Meeting the Client Before Meeting the Theory

An Epistemic Argument for Clinical Reasoning Before Theory Selection

By Sarah Ozol Shore, MS, Clinical Trainer, Clinical Effectiveness Institute
www.sarahozolshore.com | sarahozolshore@gmail.com | September 2026

Abstract

Clinicians who struggle to gain traction with a client are often assumed to be lacking something personal: empathy, confidence, training, or intuition. This paper proposes a different explanation. Many clinicians have never been taught an explicit process of clinical reasoning that operates prior to theory. Contemporary training teaches modalities, techniques, and named models with considerable skill, but it rarely teaches what a clinician should do with a client before any of those models are applied. The result is a common and largely invisible epistemic risk: theory can substitute for thought. This paper distinguishes several kinds of claims that psychotherapy theories make, which are routinely treated as interchangeable, and shows how a clinician can move illegitimately from a broad theory of human psychology to a specific intervention decision without passing through the reasoning that would justify the move. It argues that meeting the client where he or she is functions not only as a relational and ethical principle but as an epistemic requirement, since a clinician cannot fully meet a client whose psychological process has already been decided in advance. The paper introduces, without naming or branding it, a sequence of clinical reasoning that begins with observation and treats theory as something to be earned rather than assumed, and closes by proposing that theory remain answerable to the client's actual response rather than a fixed lens through which that response is read.

1. The Familiar Experience: Where Do I Go With This?

Most experienced clinicians can recall a client with whom they felt genuinely present, adequately trained, and still uncertain of the next clinical step. The clinician understood the client's history, tracked the client's affect, and had studied more than one approach to treatment. And yet, sitting across from this particular person, the clinician found himself or herself asking a plain and somewhat embarrassing question: where do I go with this?

That experience is usually interpreted as a personal deficiency. It is read as imposter syndrome, a lack of confidence, insufficient training, the need for a new modality, burnout, or an absence of clinical intuition. Any of these explanations may be true in a given case. But a simpler possibility is available and rarely considered. The clinician may never have been taught an explicit reasoning process for moving from what the client says to an individualized understanding of what appears to be happening, and from there to a decision about what to do next.

Clinical training tends to teach clinicians how to think inside a model. It teaches a clinician to formulate a case in cognitive-behavioral terms, or psychodynamic terms, or trauma-informed terms, or systemic terms. What it teaches far less often is how to reason about a case before a model has been chosen.

2. Two Sequences

Consider two ways a clinical encounter can unfold. The first begins with the client. The clinician observes what is actually happening in the room, reasons carefully about what has been observed, forms a provisional explanation of the client's difficulty, and only then turns to theory, if theory is useful, to help organize and extend that explanation. Theory informs a theory of change, which informs a strategy for treatment, which informs a specific clinical decision in the moment. The client's response to that decision is observed, and the explanation is revised accordingly.

Client, observation, disciplined reasoning, provisional explanation, theory where useful, theory of change, treatment strategy, clinical decision, observed response, revision.

The second sequence begins with theory. The clinician arrives already organized by a preferred model, meets the client, and interprets what the client presents through that model's categories. The clinical decision that follows is theory-consistent almost by definition, because the case was never permitted to generate its own explanation. When the outcome is later explained, it is explained through the same theory that produced the decision, which means the theory is confirmed by its own application rather than tested against it.

Theory, client, theoretical interpretation, theory-consistent decision, explanation of outcome through the same theory.

The second sequence is the natural result of training that teaches models with more depth and confidence than it teaches the reasoning that should precede model selection. A well-trained clinician operating in the second sequence can be fluent, articulate, and internally consistent, while still reasoning in a closed loop that never fully meets the client in front of him or her.

3. Six Questions That Are Not the Same Question

Part of what allows the second sequence to feel legitimate is that psychotherapy commonly collapses several distinct questions into a single undifferentiated category called "approach to therapy." These questions are logically independent, and a clinician can move between them without noticing that a new inferential step has been taken.

A theory of human psychology answers how people are psychologically organized in general. A theory of psychopathology or difficulty answers how psychological problems arise or persist. A theory of change answers what has to become different for meaningful change to occur. A theory of psychotherapy answers what the clinician can do to help bring that change about. A clinical formulation answers what appears to be producing and maintaining a particular client's difficulty. A clinical decision answers what this clinician should do with this client now.

These are six separate claims, each requiring its own justification. Treating them as a single package is what allows a clinician to move from a general theoretical commitment to a specific action without examining the individual steps in between.

4. The Illegitimate Move

The clearest way to see the problem is to lay out the steps a clinician actually takes and notice where the inference stops being warranted by what has been observed.

"Attachment relationships shape human development" is a broad claim about human psychology, supported by decades of developmental research.

"This client's difficulty is caused by insecure attachment" is a claim about this particular case, and it requires its own evidence, not merely consistency with the broader theory.

"The therapeutic relationship will repair the difficulty" is a claim about mechanism and change, and it does not follow automatically from the case-level claim that preceded it.

"Therefore I should emphasize attunement and consistency" is a decision about action, and it inherits whatever uncertainty was already present in the three claims above it.

Each of these four statements can be true. The problem is that a clinician can move from the first statement to the fourth without ever independently establishing the second and third, borrowing the credibility of a well-supported general theory to justify a case-specific decision that the general theory alone cannot support.

The same pattern is visible across other frameworks.

A behavioral clinician may move from a general theory of learning to the case-level claim that a particular avoidance pattern is reinforced by anxiety reduction, to a change theory built on extinction, to a decision to pursue exposure, without independently verifying that this client's avoidance is in fact functioning the way the general theory predicts avoidance functions.

An internal-parts clinician may move from a general model of the mind as composed of distinct parts to the case-level claim that a particular reaction reflects a protector, to a change theory built on internal negotiation, to a decision to work directly with that part, following the same four-step path.

What makes a clinical move legitimate or illegitimate is whether the case-level claim was actually established through observation of this client, or whether it was simply assumed because the general theory made it available.

5. What Different Orientations Primarily Offer

A further complication is that psychotherapy orientations are commonly treated as members of one category, "approaches to therapy," despite answering different kinds of questions with different degrees of confidence. The table below is offered as a rough orientation, not a complete or final account of any of these traditions.

Orientation	Primary kind of claim
Cognitive-behavioral therapy	A theory of psychopathology and change, built around cognition, learning, and reinforcement, with a well-developed theory of psychotherapy
Psychodynamic and psychoanalytic approaches	Often begin as a broad theory of human psychology and organization, from which theories of pathology, change, and technique are derived

Internal Family Systems	A model-level claim about the internal organization of mind, from which a theory of change and a treatment approach are derived
EMDR	Primarily a theory of psychopathology, memory processing, and change, with a comparatively limited general theory of human psychology
Trauma-focused approaches	Largely theories of psychopathology tied to threat response and nervous-system state, with change theories built on regulation and processing
Systems and family systems approaches	A theory of human psychology and difficulty located at the level of relational systems rather than the individual
Solution-focused therapy	Relatively limited claims about the deep structure of human psychology, stronger and more specific claims about what psychotherapy needs to do to facilitate change
Person-centered and relational approaches	A theory of change centered on relational conditions, with a comparatively minimal theory of pathology
ACT and DBT	A theory of psychopathology built on avoidance and dysregulation, paired with an explicit theory of change and a detailed theory of psychotherapy
Eclectic and integrative practice	Not itself a theory of psychology, pathology, or change. A strategy for selecting among theories and techniques, coherent when guided by formulation and prone to becoming technique accumulation when it is not

These descriptions are meant to distinguish certain types of traditions. A clinician trained primarily in one of these traditions inherits a particular distribution of theoretical confidence, strong in some places and thin in others, and that distribution shapes what the clinician is prepared to see in a given client before any observation has occurred.

6. Theory as a Perceptual Filter

Theories do more than explain data that has already been gathered. They organize what a clinician is prepared to notice in the first place. The same clinical moment can be heard several different ways depending on the theory the listener has already adopted. A psychodynamically trained clinician may hear resistance. An acceptance-based clinician may hear experiential avoidance. An internal-parts clinician may hear a protector. A cognitive-behavioral clinician may hear avoidance maintained by anxiety reduction. A trauma-informed clinician may hear a nervous system protecting itself. A relationally oriented clinician may hear an attachment enactment.

None of these interpretations is wrong per se. The interpretation can be theoretically coherent, since each of these interpretations is coherent within its own framework. The relevant question is what entitled the clinician to make that particular interpretive move with this particular client, what was actually observed before the theoretical translation occurred, what alternative explanations remain available, and what would count as evidence against the interpretation chosen.

A clinician who can answer these questions is using theory to organize an understanding that observation has already begun to establish. A clinician who cannot answer them is allowing the theory to generate the observation, which reverses the order that clinical reasoning requires.

Clinicians need the capacity to move deliberately among several levels: ordinary language, direct observation, pattern recognition, logical inference, case-level explanation, theory, and clinical decision, without becoming permanently lodged inside any single one of them. A clinician who can move this way is not abandoning theory. He or she is keeping theory in its proper place, downstream of observation rather than upstream of it.

7. Confidence Is Not Reasoning

It is worth returning to the clinician who asks where do I go with this, because that question is frequently mistaken for a confidence problem. A clinician can become steadily more confident in a given model over years of practice without becoming any more accurate in a given case, since confidence tracks familiarity with a framework and accuracy tracks correspondence between the framework and the client in front of the clinician.

It is equally possible for a clinician's confidence to decrease precisely because he or she is beginning to notice the limits of a reasoning process that had previously gone unexamined. This should not be read as a sign of decline. It is frequently a sign that the clinician is starting to see the gap between what the model asserts in general and what has actually been established about this particular client, which is a more accurate position than the one the clinician occupied before, even though it feels less comfortable. Confidence, in other words, is not a reliable stand-in for reasoning, and building confidence is not the same project as building an explicit account of how a clinical conclusion was reached.

8. Evidence, Prediction, and Self-Sealing Explanations

A clinically useful theory of change should be evaluated against more than a single kind of evidence. Randomized outcome trials are one source of evidence, but a clinician can also draw on process-outcome relationships observed across cases, the temporal sequence in which change actually appears to unfold, the theory's ability to predict what needs to shift before improvement occurs rather than merely describe improvement after it has occurred, mechanism evidence from adjacent fields, replication across the clinician's own cases, phenomenological fit with what the client reports, and the theory's ability to account for cases in which the expected change did not occur.

If a theory predicts that a given decision should help, and the client does not improve, a useful theory permits the clinician to reconsider the formulation that generated the decision. A theory that instead treats non-improvement as further confirmation of itself, through resistance, insufficient readiness, protective structures, inadequate safety, low motivation, or incomplete processing, has stopped functioning as an explanation and started functioning as a closed system. Every outcome becomes evidence for the theory, including the outcome the theory failed to predict, and the clinician loses the one signal that would otherwise indicate the formulation needs revision.

A theory that can describe improvement after it has occurred is useful. A theory that can predict what needs to change before improvement occurs, and that can be disconfirmed when the client's actual response fails to match that prediction, is considerably more useful, because it gives the clinician somewhere to go when the first attempt does not work.

9. A Reasoning Architecture That Begins With the Client

What is proposed here is not a new modality and not a replacement for existing theories. It is a working sequence of clinical reasoning that precedes theory selection and keeps theory answerable to the client throughout treatment.

The sequence can be stated in ten steps:

1. observation of what actually occurred
2. identification of what recurs across observations
3. an account of how the recurring elements appear to be organized and held together
4. a formulation of what appears to be producing and maintaining this client's difficulty
5. selection of a theory, if one is useful, to help explain the pattern already established
6. articulation of a theory of change specific to this formulation
7. development of a treatment strategy that follows from that theory of change
8. a clinical decision about what should happen now
9. careful observation of what the client actually did or experienced in response
10. revision of the formulation in light of that response.

This sequence is offered as a working architecture rather than a finished framework, and it is intended to be tested against practice. Subsequent training developed through the Clinical Effectiveness Institute takes up each step of this sequence in far greater detail, including the specific questions, exercises, and decision rules a clinician can use at each stage.

At the observation stage, the relevant questions include what the client is actually saying, what has been directly observed as opposed to inferred, what recurs across sessions, what tends to occur together, under what conditions the difficulty appears, and what intensifies, interrupts, or changes it.

At the formulation stage, the relevant questions include why the difficulty appears to recur, what appears to maintain it, what would need to become different for it to resolve, and what capacities the client would need in order to make and sustain that change. Throughout, the clinician can ask what evidence would support the explanation currently held and what evidence would require reconsidering it.

These are not exotic questions. They are the ordinary discipline of careful reasoning, applied to a domain, psychotherapy, that has often treated theory fluency as a substitute for that discipline rather than a complement to it.

10. Logic as the Discipline Between Claims

Logic is not a body of clinical content. It is the discipline that governs the transitions between claims, and psychotherapy, like any applied field, depends on those transitions being sound even when the individual claims are well supported.

A clinician can use logic to ask what actually follows from what is known and what does not, whether something being treated as an observation is in fact an inference, whether a general theory is being used as though it were an individualized explanation of this client, whether a theory of change is being mistaken for evidence that the mechanism it describes is the one operating in this case, and whether a particular clinical decision is being chosen because the case indicates it or because the clinician's preferred modality happens to make that decision available.

These questions apply equally to a psychodynamic formulation, a cognitive-behavioral case conceptualization, a somatic intervention, or an eclectic combination of several approaches, because they concern the structure of the reasoning rather than its content.

11. Conclusion: Theory Answerable to the Client

Psychotherapy theory is valuable. Theories of human psychology, pathology, change, and technique represent decades of clinical observation and, in many cases, empirical study, and a clinician who abandoned them in favor of pure improvisation would lose a great deal of hard-won knowledge.

The position of the Clinical Effectiveness Institute concerns sequence rather than content. Theory should remain answerable to the client, brought forward once careful observation and disciplined reasoning have established what actually appears to be happening, rather than installed in advance of that observation and permitted to determine what the clinician is able to see.

Meeting the client where he or she is has usually been understood as a relational and ethical commitment. It is also an epistemic one. A clinician cannot fully meet a client whose psychological process has already been decided, implicitly or explicitly, before the client has been observed. The clinician's task is not to fit the client into an explanatory system that was chosen in advance. It is to develop the clearest possible understanding of this particular person, to use theory where it genuinely improves that understanding, to act on the understanding that results, and to let the client's actual response determine whether the clinician needs to think again.

Clinicians have an abundance of theory and modality. It seems that they may never have been taught what to do before theory.

If this problem feels familiar, the Clinical Effectiveness Institute's Clinical Formulation training takes up the practical work that follows: how to move from what a client presents to an individualized, provisional understanding that can actually guide the work. https://www.sarahozolshore.com/upcomingtrainings

---

References

Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 16(3), 252–260.

Beutler, L. E., Clarkin, J. F., & Bongar, B. (2000). Guidelines for the systematic treatment of the depressed patient. Oxford University Press.

de Shazer, S. (1985). Keys to solution in brief therapy. Norton.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. University of Chicago Press.

Meehl, P. E. (1954). Clinical versus statistical prediction: A theoretical analysis and a review of the evidence. University of Minnesota Press.

Norcross, J. C., & Goldfried, M. R. (Eds.). (2005). Handbook of psychotherapy integration (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Norcross, J. C., & Wampold, B. E. (2011). Evidence-based therapy relationships. Psychotherapy, 48(1), 98–102.

Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. Basic Books.

Schwartz, R. C. (1995). Internal family systems therapy. Guilford Press.

Shapiro, F. (2001). Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR): Basic principles, protocols, and procedures (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Shedler, J. (2010). The efficacy of psychodynamic psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 65(2), 98–109.

Wampold, B. E., & Imel, Z. E. (2015). The great psychotherapy debate: The evidence for what makes psychotherapy work (2nd ed.). Routledge.