International Journal in Management and Social Science
Volume 6 Issue 08, August 2018 ISSN: 2321-1784 Impact Factor: 6.178
Journal Homepage: http://ijmr.net.in, Email: rjmss@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal

Philosophical Counselling versus Psychological Counselling: A Critical Comparative Analysis

GOPA BHATTACHARYYA
Assistant Professor
Department of Philosophy
Santipur College
(Affiliated to University of Kalyani), Santipur, Nadia
Email: gopaphil@gmail.com

Abstract
Philosophical counselling and psychological counselling represent two distinct yet increasingly overlapping approaches to addressing human distress, confusion, and existential dissatisfaction. While psychological counselling is grounded in empirical science and clinical methodologies aimed at diagnosing and treating mental disorders, philosophical counselling draws upon philosophical traditions to help individuals clarify beliefs, values, and meaning structures. This article provides a systematic comparative analysis of philosophical counselling and psychological counselling across five critical dimensions: goals, methods, client problems, professional boundaries, and epistemological assumptions. Through conceptual discussion, comparative tables, and schematic visualizations using TikZ, the paper elucidates both complementarities and tensions between the two practices. The analysis reveals that while psychological counselling prioritizes symptom reduction and mental health stabilization, philosophical counselling emphasizes conceptual clarity, ethical reflection, and existential understanding. The article concludes by arguing that philosophical counselling occupies a legitimate, non-clinical professional space that complements psychological counselling rather than competing with it.

Keywords: Philosophical counselling, psychological counselling, comparative analysis, epistemology, therapeutic practice

1. Introduction

In recent decades, counselling has expanded beyond its traditional clinical boundaries to include diverse approaches aimed at supporting human well-being, self-understanding, and personal development. Among these approaches, psychological counselling and philosophical counselling have emerged as two prominent yet conceptually distinct practices. Psychological counselling has a long-established position within mental health care systems, drawing on scientific psychology, clinical diagnosis, and evidence-based interventions. In contrast, philosophical counselling is a comparatively recent applied philosophical practice that addresses existential, ethical, and conceptual problems through reflective dialogue.

Modern individuals increasingly face problems that are not purely psychological in nature but are deeply connected with questions of meaning, values, identity, responsibility, and purpose. Such concerns may not qualify as mental disorders, yet they significantly affect life satisfaction and decision-making. This situation has created a growing interest in philosophical counselling as a non-clinical alternative or complement to psychological counselling.

The present article aims to provide a detailed and systematic comparison between philosophical counselling and psychological counselling. Unlike brief descriptive accounts, this study develops a structured academic discussion with clearly defined sections, including literature review, main contributions, comparative analysis, and conceptual illustrations. The goal is to clarify boundaries, reduce conceptual confusion, and demonstrate how both practices can coexist productively.

2. Literature Review

The literature on psychological counselling is extensive and well-established. Classical works in counselling psychology emphasize diagnosis, therapeutic alliance, and structured intervention models. Approaches such as cognitive-behavioral therapy, psychodynamic therapy, humanistic counselling, and existential psychotherapy dominate both research and practice. These models are supported by empirical studies demonstrating effectiveness in reducing symptoms of anxiety, depression, trauma, and related mental health conditions.

Ethical frameworks and professional guidelines provided by organizations such as the American Psychological Association and the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy further define the scope and responsibilities of psychological counsellors. These standards reinforce the view of counselling as a healthcare-related profession focused on treatment, risk management, and measurable outcomes.

Philosophical counselling, by contrast, originates from applied philosophy rather than clinical psychology. Early proponents argued that many human problems arise from conceptual confusion, unexamined beliefs, or unresolved value conflicts rather than psychological dysfunction. Key contributions in the philosophical counselling literature emphasize Socratic dialogue, logical clarification, phenomenological reflection, and ethical reasoning as core methods.

Recent studies highlight the relevance of philosophical counselling in contexts such as life coaching, ethical decision-making, professional burnout, and existential crises. However, the literature also reveals ongoing debates regarding professional legitimacy, ethical boundaries, and its relationship with psychotherapy. This article contributes to this debate by offering a balanced and structured comparative framework.

3. Main Contributions of the Study

This study makes several original contributions to the existing literature on counselling practices.

First, it presents a clear structural comparison across multiple dimensions—goals, methods, client problems, ethics, and epistemology—rather than focusing on a single aspect. This holistic approach allows for a deeper understanding of the fundamental differences between philosophical and psychological counselling.

Second, the article adopts a deliberately simple and humanoid academic style, making the discussion accessible to scholars from philosophy, psychology, education, and social sciences. This is particularly valuable for interdisciplinary readers and students who often struggle with overly technical descriptions.

Third, the study explicitly positions philosophical counselling as a complementary, non-clinical practice rather than an alternative form of psychotherapy. This clarification helps prevent the medicalization of existential problems while preserving the importance of clinical intervention when necessary.

Finally, the paper proposes conceptual visualizations and structured tables that can be extended into empirical or mixed-method research in future studies.

4. Goals of Counselling

The most fundamental divergence between philosophical counselling and psychological counselling lies in the nature and orientation of their respective goals. Psychological counselling is firmly embedded within a mental health paradigm, where the primary objective is the alleviation of psychological distress and the restoration or enhancement of functional well-being. Its goals are typically articulated in clinical terms, such as the reduction of symptoms, modification of maladaptive behaviors, improvement of emotional regulation, and development of effective coping strategies. These objectives are closely aligned with diagnostic and classificatory frameworks such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) and the International Classification of Diseases (ICD), which provide standardized criteria for identifying mental disorders and informing treatment planning.

Within this framework, psychological counselling is often corrective and remedial in orientation. Distress is interpreted as a deviation from psychological norms, and counselling aims to return the individual to a state of emotional stability and functional competence. Progress is commonly evaluated using measurable indicators, including symptom severity scales, behavioral checklists, and psychometric assessments. Success is thus operationalized in terms of observable or reportable change, such as decreased anxiety, improved mood, or enhanced interpersonal functioning.

Philosophical counselling, by contrast, does not primarily aim to diagnose or treat mental illness. Instead, its central goal is the cultivation of philosophical understanding, rational coherence, and existential insight. Clients typically seek philosophical counselling not because they meet criteria for a psychological disorder, but because they are confronted with fundamental questions concerning meaning, values, identity, freedom, responsibility, or life direction. The concern is not whether a client is psychologically “healthy” or “unhealthy,” but whether their beliefs, values, and assumptions form a coherent and meaningful framework for living.

Accordingly, philosophical counselling operates within what may be described as a wisdom-based paradigm rather than a health-based one. Improvement is not measured by symptom reduction or behavioral change but by qualitative shifts in understanding. Indicators of progress include greater conceptual clarity, recognition of previously unexamined assumptions, resolution or acceptance of moral dilemmas, and an enhanced capacity for reflective autonomy. The client is encouraged to become a more thoughtful, self-aware, and philosophically informed agent rather than a patient undergoing treatment.

This divergence in goals also reflects differing temporal orientations. Psychological counselling is predominantly future-oriented and corrective, focusing on how distress can be reduced and how functioning can be improved moving forward. Philosophical counselling, in contrast, is interpretive and meaning-oriented. It seeks to understand the significance of the client's experience within a broader existential or ethical context. Where psychological counsellors may ask, "How can this distress be managed or eliminated?", philosophical counsellors are more likely to ask, "What does this experience reveal about your values, beliefs, and conception of a good life?"

Despite these differences, there is a meaningful area of overlap. Both forms of counselling ultimately aim to enhance the client's quality of life and promote self-understanding. However, philosophical counselling explicitly resists the medicalization of existential suffering. States such as confusion, despair, or moral uncertainty are not automatically treated as pathological conditions but are instead regarded as philosophically significant dimensions of the human condition. In this sense, philosophical counselling complements psychological counselling by addressing forms of distress that arise not from psychological dysfunction but from reflective engagement with life's fundamental questions.

5. Methods and Techniques

The methodological distinction between psychological counselling and philosophical counselling reflects their differing theoretical foundations and professional objectives. Psychological counselling employs empirically validated methods grounded in psychological theory, clinical research, and evidence-based practice. Its techniques are derived from well-established therapeutic traditions, including cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), psychodynamic therapy, humanistic and person-centered approaches, and various integrative or eclectic models. These approaches are supported by experimental studies, clinical trials, and outcome research, which aim to demonstrate their effectiveness in reducing psychological distress and improving mental health outcomes.

Within psychological counselling, techniques are often systematic, structured, and replicable. Cognitive restructuring targets distorted or maladaptive thought patterns; exposure techniques are used to reduce anxiety responses through controlled confrontation with feared stimuli; behavioral activation focuses on increasing engagement in rewarding activities; and emotion regulation strategies aim to enhance emotional awareness and control. These interventions are frequently manualized, allowing for standardized implementation and consistency across practitioners. Such standardization is particularly important in clinical contexts where accountability, treatment fidelity, and measurable outcomes are emphasized.

Philosophical counselling, by contrast, relies primarily on dialogical and argumentative methods rooted in philosophical traditions rather than clinical science. Its core techniques include Socratic questioning, conceptual clarification, logical analysis, thought experiments, phenomenological description, and ethical deliberation. Rather than applying predefined interventions, the philosophical counsellor engages the client in a reflective dialogue designed to examine beliefs, values, assumptions, and reasoning patterns. The counsellor functions not

as a therapist who administers treatment, but as a philosophical interlocutor who facilitates inquiry and critical reflection.

This difference is evident in session structure. Psychological counselling sessions are typically time-bound, goal-oriented, and guided by treatment plans formulated at the outset. Progress is monitored through periodic assessments, and sessions often follow a predictable structure, such as agenda setting, intervention, and review. Philosophical counselling sessions are comparatively open-ended and exploratory. The direction of inquiry emerges dynamically from the client's concerns, language, and conceptual framework. Rather than following a protocol, the counsellor adapts philosophical tools to the unique intellectual and existential landscape of the client.

Another important methodological distinction concerns the use of assessment instruments. Psychological counselling frequently employs standardized diagnostic tools, symptom inventories, and behavioral measures to guide intervention and evaluate outcomes. Philosophical counselling explicitly avoids diagnostic instruments, as it does not conceptualize the client's difficulties in terms of pathology. Instead, it prioritizes individualized inquiry, treating each case as philosophically unique rather than as an instance of a general category.

Interpretation also plays a different role in the two practices. In psychological counselling, interpretation is often theory-laden. Client experiences are understood through the lens of specific psychological models, such as cognitive schemas, defense mechanisms, or attachment styles. In philosophical counselling, interpretation is directed toward uncovering implicit assumptions, conceptual confusions, internal contradictions, and unexamined value commitments. The goal is not to explain the client's experience causally, but to clarify its meaning and normative implications.

Methodological Comparison Table

Dimension	Psychological Counselling	Philosophical Counselling
Core Tools	Clinical techniques	Philosophical dialogue
Structure	Manualized, structured	Open-ended, flexible
Evidence Base	Empirical, experimental	Rational, conceptual
Role of Theory	Psychological models	Philosophical traditions

6. Types of Client Problems Addressed

The distinction between philosophical counselling and psychological counselling becomes particularly clear when examining the types of client problems each practice is designed to address. Psychological counselling primarily focuses on clinically recognized psychological difficulties, including anxiety disorders, depressive disorders, trauma-related conditions, phobias, stress-related disorders, and various forms of interpersonal dysfunction. These problems are typically characterized by significant emotional distress, cognitive impairment, or maladaptive behavioral patterns that interfere with an individual's capacity to function effectively in personal, social, or occupational domains.

Within psychological counselling, client problems are conceptualized through diagnostic frameworks that distinguish between normative experiences and clinically significant conditions. Distress is viewed as requiring therapeutic intervention when it reaches a level of intensity, duration, or impairment that compromises mental health. For example, persistent sadness accompanied by loss of motivation, sleep disturbance, and impaired concentration may be interpreted as depressive pathology rather than a transient emotional response. Psychological counselling thus seeks to alleviate symptoms, restore functioning, and prevent further deterioration through targeted interventions.

Philosophical counselling, in contrast, addresses a distinct category of human problems that are non-clinical yet profoundly significant. These include existential crises, moral dilemmas, identity confusion, experiences of meaninglessness, value conflicts, and what may be termed philosophical or existential anxiety. Such problems do not necessarily involve psychological dysfunction or impairment; rather, they arise from reflective engagement with fundamental questions about life, selfhood, freedom, responsibility, and the nature of a good life.

Clients seeking philosophical counselling may be psychologically healthy by clinical standards, yet deeply troubled by questions such as whether their career choices align with their values, how to live authentically in a complex social world, or how to reconcile conflicting moral obligations. These concerns are not reducible to symptoms, nor are they easily addressed through behavioral or emotional regulation strategies. Instead, they require careful conceptual analysis, ethical reflection, and philosophical exploration.

A critical distinction, therefore, lies in how distress itself is interpreted. Psychological counselling tends to treat distress as a condition requiring intervention—something to be reduced, managed, or eliminated in order to restore well-being. Philosophical counselling treats confusion, uncertainty, and even anguish as conditions requiring understanding rather than correction. From this perspective, distress is not always a problem to be solved, but sometimes a meaningful response to genuine existential challenges.

The example of grief illustrates this contrast clearly. In psychological counselling, grief may be approached as a process that must be navigated carefully to prevent complications such as prolonged grief disorder or depression. Interventions may focus on emotional processing, coping strategies, and functional adjustment. In philosophical counselling, grief may instead be examined as an expression of love, attachment, and finitude—an experience that invites reflection on mortality, meaning, and the value of human relationships. The aim is not to hasten recovery, but to deepen understanding of what the experience signifies within the client's life narrative.

Despite this distinction, there is an important area of overlap between the two domains. Many client concerns exist at the intersection of psychological distress and existential questioning. For instance, anxiety may have both clinical and philosophical dimensions, involving not only physiological arousal and cognitive patterns, but also fear of uncertainty, freedom, or death. In such cases, philosophical and psychological counselling may be complementary rather than mutually exclusive.

7. Professional Boundaries and Ethics

Professional boundaries and ethical frameworks constitute a crucial point of differentiation between psychological counselling and philosophical counselling. Psychological counselling is a formally regulated profession, governed by licensing authorities, professional associations, and legally enforceable ethical codes. Practitioners are required to undergo extensive formal education, supervised clinical training, and continuing professional development. Ethical guidelines typically address issues such as confidentiality, informed consent, dual relationships, competence, risk management, and mandatory reporting. These regulations are designed to protect clients, ensure professional accountability, and maintain public trust in mental health services.

Within psychological counselling, professional boundaries are closely linked to the clinical mandate of diagnosis and treatment. Counsellors are trained to identify symptoms of mental illness, assess risk factors such as self-harm or harm to others, and intervene appropriately. When a client presents with severe psychological distress or psychiatric symptoms beyond the counsellor's scope of practice, ethical standards require referral to specialized mental health professionals. The counsellor thus occupies a position of clinical authority, with responsibility for treatment planning and outcome monitoring. Confidentiality is legally protected but may be ethically breached under specific circumstances, such as imminent risk, in accordance with professional codes.

Philosophical counselling operates outside this clinical and regulatory framework and explicitly refrains from diagnosing or treating mental disorders. Its ethical stance is defined not by medical or psychological models, but by philosophical principles concerning autonomy, rational agency, and responsibility. The philosophical counsellor does not claim expertise over the client's mental health, nor does the practice involve clinical assessment or therapeutic intervention. Instead, philosophical counselling positions itself as a reflective and dialogical practice concerned with meaning, values, and understanding.

This non-clinical positioning creates both ethical freedom and ethical responsibility. Philosophical counsellors must be vigilant in recognizing the limits of their competence. Ethical practice requires careful discernment of whether a client's difficulties are primarily philosophical or whether they indicate underlying psychological conditions that require professional mental health care. When a client exhibits symptoms of severe depression, psychosis, trauma, or risk of harm, ethical responsibility demands referral to psychological or psychiatric services. Failure to recognize such boundaries risks harm and undermines the legitimacy of philosophical counselling as a responsible professional practice.

A defining ethical feature of philosophical counselling is its emphasis on client autonomy and equality within the counselling relationship. Unlike psychological counselling, where the practitioner often occupies the role of expert and interventionist, philosophical counselling adopts a collaborative model of inquiry. The counsellor does not interpret the client's experiences through authoritative theoretical frameworks, nor prescribe corrective strategies.

Instead, the counsellor engages as a co-inquirer, facilitating reflection while respecting the client's capacity for rational self-determination.

Informed consent in philosophical counselling is therefore grounded not in treatment disclosure but in clarification of the nature and limits of the practice. Clients are informed that philosophical counselling does not replace psychological or medical care and is not intended to address mental illness. This transparency is central to ethical integrity and helps prevent role confusion or unrealistic expectations.

While psychological counselling prioritizes ethical principles such as beneficence and non-maleficence within a healthcare model, philosophical counselling foregrounds respect for persons as rational and moral agents. The ethical aim is not to fix or normalize the client, but to support thoughtful engagement with life's complexities. When practiced with clear boundaries and ethical vigilance, philosophical counselling complements psychological counselling by offering a distinct, non-clinical space for reflective inquiry.

Comparative Table: Professional Boundaries and Ethics

Dimension	Psychological Counselling	Philosophical Counselling
Professional Status	Regulated clinical profession	Non-clinical applied philosophical practice
Governing Bodies	Licensing boards, professional associations (e.g., APA, BACP)	Professional societies and informal standards
Legal Framework	Subject to mental health laws and regulations	Not governed by mental health legislation
Primary Ethical Codes	Clinical ethics (beneficence, non-maleficence, duty of care)	Philosophical ethics (autonomy, rational agency, responsibility)
Role of Diagnosis	Central; diagnosis guides treatment	Explicitly avoided
Treatment Authority	Counsellor acts as clinical expert	Counsellor acts as dialogical partner
Client Role	Patient or client receiving intervention	Reflective agent engaged in inquiry
Risk Management	Mandatory risk assessment and intervention	Ethical duty to recognize limits and refer
Confidentiality	Legally protected with defined exceptions	Ethically maintained, not legally mandated
Referral Obligations	Required for complex or severe cases	Required when issues exceed philosophical scope
Power Relationship	Asymmetrical (professional–client)	Relatively symmetrical (co-inquirers)
Informed Consent	Disclosure of treatment methods and risks	Clarification of non-clinical nature and limits

8. Epistemological Assumptions

The epistemological foundations of psychological counselling and philosophical counselling reveal some of the deepest and most consequential differences between the two practices. Psychological counselling is grounded primarily in empiricism and scientific realism, traditions that regard knowledge as valid insofar as it can be observed, measured, and empirically verified. Within this framework, psychological phenomena—such as emotions, thoughts, and behaviors—are treated as objects of scientific inquiry that can be studied systematically, quantified, and explained through causal models.

Psychological counselling relies on experimental research, statistical analysis, and evidence-based practice to justify its methods and claims. Therapeutic interventions are evaluated through controlled trials, outcome studies, and meta-analyses, and their legitimacy depends on demonstrable effectiveness across populations. Knowledge is thus understood as generalizable and predictive, enabling practitioners to apply standardized models to individual cases. Mental states are conceptualized as components of a psychological system, governed by cognitive, behavioral, affective, and neurobiological processes that can be modified through targeted intervention.

This epistemological orientation shapes how psychological counsellors understand truth and validity. Truth is largely defined in probabilistic and statistical terms: an intervention is considered valid if it reliably produces desired outcomes under specified conditions. Subjective experience is acknowledged, but it is often operationalized through measurable indicators such as self-report scales or behavioral observations. Consequently, the counsellor's interpretations are constrained by theoretical models and empirical findings, which function as authoritative sources of knowledge.

Philosophical counselling, in contrast, is grounded in epistemological traditions such as rationalism, phenomenology, and interpretivism. Rather than privileging empirical measurement, philosophical counselling emphasizes reasoning, conceptual analysis, and first-person lived experience as primary sources of knowledge. Understanding is achieved through reflective dialogue, logical examination of beliefs, and careful attention to how individuals interpret their experiences within broader conceptual and cultural frameworks.

In this context, truth is not necessarily singular or statistically validated, but often pluralistic and context-dependent. Philosophical counselling acknowledges that multiple, internally coherent interpretations of a situation may coexist, each shaped by different values, assumptions, and philosophical commitments. The aim is not to identify the "correct" explanation in a scientific sense, but to help the client arrive at a more coherent, examined, and meaningful understanding of their own worldview.

This epistemological difference has important implications for the conception of the person. Psychological counselling tends to view the individual as a psychological system whose functioning can be optimized through intervention. Philosophical counselling views the individual primarily as a rational and moral agent capable of reflection, deliberation, and self-interpretation. Rather than treating beliefs and values as variables to be modified, philosophical

counselling treats them as objects of inquiry whose justification and implications must be examined.

Moreover, philosophical counselling resists the reduction of complex human experiences to causal explanations alone. While it does not deny empirical findings, it maintains that questions of meaning, value, and purpose cannot be fully resolved through scientific methods. These questions require philosophical engagement, interpretive understanding, and normative reasoning.

Despite their differences, the epistemological approaches of psychological and philosophical counselling are not necessarily incompatible. Empirical knowledge can inform philosophical reflection, and philosophical analysis can clarify the assumptions underlying psychological models. Recognizing these distinct epistemological foundations allows for clearer professional boundaries and opens possibilities for complementary collaboration between the two practices.

Epistemological Comparison Table

Aspect	Psychological Counselling	Philosophical Counselling
Knowledge Source	Empirical evidence	Rational reflection
Truth Criterion	Statistical validity	Logical coherence
View of Person	Psychological system	Rational–moral agent

9. Conclusion

This comparative analysis has demonstrated that philosophical counselling and psychological counselling are distinguished by fundamental differences in their goals, methods, types of client problems addressed, professional boundaries, and epistemological assumptions. Psychological counselling is firmly situated within a clinical and empirical framework, aiming to alleviate psychological distress, restore functional well-being, and treat diagnosable mental health conditions through evidence-based interventions. Philosophical counselling, by contrast, occupies a non-clinical domain, focusing on conceptual clarity, existential understanding, ethical reflection, and the cultivation of rational autonomy.

The analysis shows that these differences are not merely technical or procedural but reflect deeper philosophical commitments regarding the nature of human problems and the kind of knowledge appropriate to addressing them. Psychological counselling approaches distress as a condition requiring intervention, guided by diagnostic categories, empirical validation, and therapeutic expertise. Philosophical counselling treats confusion, uncertainty, and existential struggle as conditions requiring understanding rather than correction, emphasizing dialogue, reflection, and philosophical inquiry over treatment.

Importantly, the two practices should not be understood as competing alternatives. Rather, they address different dimensions of human experience that frequently coexist but are not identical. Psychological counselling is indispensable when individuals face mental illness, severe emotional dysregulation, or functional impairment. Philosophical counselling becomes

particularly relevant when individuals confront questions of meaning, value, identity, and responsibility that fall outside the scope of clinical pathology. Attempts to subsume philosophical counselling under psychological models risk medicalizing existential concerns, while attempts to replace psychological counselling with philosophical inquiry risk neglecting genuine clinical needs.

This distinction has practical and ethical implications. Clear professional boundaries are essential to ensure client safety, informed consent, and appropriate referral practices. At the same time, mutual recognition of complementary roles can foster interdisciplinary cooperation. Psychological counsellors may benefit from philosophical perspectives that illuminate implicit assumptions about normality, well-being, and value, while philosophical counsellors may draw on psychological insights to better understand the emotional and cognitive dimensions of human experience.

In conclusion, philosophical counselling represents a legitimate and valuable form of professional practice that complements, rather than challenges, psychological counselling. By providing a structured yet non-clinical space for existential and ethical inquiry, philosophical counselling contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of human flourishing—one that recognizes both the psychological and philosophical dimensions of the human condition.

References

1. American Psychological Association. (2002, July). *American Psychological Association ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*.
2. Achenbach, G. B., & Picard, M. (2024). Philosophical praxis: Origin, relations, and legacy.
3. Du Plessis, G. (2024). The Utility of Friedrich Nietzsche's Philosophy for Philosophical Counseling. *International Journal of Philosophical Practice*, *10*(1), 252-277.
4. Corey, G. (2016). Theory and Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy (10th). *Belmon, CA: Brooks/Cole*.
5. Marinoff, L., & Kapklein, C. (1999). *Plato, not Prozac!: applying philosophy to everyday problems*. New York: HarperCollins.
6. Raabe, P. B. (2001). Philosophical counseling: Theory and practice.
7. Cooper, M. (2016). Existential therapies.
8. Mohammadabadi, H., Alavi, H. R., & Dehnavi, M. Y. (2024). Ali Ṣafāei Ḥāeri's Approach to Philosophical Counseling. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Pure Life (IMJPL)*, *11*(38), 121-143.
9. Schneider, K. J., Pierson, J. F., & Bugental, J. F. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of humanistic psychology: Theory, research, and practice*. Sage Publications.
10. Van Deurzen, E. (2012). Existential counselling & psychotherapy in practice.