

Kevin C. Krycka and Deb Lambo
Seattle University, Washington State, USA

Gendlin's 'Edge': Making fresh sense of gay and lesbian experience

Abstract. By asking: 'What more can emerge after my research is completed?' any researcher can follow strands of truths implicit in their work to new and fresh understandings. This chapter elaborates on Gendlin's 'responsive order' (1997d) and explores what remained implicit after a recent phenomenological research study investigating gay and lesbian experience was completed. Structural-thematic statements from the study form the backdrop and starting point for this discussion. We suggest that when researchers 'think at the edge' (Gendlin, 1997c) of their own conclusions, something more than was originally found or anticipated can come. The 'more' that emerges then carries the project forward (backwards, in and out, even crossing and dipping conceptual-disciplinary lines here and there) resulting in a fresh understanding of the phenomenon investigated.

Making sense of a completed research project involves more than logical or even intersubjective agreement with colleagues. It involves using the more-than-logical and more-than-intersubjective. Making sense requires that the felt complexity of the question under investigation be followed, carried forward if you will, to its fresh new beginnings.

What starts off most research is a felt-sense of some 'thing' needing to be further explored, explained, or defined. The originating felt-sense occupies a large part of the very first movements of any research project. If not protected in some manner, the felt-sense, with its nascent structural future, will be dislodged from its centrality and relegated to the outskirts, or even the trash bin, of our activities. If protected and nurtured, the surviving felt-sense inevitably encounters other, often disparate, considerations. This is not usually a problem. In fact, having other voices partake in our 'thing' can be exciting to it and invigorate the entire process of research.

We could probably all agree that research comes into existence out of a host of influences located within and outside the researchers. The original felt-sense, in the best of situations, is present during the project's development and is able to be accessed by the researcher at every step of the way. Of course the felt-sense is transformed and shaped along the way by our theoretical leanings and other demands that more pragmatic concerns placed upon us, such as our employer, the government, or the subjects of the question. However, even after the project is completed, for some, the felt-sense will continue to raise its voice and call us on to further action (Gendlin, 1990). Such was the case with us. In the following pages, we explain what happened regarding the felt-sense of a completed research project and how the felt-sense came forward again forming a new, fresh understanding of gay and lesbian experience.

Anyone who has been involved in research will more than likely relate to this chapter on a personal level. We know what it's like to sit with what remains to be said about the original

idea or felt-sense of the project, long after it's finished. We know what it's like to ponder the conclusions not yet articulated. However, anyone can relate to what it feels like to sense the pull of an idea that needs to be put down into words, concepts, or even theory. Under the special circumstance of a research setting, the leftover felt-sense of the project serves to draw the researcher into new situations and new questions. It's fair to say many of us have had this very experience.

The authors collaborated on taking an already-completed qualitative research project on gay and lesbian experience and following its conceptual and felt-sense edges toward a point where we could be done with it. Kevin Krycka had concluded the original project in the year prior to his asking Deb Lambo, a partner on past research projects, to help think through his sense that the work was not yet done. As we had worked together on other focusing-oriented research projects, we were familiar with each other's style of approaching understanding experience and the processes involved in doing research. So, it didn't take long for us to admit to being somewhat compelled to take the research through its next steps and see what would come of it.

Kevin recalled about one of our first meetings that 'Graciously, Deb sat with me as I went over my 'findings' with her. She sympathized with me as I complained about a nagging feeling I had about the themes I had articulated from the project. She was intrigued more by my not being finished than with the themes of the finished project. I thought that was a hopeful sign. To me, and now to her, the project wasn't yet over.'

Nevertheless, a conceptual block stood in our way that stemmed from our own graduate schooling. We had both been taught that the general goal of doing research is to construct a study in such a way that you could come up with final conclusions based on the data. You weren't supposed to keep going after you made your final statements. The prevailing wisdom of doing research held that when you were done with a research project, you were done and you should move on to something else.

This did not satisfy us in the least. We had to get around our own hesitance to see and honor what was unsaid as an indicator of there being more to do, more to say about being gay and lesbian. To help jostle our thinking, we took up re-reading the contemporary works of Eugene Gendlin that pertained to grounding understanding in the body, particularly his latest body of work referred to under the rubric, 'The Philosophy of Entry into the Implicit'. (Gendlin, 1991b, 1992b and 1992c).

As we reviewed Gendlin's works and shared our responses to it, we quickly realized that Gendlin's emphasis on the role of the 'more than words can say' played an important part in our next step with the project. We discovered that following the edge of our bodily complexity regarding the finished research project indeed could lead us to new articulations and extensions of the project itself.

Philosophically, the foundation for this project rests on Gendlin's core philosophical works beginning with *Experience and the Creation of Meaning* (1962/97a) and continuing through in his later works 'Thinking Beyond Patterns' (1991b), *A Process Model* (1997c), 'Thinking at the Edge', or TAE for short, and those on language (1997b). In these works, Gendlin revolutionizes philosophy and psychology by explicating the responsive order of experience.

This order is present in every part of our existence, in fact, the responsive order itself forms a hermeneutic through which knowledge is discovered. Gendlin brings together praxis with theory in a way that makes central the felt-sense (felt-referent), a concept he pioneered

through Focusing (Gendlin, 1982) and his work as a psychotherapist (Gendlin, 1996a, 1996b, 1990 and 1984). He insists we marry thinking with feeling, so that new ideas and concepts can flow from that place where precise thinking and explicit bodily felt-knowing come together.

For our part, we have a rather modest agenda in regard to Gendlin's larger philosophical project. We simply hope to show how we came to form new concepts out of an emergent bodily sense. Our specific goal for this chapter is to show how implicit intricacy might work in research, and how a project on gay and lesbian experience was carried forward beyond thematic statements to more precise and fresh languaging of gay and lesbian experience that is faithful to experience itself.

The concepts that were ultimately formed found their way to daylight through the use of TAE. We don't pretend to be experts on TAE in the least; rather, we see this chapter as one example of how research can be carried forward where there was previously an unfinished sense.

At the heart of what we have done lies an appreciation for the psychological and philosophical concepts and models of human experience present in phenomenology. Again to quote Gendlin, 'Philosophy can reopen the old assumptions and conceptual models if we think with our more intricate experiencing as well as with logic. Our more intricate experiencing may carry it forward, but is not thereby replaced. It (models, concepts, forms) is always freshly there again, and open to being carried forward in new ways, never arbitrarily, but always in quite special and precise ways' (Gendlin, 1962/97a, p. xxi).

Perhaps a little about the initial project is in order at this point. The next section is written in Kevin's own voice so that the reader can be more closely connected to what pulled him to contact Deb. Perhaps you will discover for yourself a felt-sense of the initial research project.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

I began almost five years ago with a sense for a gap in the psychological and sociological literature on what it means to identify oneself as gay or lesbian as we approach midlife. The various deconstructions of identity frankly left me cold inside. There was ample evidence that I probably should have stopped with the conclusions of Foucault, Derrida, and Plummer, who say identity, among other things, is really a politics; not a mutable or changeable form, but a form itself that is determined —by one's culture, race, gender, class, and history— and which is played out in the social arena.

In my social-cultural neighborhood of Seattle, no one I knew really acted as if they were a product of their culture or their past. It seemed more true to me that who we are as gays and lesbians cannot be solely located within specified disciplinary domains or the contextual elements of our current times or those preceding us. Indeed, my company of friends, my lover, and my colleagues, showed something quite different. I sensed an action within the common body of theories about gay identity (or identity in general) that was not reflected in my world at all. So I sat with an uneasy, somewhat irritated felt-sense about my reading of those theories. I knew something was absolutely right about what they said, but something was also absolutely missing as well.

Stumbling forward with this 'something's missing' sense, I took up the methodological

tools I'm most familiar with from phenomenological psychology and posed a task to 15 gay men and women. Their task was to 'Describe how you know you are gay/lesbian.'

These individuals were asked to describe their knowing in body-sensing terms, their felt-sense of the task. What came were elaborate descriptions of many defining moments of what it's like to be gay or lesbian at midlife.

You might predict that such an open-ended question would yield a discordant picture of gay identity. At first glance it seemed so. After all, there are many different kinds of tales to tell about oneself, all gripping in detail and meaning. But a thorough phenomenological analysis revealed something different. Recall that phenomenological analysis asks of the investigator to let the underlying experiential structure of the thing being studied speak loudest (Halling, 1984). In my case, analysis revealed what I believe to be rather provocative answers to what it is to be gay and lesbian at midlife. Below are the major thematic findings from the initial study.

- The experience of being a gay person is most basically one of difference.
- Gay life is one marked by hope, which is the ambiguous balance between passion and committed action.
- Ethicality in gay life emerges from one's difference and sense of hope.

These three sentences can further be reduced to three words, 'difference, hope, and ethicality'. Again, I present these findings as a basis for our further discussion of employing TAE when research refuses to finish. In the following section, we will briefly review the basic background to TAE and explain how we employed it.

WHAT IS 'THINKING AT THE EDGE'?

Thinking at the edge arises through an intuitive understanding of the subject that can only come with experience. It includes a sense of urgency or opportunity, a sense of necessity which brings a pressure or drive to articulate and communicate this understanding. What it is may still be inchoate — fertile with possibility but still unformed and unclear.' (Gendlin, 1997e, July)

When we first read this statement from the Focusing Institute's summary of the first TAE conference, we were drawn and excited. The first conference happened just after Kevin had finished the project on gay/lesbian identity at mid-age.

When we sat down together at one of our very first meetings to discuss going further with the research, we both felt Gendlin's paragraph tugging at our insides. Like the restless quality that helped form the initial research project, we found the project was not finished yet. Ostensibly, it was done, but not finished.

When we finally sat down to work further with the research, we noticed distinct felt-senses emerge. First was the sense that 'more could be said'. This came in relation to the individual themes. The second distinct sense that came in a felt-sense way was the realization that the larger importance of the project was 'yet to be discovered'. For us this was certainly true, but we also felt it may be true for others who would someday read that original study. The sense of 'yet to be discovered' is both inviting of further research projects, but more

importantly for us, is characteristic of Gendlin's edge.

He said at the first TAE Conference in 1997 some notable things. Below are a few excerpts from some of Gendlin's full-group sessions. In their entirety, they can provide an overview of the entire TAE process.

- In you, arising from and relating to your work, there is a knowing. It is out of this knowing that a new expression of your work can seek to come.
- In the edge of this knowing, you can touch something as yet unclear. You sense the never-yet-said quality of this unclear something, and its value to others.
- So you make a place to listen to this something, and you hold it carefully but strongly, protecting it as words to speak from it come.
- You step outside yourself and look at each main word, but none of them yet say what this something in you means to say.
- But in seeing how they don't work, you insist that they say what you want them to say, and so make them come alive.
- As you listen, you begin to pull out strands from this something, and what was vague begins to take form.
- The strands cross, and bring out their intricacy and become able to contain a world of new meaning. The crossing generates sentences.
- Your particular becomes universal, and your knowing is carried forward.
- Then you write your theory.

In order to help you get a sense of the importance of staying with the felt-sense, let's review the first theme. Here again is the first statement from the original research project: THE EXPERIENCE OF BEING A GAY PERSON IS MOST BASICALLY ONE OF DIFFERENCE.

See if you can find your felt-sense of this statement. What is there for you right now as you re-read the above statement? It may be inchoate, it may be very defined. See if you can find your own sense of this statement. Whatever it is, your sense has an intuitive edge about it. That's where TAE works. It works with deeply already-known places and draws us beyond its (our own) initial felt-sense and the parameters, forms, constructs, meanings, and classifications we use in explaining. Below is a brief re-creation of a meeting where a clear felt-sense emerged regarding this research statement.

We reread the entire first statement and then remained still for quite a few moments. Attending to our inner workings, we were each on our own finding our felt-sense about the statement. Deb indicated first that she had something. 'I don't know, but it seems not right.' Almost inevitably this is how a felt-sense emerges. There indeed is something not quite right going on. She persisted, 'It's like I want to add some more words.' Kevin then helps the unclear find words or senses by saying, 'There's more that wants to be said?' By posing a question here the process of Deb leaning into her unclear sense starts to move forward. The unclear now has an edge. Deb then said, 'I don't like it. Who says gays and lesbians have a corner on feeling different? Isn't it just plain wrong to say that? I get all tight inside. Something's not right here.'

Reference to being 'tight inside' is a bodily signal that Deb has long ago learned to pay attention to. The bodily signal is now invited to come a bit forward and say more in its own right.

'The tight seems like a jealousy thing. Yeh, that's it. It's twisted up there. Hum. Tight and jealous go together. Yes, that's right.'

At this point Kevin is acting as an active listener. Since he knows Deb is proficient at finding her way with felt-senses, he sits back and watches the sense unfold for several more minutes.

'Wow! Reading that gays and lesbians feel so different makes me feel defensive, tight, and wanting to contradict it or . . . no, not contradict it. I feel this pulling going on that is more like wanting to join it and say, 'Hey, I know that feeling too.' So, if I make a place for *that* . . . ah, then it eases.'

Deb found that the sense of being different at a very basic level wanted to be owned by her. In our time together we unpacked the subtle but powerful rendering of the word 'different' so that it eased; it no longer presented a huge blocking to sensing what more could be said about gay and lesbian experience of difference.

If you're like us, you may have had a negative reaction to this statement as well. The statement, 'gays are different,' may seem to you (as it did to us) very problematic on a number of levels, levels associated with what is *already known* — or stated — about gays and their identity. But, Gendlin's work says we can go beyond what is already known and beyond the given patterns, assumptions, and categorizations lying underneath that knowledge. We can go to the fresh, the emergent, and the revealing. He encourages us to enter into our original research again and again with our felt-sense at any step. That is what we did and then further built upon this one statement with more concepts that came from the experiential edge of our thinking.

We should note that TAE is an evolving process based in a likewise-evolving new theory of being human. The steps of TAE are the more mechanical aspects associated with how we can develop new theory. Like the steps of Focusing (Gendlin, 1981), TAE has an order that is always in service of the felt-sense itself. The marriage of thinking and feeling in TAE and Focusing rely upon our interest in maintaining congruence with our ever-changing experience and not to let a somewhat arbitrary form, like steps, interfere with discovery and idea creation.

We also note that the steps of TAE have grown since we finished the bulk of our work together from nine steps (below) to now fourteen steps as of the summer of 2000. Here are the nine steps of TAE that we used in our working out what was implicit still in thinking about what it means to be gay or lesbian at midlife.

SUMMARY OF THE NINE STEPS

Step 1 — Get a felt sense.

Step 2 — Notice how this thing is in some way not logical.

Step 3 — Notice that no words fit. Explore the felt sense as you do so. Pull out these key words.

Step 4 — Make the words mean what you want them to mean.

Step 5 — Notice that each time you use a different word to mean what you mean you pull out something different from the felt sense.

Step 6 — Collect facets.

Step 7 — Write a sentence for each facet that makes no sense at all unless it is understood

the way you mean it.

Step 8 — Cross the structure of two facets.

Step 9 — Write some real sentences about your thing.

There are many, many things that could be said about the steps themselves, but for now, let us proceed with an example of how the nine steps came into use in regards to just the first thematic statement about gays, saying they are different. If you would like a further and more in-depth discussion of the steps of TAE, please go to the Focusing Institute's web site (<http://www.focusing.org>). For now, let us make a few general observations about using the TAE steps.

Steps One and Two: Unpacking our thing

In you, arising from and relating to your work, there is a knowing. (Gendlin, 2000, July)

In steps one and two, we went back to the original wording of the themes and played with them and let our felt-sense be the guide. In the TAE process, the first two steps are critical. Without consistently referencing the felt-sense and noticing how it shifted and changed as we discussed the themes, we believe it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to carry forward our concepts beyond the original wording and assumptions about difference and being gay. We aired our objections over phrasing and our troubles with the buried meanings the words themselves give to each other. We used the first two steps over and over to help us get underneath the given quality of that first statement.

At times it wasn't easy to stick with this process. We wanted to short-cut TAE and make it more 'efficient'. It was taking too long, we said to each other on many occasions. There is no doubt that working with TAE is exacting, but we know now just how powerful a process it is.

In practical terms, we each sat with the themes from the study and let our felt-sense of each come. We talked together about our felt-sense and let each inform and even change the other at times. The organic feel to this part of the process was exciting. It really helped us clarify our positions and involve the other in the discovery process itself. We stopped this part of TAE only when we felt all of the felt-sense was known.

Steps Three, Four, Five: Inching us forward

It is out of this knowing that a new expression of your work can seek to come. In the edge of this knowing, you can touch something as yet unclear. You sense the never-yet-said quality of this unclear something, and its value to others. So you make a space for it and let it speak up. (Gendlin, 2000, July)

In Steps Three, Four, and Five we took apart the three themes from the original study and played around with various wordings, being diligent to stay in touch with our felt-sense in the process. The key to these steps is to let your felt-sense guide you and keep you honest. We decided to work on each theme separately and then all at once. It seemed to us that each concept was different enough to warrant being worked on alone, but we were uncomfortable

with not tying each back to the other. Keeping the sense of the whole research project was very important to us, even though keeping the whole created its own confusions.

Along the way, we were comforted by Gendlin's various writings where he encourages us to go beyond traditional patterns of understanding (language, etc.) in our thinking. We came to realize that by seeing how things don't work, how words don't say what we mean, we became free to make words work for us, or as Gendlin says, 'make the words say what you mean them to say' (Gendlin, 2000, July).

Again, using the first concept-statement as an example, we pulled out various words from it and tried to insert new ones. For instance, we took out the word 'basically' and worked on it a little. We tried substituting 'substantially' and 'eventually' because these words held something of their own that needed to be said. We also found that each tried-out word conveyed more than was said in 'basically', particularly if you add a prefix or suffix to them. Basic (the core of basically) became briefly 'basicnessing'. In the end, we kept 'basically' just as it was. There was genuine excitement at attempting to forge new words, weird ones in fact, that followed the leading edge of our felt-sense.

Steps Six and Seven: Filling-out

You find however, that if you step outside of it, some of it doesn't work all that well. You insist that your thing say exactly what you mean it to say. (Gendlin, 2000, July)

Gendlin asks in these steps that we first collect instances of the concepts. We discuss these steps together because step six came right along with step seven for us in practice. For this part of the process, we went our separate ways for a while, each collecting our own personal stories of being different, for instance. This was a personally challenging time. It caused us to delve deeply into our own histories and feelings. It engaged us further in the concepts by demanding that we use our own experiences as a sort of tool for the refinement of the concept itself.

We believe these two steps to be two of the most powerful in Gendlin's TAE process. It called us first to go inside our own experiences and recall times from our own lives that resonated to the particular concept or part of the concept we were working with at the time, and then to write down these facets. The act of writing something powerful down, knowing it will be eventually shared, was necessary if we were going to pull out the fresh and leading edges of our work that could be shared. So we wrote down instances, we collected various facets for each of the three concepts from the original study.

When we came back together to go over our facets, we noticed how much similarity there was between us. Our personal life stories yielded many of the same kinds of feelings and memories. In the end, we found this to be a very powerful time in our work together. It enabled us to share deeply from our own history and listen intently to that of the other. Of course, Focusing helped out a great deal here for it provided a practical tool for us when we got stuck in our sharing or in understanding each other.

One kind of instance that poked through many of our personal instances was that of embodiment. Difference was (is) a thing felt in the body. Yes, it could be a kind of thought or intellectual endeavor, but it was mostly for us a felt experience. We recalled the feelings of being called names at school or simply feeling not 'normal' in adolescence, like just about

everybody has. We shared how that sick feeling in our guts would almost come spontaneously when discussing the very word difference. We also recalled the times when difference was a badge of honor and the associated feelings were ones of power and location in life. Under whatever circumstance it arose, difference was very present for us in a physical way.

It should be noted too that this word embodiment is laden with various meanings in the philosophical and psychological literature, so much so that we almost threw it out. We decided to keep it primarily because it was accessible to so many who might read our words later, and the fact that it fit our felt-sense of difference.

Steps Eight and Nine: Finalizing our thing

It begins to take new form. You are now ready to share it with the outside world. (Gendlin, 2000, July)

We worked with TAE for about a year with the thematic statements. We met regularly to sit with and move with the first statement, then the others. Neither one of us was satisfied with the statements, even though they were the major findings of the original project. When it came time to actually write out our new understandings we were intimidated a little. Upon reflection, it seemed to us that writing something down could potentially close it off too soon. But, if we checked back with the felt-sense regarding our new sentences, we generally found our felt-sense was indeed okay with the new phrasing.

Below is an example of a preliminary sentence created at this stage. The sentence relates to the first theme produced in the original study. Here's the sentence.

QUEER DIFFERENCE IS MARKED BY AN EMBODIED UNDERSTANDING THAT INVOLVES A DISTINCT KIND OF PRESENCE-IN-THE-BODY.

You can see how we were now using words in traditional ways. 'Difference' reappears here in recognizable form, but we also added several new words that change the original theme dramatically. Now difference comes to be about embodiment that involves distinctiveness.

What's so important about Gendlin's theory making process in TAE, is that the goal is to produce a new understanding, perhaps an entirely new theory, regarding the thing we know and are working with. In this case, difference comes to mean more than originally thought. Difference is distinctly about the manner in which it is embodied in the gay and lesbian person. Our theme becomes a theory now, because it is stated as one and holds up to the truth of experience and logic.

Is it reasonable to see being gay or lesbian as essentially about being different? Maybe. Is it plausible that queer people see and experience themselves and the world in a uniquely embodied way? Sure. This is a new theory. Of course it remains to be tried out and tested, but it is a new theory on queer difference.

PARTING THOUGHTS

We worked the steps, not religiously, but rigorously. Sometimes we'd go off in what you might call tangents, setting down those strings of associations for what would come into the

slot created by an unfinished sense from within the work. Setting down strings became just as important to notice as did realizing when a set of words actually did stick.

We found staying with the felt-sense amazingly helpful. We would often become caught up in something or another and then need to be brought back to the felt-sense to see if the tangent was part of what was emerging. The steps provided a method for our searching and in that way were invaluable to use. At times we felt lost in our own process or in the giddy potentials that lay ahead. In the end, we relied upon the felt-sense to guide us.

We frequently went back to Step Seven for instance. We forced ourselves to live with the not-fitting facets. In our dialogue, we crossed our 'opposing' facets Step Eight, and eventually found out more that did fit the blank but pregnant slot facing us.

Coming to joint resolution took quite a while. As was said earlier, about a year. There were many weeks between our meetings. Plenty of time for our concepts to be reformed by further readings and conversations. Each facet was interfered. The interfering could not, nor should not, be stopped. It was part of it — part of the discovery of the fresh understanding yet to come, but somehow implied already.

In closing, we would like to share another statement we generated that is fuller, dramatically so, and ripe with big words strung together just so, compared to the original theme on ethicality. Here it is.

AS REGARDS GAY EXPERIENCE EMBODIED — A PRIMARILY A DIALOGAL PHENOMENON — IT INHABITS PLACES THAT REACH OUT FROM FLESHY BOUNDARIES TO OTHERS IN WHAT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD AS POINTING TOWARD A TRANSHUMAN ETHICAL LIFE.

You can see this statement (probably not yet fully explored) has much more life in it than the theme 'Ethicality in gay life emerges from ones difference and sense of hope.' It has movement (pointing toward) and anchoring (embodied). The old concepts, being different and hope, still exist in this one. The old ones have not been supplanted totally. No, the new statement pays tribute and even honors a little the old way of seeing things.

Gay experience now becomes alive again. From the stale, no-flesh, deconstructions and constructions of concepts familiar to us, this last statement resonates as something original, something not quite said before in this exact way with these exact intentions packed into each word.

Of course, it remains for us to suffer the slings and arrows of disagreement and conjecture that inevitably will come. But, that is part of entering into the public discourse, isn't it? Any discourse on a 'truth' will be debated. But that is not in fact why we thought of presenting this work to you.

Rather, we wanted to demonstrate how TAE works in the revolution of concepts and ideas, some near and dear to us, which ultimately can produce new knowledges that, given a space, will provoke further intricacies and clarifications.

Our culture primarily uses two thinking systems. What seems to be needed most in this historical moment is the capacity to join the precision of logic which comes from the use of the intellect with the groundedness-in-experience contributed by our intuitive, experiential side: in short, a system of thought that can help mediate between the felt-sense of what one knows, and the public language in which one must communicate. (Gendlin, 1997e, July)

Thinking at the Edge is a risky business. On the one hand, it does not deny the usual

frameworks of words and meanings, and on the other hand, it rearranges and transforms them to suit the very specific needs of the emergent in our thinking and experiencing. As Gendlin says, there is benefit to thinking at the edge. It mediates between the felt-sense of what one knows and the public language in which one must communicate. This benefits us with fresh understandings, intricacy beyond original concepts, with original ways of thinking and communicating. It is revolutionary in the kindest of ways and leads us to new ground where structures change and excitement for thinking can be found again.

REFERENCES

- Gendlin, E. T. (1982). *Focusing*. New York: Bantam.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1984). The client's client: The edge of awareness. In R. L. Levant and J. M. Shlien (Eds.) *Client-centered Therapy and the Person-Centered Approach. New directions in theory, research and practice*. New York: Praeger, pp. 76–107.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1990). The small steps of the therapy process : How they come and how to help them come. In G. Lietaer, J. Rombauts and R. Van Balen (Eds.) *Client-centered and Experiential Psychotherapy in the Nineties*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, pp. 205–24.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1991a). On emotion in therapy. In J. D. Safran and L. S. Greenberg (Eds.) *Emotion, Psychotherapy and Change*. New York and London: Guilford Press, pp. 255–79. Also in *The Folio*, 1990, 9(1), 1–49, under the title 'On emotion in therapy' (1990 revision).
- Gendlin, E. T. (1991b). Thinking beyond patterns: body, language and situations. In B. den Ouden and M. Moen (Eds.) *The Presence of Feeling in Thought*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 25–151.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1992a). Celebrations and problems of humanistic psychology. *Humanistic Psychologist*, 20(2–3), 447–60. Reprinted in *The Folio*, 1994, 13(1), 27–37.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1992b). Meaning prior to the separation of the five senses. In M. Stamenov (Ed.) *Current Advances in Semantic Theory*. (Published as Vol. 73 of the series 'Current issues in linguistic theory'). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 31–53.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1992c). The primacy of the body, not the primacy of perception. *Man and World*, 25 (3–4), 341–53.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1996a). *Focusing-oriented Psychotherapy. A manual of the experiential method*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1996b). The use of focusing in therapy. In J.K. Zeig, (Ed.) *The Evolution of Psychotherapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1962/97a). *Experience and the Creation of Meaning: A philosophical and psychological approach to the subjective*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997b). How philosophy cannot appeal to experience, and how it can. *Language beyond Postmodernism: Saying and thinking in Gendlin's philosophy*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press, pp. 3–41.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997c). *A Process Model*. Spring Valley, NY: Focusing Institute.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997d). The responsive order: A new empiricism. *Man and World*, 30, 383–411.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1997e, July). *Thinking at the Edge*. Presented at the annual Thinking at the Edge workshop, Spring Valley, NY.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2000, July). *Thinking at the Edge*. Presented at the annual Thinking at the Edge workshop, Spring Valley, NY.
- Halling, S. and Leifer, M. (1991). The theory and practice of dialogal research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 22(1), 1–15.