers' reflection of feelings, set in the background of Heideggerian thought, is a valuable way of demonstrating an existentially rich understanding of the client's emotional world, revealing how he or she is attuned within certain contexts. To this effect, the intention is demonstrating understanding of

the client's here-and-now attunement to the world, as well as facilitating the implicitly-felt meanings to arise and become explicit conceptualizations. Moreover, it provides validation for the client's experience as a way to be heard and understood by another human being. Sharing with another and being understood allows for the ontological acknowledgement of his or her experience by another human being as a human possibility, thusly reducing experiential and ontological isolation. Elucidating the client's implicit emotional experience provides context for the moods, emotions, and feelings based in sociocultural practices and experiential history to be brought forth within the context of the therapeutic relationship. Recognizing the possibilities in the here-and-now creates the conditions for the client to deeply understand how he or she functions in situations of everyday life in order to open new potentials and facilitate change. Rogers' approach within Heidegger's rich philosophy provides a deep and robust way of elucidating the client's emotional world and his or her way of constituting meaning. Insights presented in this paper can also provide a basic grounding to understand emotion for a variety of therapeutic approaches.

### **III. REFERENCES**

- [1] Friedman, N. "Experiential Listening." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 45, no. 2 (2005): 217-238.
- [2] Gendlin, E. *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning: A Philosophical and Psychological Approach to the Subjective*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1962/1997.
- [3] Guidano, V.F. and G. Liotti. *Cognitive Processes and Emotional Disorders: A Structural Approach to Psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 1983.
- [4] Martin, J. and D. Dawda. "Beyond Empathy: A Hermeneutically Inspired Inquiry into Interpersonal Understanding in Psychotherapy." *Theory & Psychology* 9, no. 4 (1999): 459-481.
- [5] Rogers, C.R. *Client-Centered Therapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.