TJTS Turkish Journal of Traumatic Stress

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63175/tjts.63
ISSN: 3062-2336

Turkish Journal of Traumatic Stress
2026; Vol. 2, No. 1, 1-4

EDITORIAL

Rethinking the Pathologization of Trauma: A Functional Contextual Perspective on Conceptual and Clinical Implications

Kaasım Fatih Yavuz [1,*]

[1] Psychiatrist. Turkish Association for Contextual Science and Psychotherapies, İstanbul, Turkiye

***Correspondence:** Kaasım Fatih Yavuz
Address: Turkish Association for Contextual Science and Psychotherapies, Kalenderhane Mah. Cemal Yener Tosyalı Cad. Şehzade Camii Sok. No:3, Fatih İstanbul, Turkiye
Email: kfatihyavuz@yahoo.com

The increasing recognition of traumatic experiences and their psychological consequences represents one of the most important developments in contemporary clinical psychology and psychiatry. Trauma-focused and trauma-informed approaches have contributed substantially to reducing stigma, legitimizing suffering, and improving access to evidence-based care. Empirical models of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) have clarified how adverse experiences may influence threat perception, memory processes, and emotional regulation.[1] Alongside these advances, however, a parallel conceptual shift appears to be taking place. In both clinical literature and applied practice, trauma is increasingly described not only as a category of experience or a historical event, but as an internal pathological entity—something individuals *have*, that becomes *activated*, and that is assumed to exert a direct causal influence on present psychological functioning. This does not dispute the seriousness of traumatic experiences nor the value of trauma-focused interventions. Rather, it seeks to examine the potential conceptual and clinical costs of increasingly treating trauma as a reified pathological cause, and to suggest a functional contextual perspective as a complementary framework.

Trauma and the Risk of Conceptual Reification

Clinical science has long acknowledged the risk of reification: the tendency to treat descriptive constructs as if they were causal entities.[2] Diagnostic categories, while pragmatically useful, can gradually acquire

Citation: Yavuz FK. Rethinking the Pathologization of Trauma: A Functional Contextual Perspective on Conceptual and Clinical Implications. Turkish Journal of Traumatic Stress 2026;2(1):1-4. Doi: https://doi.org/10.63175/tjts.63

explanatory status, obscuring the distinction between description and cause. Trauma discourse appears particularly susceptible to this shift. Symptoms are frequently described as occurring *because of trauma*, behaviors are framed as manifestations of *unresolved trauma*, and distress is attributed to trauma being *triggered*.

Such formulations risk collapsing historical events into present explanations by treating past trauma as a sufficient cause of current psychological functioning, thereby obscuring the role of ongoing contextual and behavioral processes. Traumatic experiences undoubtedly constitute powerful learning contexts, yet they do not operate as static internal forces. When trauma itself is positioned as the primary explanatory cause, other clinically relevant variables—such as avoidance patterns, safety behaviors, attentional rigidity, and current environmental contingencies—may receive diminished analytic attention. As Kendler (2012) has argued more broadly, psychiatric phenomena rarely arise from singular causes; rather, they reflect complex, interacting, and context-sensitive processes. [3]

The concern here is not merely semantic. Reification of trauma may short-circuit functional analysis by encouraging historical explanations at the expense of examining how distress is maintained in the present. This risk echoes prior warnings regarding the expanding boundaries of psychopathological constructs and the tendency to medicalize heterogeneous forms of human suffering. [4]

A Functional Contextual Perspective on Trauma

A functional contextual perspective offers a complementary way of approaching trauma-related distress. Rather than asking what trauma *is* as an entity, this approach asks how particular learning histories interact with current contexts to shape patterns of behavior—and to what effect.[5] From this viewpoint, traumatic experiences are understood as formative events that may alter sensitivities to threat, evoke emotional and self-related relational networks, reinforce avoidance strategies, and shape meaning-making processes. However, their influence is always mediated by present contextual variables.

Importantly, the presence of trauma in an individual's history does not, by itself, explain when, where, or why specific symptoms emerge. Behavior is understood as a function of ongoing interactions between historical learning and current contingencies. This perspective aligns with process-oriented approaches in contemporary clinical science, which emphasize mechanisms of change over categorical explanations. [6]

Conceptualizing trauma as learning history rather than pathology preserves its clinical relevance while avoiding deterministic implications. It highlights variability, context sensitivity, and the possibility of change—features that are difficult to reconcile with models that implicitly treat trauma as a fixed internal defect.

Clinical Language and Its Organizing Effects

Clinical language plays a central role in shaping how individuals understand themselves and their difficulties. When trauma is framed primarily as an internal pathology or extraordinary life experience, individuals may come to organize their sense of self around trauma-related self-content, fostering attachment to self-descriptions centered on damage or vulnerability. While validation of suffering is essential, an exclusive focus on injury may inadvertently strengthen such self-organizing narratives. Notably, this risk has been explicitly highlighted in process-based approaches such as Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), which

emphasize how attachment to self-content can narrow behavioral repertoires. [7]

Research on diagnostic labeling suggests that explanatory frameworks can influence expectations, self-concept, and treatment engagement.[2] Within trauma-centered discourse, a trauma-based identity may organize experience in ways that prioritize vigilance and avoidance, even in contexts where such responses are no longer functionally necessary. From a functional standpoint, these narratives themselves become part of the context influencing behavior.

Relatedly, commonly used clinical narratives emphasizing the "processing," "healthy integration," or "resolution" of trauma often converge on a shared implicit assumption: that individuals experiencing trauma-related difficulties are characterized by a disruption in an organismic function that should have occurred but failed to do so. Across these formulations, distress is implicitly attributed to an incomplete or deficient internal process, positioning trauma-related difficulties as something that remains unresolved within the individual. While such language may be intended to normalize suffering and guide intervention, it can also inadvertently reinforce a deficit-oriented model in which the self is organized around a perceived internal malfunction. From this perspective, difficulties are no longer limited to specific patterns of avoidance or contextual responding, but may extend to self-related processes, including increased attachment to trauma-centered self-descriptions, and diminished behavioral flexibility.

Language that emphasizes irreversibility or fragility may unintentionally reinforce avoidance patterns, whereas language that highlights adaptability, learning, and contextual sensitivity may better support long-term functioning.

Posttraumatic Growth and the Limits of a Pathology-Based Model

The literature on posttraumatic growth offers an important counterpoint to the conceptualization of trauma as an inherently pathological entity. A substantial body of research indicates that exposure to traumatic or highly adverse experiences may be associated, for some individuals, with positive psychological changes, including shifts in life priorities, increased relational depth, enhanced personal strength, and existential or spiritual development. [8]

The existence of posttraumatic growth does not imply that trauma is desirable or that suffering should be minimized. Rather, it underscores a critical conceptual point: traumatic experiences do not exert uniform or deterministic pathological effects. If trauma were best understood as an internal pathology, the consistent documentation of growth-oriented outcomes following severe adversity would be difficult to explain.

From a functional contextual perspective, posttraumatic growth is not viewed as a direct consequence of trauma itself, but as an emergent pattern shaped by how individuals respond to disruption within specific contexts. Processes such as cognitive and emotional flexibility, openness to new contingencies, values clarification, and shifts in behavioral priorities may support growth alongside—or sometimes despite—ongoing distress.

Implications for Assessment and Intervention

Reconsidering the pathologization of trauma has important implications for assessment and intervention. A functional contextual approach shifts attention from explaining distress in terms of past events to examining how historical traumatic and non-traumatic experiences, current contexts, and patterns of responding interact to sustain suffering over

time. Hypervigilance may be understood not simply as a symptom of trauma, but as a learned strategy that was once protective and has become overly generalized. Avoidance may be conceptualized as an effective short-term solution that now carries long-term costs. Such formulations preserve the legitimacy of traumatic histories while directing clinical attention toward modifiable processes. They also facilitate clearer links between intervention components and outcomes. [9]

Conclusion

Trauma represents a significant and often life-altering dimension of human experience, and its recognition has been a major achievement of contemporary clinical science. At the same time, the increasing tendency to conceptualize trauma as a pathological entity warrants careful examination. Reification may carry unintended conceptual and clinical costs, including reduced attention to functional processes and diminished emphasis on changeability.

We all need a dialogue on how trauma is conceptualized, studied, and discussed within the field. A functional contextual perspective offers a framework capable of accommodating both suffering and resilience, persistent distress and posttraumatic growth, individual vulnerability and collective continuity. By shifting attention from what trauma *is* to how historical experiences function in present contexts, clinical science may enhance both conceptual clarity and clinical effectiveness.

Acknowledgment: None

Funding: This research received no specific grant and financial support from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Use of AI for Writing Assistance: Not declared.

REFERENCES

1. Ehlers A, Clark DM. A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour research therapy*. 2000;38(4):319-345.
2. Hyman SE. The diagnosis of mental disorders: the problem of reification. *Annual review of clinical psychology*. 2010;6(1):155-179.
3. Kendler KS. The dappled nature of causes of psychiatric illness: Replacing the organic–functional/hardware–software dichotomy with empirically based pluralism. *Molecular psychiatry*. 2012;17(4):377-388.
4. McNally RJ. The expanding empire of psychopathology: The case of PTSD. *Psychological Inquiry*. 2016;27(1):46-49.
5. Hayes SC, Barnes-Holmes D, Wilson KG. Contextual behavioral science: Creating a science more adequate to the challenge of the human condition. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*. 2012;1(1-2):1-16.
6. Hayes SC, Hofmann SG, Ciarrochi J. A process-based approach to psychological diagnosis and treatment: The conceptual and treatment utility of an extended evolutionary meta model. *Clinical psychology review*. 2020;82:101908.
7. Yavuz F. Acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT): an overview. *Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Psychiatry Special Topics*. 2015;8(2):21-27.
8. Tedeschi RG, Calhoun LG. " Posttraumatic growth: conceptual foundations and empirical evidence". *Psychological inquiry*. 2004;15(1):1-18.
9. Ciarrochi J, Sahdra B, Hofmann SG, Hayes SC. Developing an item pool to assess processes of change in psychological interventions: The Process-Based Assessment Tool (PBAT). *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*. 2022;23:200-213.