An Interview with Eva Dreikurs Ferguson: Reflections on a Lifetime of Individual Psychology

Roy M. Kern, William L. Curlette

The Journal of Individual Psychology, Volume 72, Number 1, Spring 2016, pp. 12-28 (Article)

Published by University of Texas Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2016.0005*

An Interview with Eva Dreikurs Ferguson: Reflections on a Lifetime of Individual Psychology

Roy M. Kern and William L. Curlette

During the NASAP conference at the DoubleTree Hotel on May 22, 2015, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the co-editors of *The Journal of Individual Psychology* were honored to be able to conduct an hour-long interview with one of the most internationally recognized professors in the field of Individual Psychology, Eva Dreikurs Ferguson. A variety of topics were discussed in the following interview, including insights on what it was like growing up with her father (Rudolf Dreikurs), her educational experiences and research, and her experiences with a number of famous professionals with whom she has associated during her illustrious career.

Interviewers: Roy Kern and William Curlette

Bill: You have been one of the most influential professionals in the field of Individual Psychology. Yet, Roy and I know very little about how you began your career, and how your journey has brought you to this stage of professional expertise. Could you tell us a bit about your journey and life to this point?

Eva: Sure. Actually, that would take a long time [laughs]. I wrote out some comments, because as I thought about it, I realized I did so many things it would take a long time to talk about it. But, let's be brief. The first thing, as both of you probably remember, I lived in my dad's house, and that provided a tremendous variety of experiences. It is important to note, not only that my dad talked about psychology and the philosophy that he had on a regular basis, it was part of the everyday conversation in our house. Also, he had many people that he had correspondence with. In some cases they became part of my life by the fact that either I got introduced to them or they were in the house. Do either of you remember the semanticist Hayakawa? Does that mean anything to you?

Bill: No.

Roy: Afraid not.

The Journal of Individual Psychology, Vol. 72, No. 1, Spring 2016

Editorial office located in the College of Education at Georgia State University.
Published for the North American Society of Adlerian Psychology.

Eva: Ok, well, he came to dinner, for example. He was a very influential person in the field of semantics, in which he was trying to show the social meaning to communication. And then another time I was at an APA convention and my father introduced me to Abraham Maslow, who was at the time the president of APA. So these were just parts of my life—it's not a normal family [laughs]. You have to remember I didn't grow up in a normal household [collective laughter]. You know, I remember reading something from one of the Kennedy children about his mother, who was one of the Kennedy sisters, and she had developed the Special Olympics, and after her death, he wrote: "I just thought that everybody had hundreds of people coming to swim at the family pool. I thought that was normal."

Roy: So that's what it was with you—these well-known people would just come into the house and you'd be introduced.

Eva: Or they'd be part of my dad's life. You need to remember that as a young person I heard my father talk about the conflict in physics, and the whole role of Neils Bohr, Einstein, and the one that my father was so strongly in favor of, Heisenberg, and his principle of uncertainty—I don't how much you two know about that. Do you know anything about Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty?

Bill: Yes, I do.

Eva: My first husband had a physics PhD colleague and I requested of him: "Please explain to me the way a physicist would talk about Heisenberg," because my dad had talked about Heisenberg from a psychological point of view, not from the perspective of a physicist. My dad thought that the uncertainty principle was "the answer to psychiatry." I wanted to know how a physicist would explain the principle of indeterminism, which my dad considered basic to psychological life. A physicist's explanation revolved around measurement confounding, but my dad interpreted the principle as a counter-argument to objective perception or apperception in psychological processes, that is, when you are a participant in a psychological process you cannot also have an objective grasp of what is occurring. The Heisenberg principle states that "the act of observation affects the particle being observed." My dad thought this applies to psychological events as well. You can only have subjective determinism. Heisenberg was his hero. When I asked the physicist to "explain the Heisenberg principle to me the way a physicist would talk about it," he didn't provide any of the symbolic, wonderful attributes my dad had. From his point of view this was a straightforward equation question, having to do with a body in motion, and especially if the observer is in motion, you can't predict precisely where this orbiting particle is going to occur. So he didn't think it was

such a great psychological discovery. But, for my dad it was a major, major point because it was his way of saying, "There are physicists who are going to give a foundation for the indeterminism principle," which my father believed was absolutely necessary for psychiatry and psychology. So if you recognize that that's what I grew up with, then you have some understanding [of] why I don't think like other people. I don't think like other people because I've never learned how to think like other people.

Roy: You didn't have that in your life experience growing up. It was just at a different level.

Eva: Never. No, I was very different. He knew personally, people like Fritz Perls, Charlotte Bühler, Viktor Frankl, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, and these were names I heard about in part of the conversation at home. I think it made it more essential for me to develop, as a result, normative ways of talking, because you couldn't talk to your friends like that. Knowing you're 10, 12, or 14, you couldn't talk to your friends like that. So you have to talk to them like a normal person. So I learned how to talk like a normal person.

Roy: What a wonderful insight.

Eva: In a sense, I was blessed with so many riches that I had to learn how to be a proletariat. And that's what I'm doing: I'm talking proletariat. Financially, my household was never well-to-do. I don't want you to ever think that our household was well-to-do. My father was a generous man and he never kept money, and if there were patients to take care of without compensation, he was the one to do it. We were not financially well-to-do, but, intellectually, it was a rich household. So, then I went to Northwestern for my PhD, and again, I was in a heady atmosphere. Janet Taylor Spence, who's the only person who was ever president of APA and APS, she became a personal friend and we were friends forever. Rather recently, I had lunch with her before she passed away. She was a strong influence for me at Northwestern. Benton Underwood—I have no idea if you two know who he is—but he was Mr. Verbal Learning, he was Mr. Research Design. I got my start in a department specializing in research design and took a whole course on it. If you read my book on motivation you would know that I have a strong research design focus. Don Campbell was in the department, and he and I had some strong interactions.

Roy: Is that the Campbell who wrote the book on the classical research design models?

Eva: Campbell and Fiske were the ones who wrote on the quasi-experimental design. Campbell was at the University of Chicago when he wrote with Fiske and then came as a professor of psychology when I was at Northwestern.

Roy: The "Bible."

Eva: Yes. And then when I became a visiting professor at Northwestern, Don Campbell and Underwood were there. They had an influence on the way I thought about things. No question about it. As a student, we were lucky because some National Institute of Health money was available, and so we brought a number of special speakers. The one I had a more interesting time with was Wolfgang Köhler. I don't know if you remember Köhler as the Gestalt psychology founder.

Roy: Oh yes, that's a name from the past.

Eva: It is, and he was delightful. He talked about Adler and had memories of Adler which were fun to share. And I taught him about Adler. So you have to remember, a heady intellectual environment was part of my life and Northwestern was part of it. It was a great department at that time, when I was a doctoral student. And it's all been downhill after that [laughter]. Just think of it that way. I went to Pittsburgh, and that's when I was writing to you. I was a postdoc at WPI, Western Psychiatric Institute.

Roy: And you were influenced by Herb Simon?

Eva: Yes, it was wonderful.

Roy: Nobel Prize winner.

Eva: I've known three Nobel Prize winners, and I've known them to some degree well, which is nice. Herb was the first one. Ok, what happened was that when I was at WPI we had staff meetings, and one of the instructors there said "Why don't you go talk to this group at Carnegie Tech?" It was called Carnegie Tech in those days and is now called Carnegie Mellon. So we sat in one of the rooms up there, and Herb was at GSIA, Graduate School of Industrial Administration; he was the dean of that, but he was ever so nice. One of the nicest people you can imagine. What a human being he was. He was really incredible. But I had no idea—we were sitting around in the way we are now sitting, a group of five or six people talking about the beginning of artificial intelligence and computer languages. This was ages ago. They were developing artificial intelligence and "list" language, and simulating the human mind. Herb was giving talks about the way that you can test how the mind functions in certain ways. The way you do this is to create programs on the computer and you use the Turing test, and you know whether or not the program works the way the inside of the mind works. I had to argue with him a little about that. Either way, these were very heady experiences and I just took them in stride. It was part of normal life. Again, I didn't think much about it.

Roy: It's just the way that it was.

Eva: It's the way you think about life.

Roy: And your family of origin, too, you're saying, "That's what life is like." It's like the Kennedys were taught nothing more than world events that

were politics, and I'm sure that's what Kennedys thought the same thing: "That's what life is like."

Eva: That's right. That's the way. And Herb was really great. The fact is that I worked at a clinical setting, and he requested help on parenting issues. I was not his counselor at the time but I was aware of the situation. So we met privately for picnics and so on, and he was an incredibly great man. I'm still inspired by his insights. I was giving a talk this morning about work and the technology revolution and what it was doing to human relations; and Herb had an interview with a Pittsburgh interviewer, a reporter. The reporter asked him about his foreseeing the future. Will robotics, which essentially came out of AI, take over human functioning? And Herb's answer was, "No, you need humans. It's a human world." He was so prescient in his understanding, and had such an Adlerian approach, which was incredible for a man doing what he was doing. I don't know if you know anything about Herb Simon.

Bill: A little bit.

Eva: He was really amazing with his understanding. So, that was the world I lived in. Then I had babies. Then I went to Australia because I had an Australian husband. And a lot of things changed after that. As you may know, I brought four children back on my own—and I raised four kids. That was the challenge of a lifetime. That was the proletariat life. Then I was at the university trying to build a department there. But my heart and soul was in my sabbaticals. I was at the University of Vermont as a visiting professor, I was at Northwestern as a visiting professor, and I just came back from my fifth sabbatical at Berkeley and I'd say that's my intellectual home. But my bread and butter home, my proletariat home, is SIU Edwardsville. That's who I am.

Roy: Wonderful. Ok. Let's move on—of interest, as you have mentioned, when we were talking at ICASSI, at lunch or something, and you said to me "Roy, I was not aware that you were so influenced by my father!" And that's when I said "Eva, when I was at West Virginia University, they didn't mention the word Adler!" It was all Dreikurs. And I thought Dreikurs was the one who invented Adlerian psychology. So, from that I was heavily influenced by Sonstegard, your father, and Ed Stormer, who brought everyone in from an Adlerian perspective. Your father made Adlerian psychology real.

Eva: He was the real proletarian. He rebelled against his well-to-do father. His father was very influenced by money, and he said: "I will never be influenced by money." And he never was. He did things because of the internal merits. He was never going to let money influence anything. And that's why we weren't well-to-do. Ever. No.

Roy: I always remember your father having a tuxedo, every place I saw him.

Eva: I'll tell you, Mom was concerned how he looked. He would have happily worn whatever was around. Outward trimmings were so offensive to him. He never went by normative, external characteristics. It was always the intrinsic value that mattered. If he didn't say things that were intelligent and sensible, he would've been upset. But the fact that his trousers weren't creased, that his tummy was showing, that he didn't have a neat tie: that was irrelevant.

Roy: Can you think in terms of what your father contributed to the theory and technique that was beyond Adler?

Eva: Here's the thing—he wasn't fundamentally going beyond Adler . . . He focused on the essence of Adler's wisdoms. He knew the way Adler thought because he had worked very closely with him in Vienna. I know that younger Adlerians now are all trying to put things into categories, and that's unfortunate. It is counter to what Adler and Dreikurs believed. Categorical thinking is an easy way for the mind to process information. Adler was so good at emphasizing the unique characteristics of an individual, especially the unique motivation and dynamics of a person. So many people in Adlerian psychology can't handle that. I think it's a cognitive deficit—if you want to think of it that way. You know, some Adlerians talk about "the priorities" as if that were Adlerian theory. For my father the "priorities" for diagnosing personality, developed by Nira Kfir, were unfortunate. Some people advocate this approach, but that's exactly what Adler was trying to avoid. He always put the emphasis on the unique individual and understanding the individual dynamics of the person. "Priorities" focus on trait-like categories, rather than on the dynamics of a given individual. My dad stuck to the concept of dynamics strongly. A lot of what my father was saying was all in Adler—I've done a lot of reading of Adler to be able to see what was going on. One of the problems was that Adler, in formulating his ideas, was searching for answers. Thus his mature writing has insights that were not available in Adler's earlier writings. I would guess he was an incredibly unusual person in his observations. His observations of human behavior are just phenomenal. The nuances he was able to detect! And he was struck by the obvious inconsistencies that were available to observe. By the time he reached his mature period in the 1930s, he understood the sort of depth of principles that were important and the others which were surface characteristics. He understood the difference between inferiority feelings which come about by inadequate training, which lead to feeling inferior as a person, and feeling inferior regarding specific task performance. When you first learn something, you do not know how to do it well. Feeling you want to improve your performance and overcome that feeling of

inadequacy is very different than feeling you are inadequate as a person. He recognized all the ways that you raise the children in a competitive culture, etc., which lead children to feel they are inferior as a person, and his original observations 20 years earlier were correct—he saw the general phenomenon of children feeling inferior as a person, but by the 1930s he saw this was not inevitable. If you raised children in an Adlerian way, inferiority feelings about oneself vs. one's tasks are not basic to human life but rather describe the result of "faulty" child raising. What happened was that he was writing his books (this is my interpretation of Adler), he was writing his observations, as they were occurring, as he was noticing phenomena that he could identify in a descriptive way.

Roy: Almost a qualitative approach.

Eva: It was always a qualitative approach. If you look at psychology and neurology during that period, that was the nature of it. Freud tried to get away from that, and tried to be a sort of physicist determinist in the way he was thinking. And Adler of course rejected all of that, in favor of the physics of "field theory" and "relativity" that emerged when Adler was writing. You have to remember the physics environment of Adler's time—the Vienna circle, do you remember any of that from your history?

Roy: Oh, yes, I've read books on that.

Eva: So the notion of patterns, Gestalt, indeterminism, it was all in the air, it was part of the Viennese academic intellectual culture at the time. And Adler was influenced by that, and remember Adler was many years younger than Freud. So the intellectual stimulation he got and the influences he got were a completely different set of influences than Freud got. Freud developed his ideas long before World War I, while Adler shaped many of his ideas following World War I. Adler and my father shared the same academic and social environment—the freedom of democratic relations, egalitarian relations. Remember that Vienna was a socialist city. That was all a part of the way they were thinking. And Adler was making all these observations that he observed correctly, but his interpretation of causality was wrong in the early days.

By the time he got in the 1930s, he understood the causal processes. The fundamental assumption of social equality and social bonding, which is characteristic of humans as a social species, that's a necessary way to look at every single individual's functioning. All the other things he was writing about were observations of current behavior but they were not causal processes. So when he finally got to his understanding of the social evolutionary nature of humans, my father built on that.

My father was not creating Adlerian psychology; he was putting into explicit words what Adler was in fact doing by the 1930s. And the reason that Ansbacher misunderstood Adler in a number of ways was, first of all, that Ansbacher came from a stockbroker's perspective, which was not a psychiatrist's perspective, which you have to remember. He was a stockbroker who got therapy from Adler. Some of his interpretation of Adler was based on an economic model, not a psychiatric-neurological model. So the difference my dad and Ansbacher had was that Ansbacher had all of these descriptors that Adler wrote about in the '10s and '20s and he never worked with Adler the way my dad had done. My dad had been with Adler in the school systems, working with teachers, in the community. They had shared the real social life. Ansbacher never had, never shared the clinical experiences that my dad did, so he misunderstood much of Adler's emphasis. So when people say that my dad invented all of this, and developed it, all he did was to operationalize it and give it detail and nuance.

Roy: And for example, his best note on misguided goals and behavior.

Eva: Absolutely, and for him, it was so obvious . . . Once you accept the fact that all human behavior is a function of goals, you can see why my dad focused on mistaken goals. Goals are the fundamental operating system that people work with and the early "artificial intelligence" people all had that, by the way. I went to conferences of some of these people and they were talking about feedback systems and so on. And the concept of the goal towards which the machine systems work, towards systems' goals, had to be in there. You can't talk about a self-directed system in any other way. Unless you have a goal, nothing makes sense; it's an organizing principle. You can talk about executive function and all kinds of things in the brain, and unless you can think of it in goal directed terms, it doesn't make any sense. So for my father to understand the four mistaken goals, what he added was the systematic nature of things, and in spite of my father's belief that he was not a systematizer, that he was not intellectually rigorous . . . in fact he was. Enormously. But he never had that as a self-identity concept. He never thought of himself as a categorizer or as mathematical (manipulation of symbols, etc.), but his mind really worked like that. And that's how he got to the four mistaken goals. The important point here is that in his categorization of goals he is describing dynamics and not traits. The goals change according to the person or situation with which the child is interacting.

Bill: Going back to your comment about the Ansbachers—you know they had the book called "The Bible." Can you give us any examples of how they might've misinterpreted things?

Eva: Oh, surely. The big issue had to do with my father's understanding that Adler's theory was developed in three stages, and Ansbacher did not grasp this. You know what I have in my little Adlerian theory book, that Adler had 3 phases. Ansbacher got stuck in the 2nd stage. He got stuck in believing that inferiority feelings were inevitable and part of psychic life. . . . Adler in his final stage of theory development did not say that. My father got it. I just added to what my father thought. Because I had so much rigorous experimental psychological training, it was easy for me to put it in those terms. The distinction that my father emphasized and that Ansbacher just narrowly missed was that you can have inferiority feelings about tasks. And that the striving to overcome that Adler was talking about had to be understood as a task process. Thus, the nature of every child growing up is to overcome insufficiency in tasks. And what my father was able to identify clearly in his book on social equality was about that. He didn't put it in those terms because he wasn't trained as an experimental psychologist, which I was, but it's all about task performance. You can have inferiority feelings about your task performance and that's in the nature of normal growth and development. The little baby doesn't know how to walk, how to sit, or how to do anything, and looks at his own behavior and compares it to everybody around. "This is where I want to go. I want to get better at what I can do." In my father's book, social equality was: "but I am not inferior to them as a person." My father knew that Adler embraced the importance of "social equality" which was unrelated to inferiority feelings about tasks. Ansbacher never understood that, never understood that when Adler was talking about inferiority feelings that he was only referring to task performance and never to the most fundamental existential identity that a human has: "I am equal to other people." So that's the distinction. Inferiority feelings about one's self identity does occur, but it is not inevitable. When one is raised in Adlerian ways, one believes one is equal, not inferior as a person. And my dad and Ansbacher had unfortunate conflicts over that. And if you look at my book you can see I've included the three stages. It's because Ansbacher never got to the third stage, that he and my dad had important differences. Unlike my father, Ansbacher never worked with Adler in a clinic, in a community; he never was in the school with Adler.

Roy: That little yellow book is my Bible. That is the one I use with all my students. I say Ansbacher gives you richness of the theory, but the little yellow book gives you how to use it, and a little summary of really what it's all about. And you get more out of that little yellow book than you will out of four books on Adlerian psychology.

Eva: And what it is, is distilled Dreikurs. When I wrote it, I still didn't have the full insights I do now. Through ICASSI and other events, I've really grown in my own way of thinking about it. But people like Mim Pew, Richard Kopp, and others, helped with formulation of specific things. And I'd say this is pure Dreikurs. This is what my dad taught, essentially.

Bill: I always buy four or five yellow books at a time and give them away to my students.

Eva: Aww, thank you.

Bill: That's how I introduce them to Adlerian psychology.

Eva: That's good. I'd like to think it becomes the foundation for a lot of people. When I was just now at Berkeley, I tried to get them to understand they are getting so close to Adler and Dreikurs. They're so close. They have so much of those ideas, but they don't have any grasp of what Adlerian psychology is and how it is so prescient of developments in psychology today. I sent you a copy of that article that came out in the *General Psychologist*, and I sent it to some of my colleagues there. Unfortunately, Adlerian psychology is not yet part of the dominant approach, and though their work is so close to Adler, they are not cognizant of Adler, and they don't accept that language yet. But I sure did my best to try to persuade them: "You need to understand what Adler tried to say," because they are so close, so close, to understanding exactly what Adler and Dreikurs are talking about. But they haven't yet acknowledged it. I did what I could, but I couldn't counteract the prestige factor, meaning that the "big wigs" in psychology aren't talking Adler, so at this point they aren't talking Adler. We'll see what I can do. I may not live long enough to push them over the edge.

Roy: Knowing you as I do, you won't go away.

Eva: No, I won't go away. And getting that little article in the American Psychological Association newsletter like that was reaching people who had never heard of Adler. That newsletter was talking about Tolman in that same issue, and it was presenting these wonderful obedience studies by Milgram, and so my article was buried in classical stuff. I don't know if you looked at that—did you look at the little article?

Bill: No, I didn't see it.

Eva: So it's buried. Adler is in between Milgram and Tolman. People who are interested in psychology and the history of psychology may think Adler is worth listening to.

Bill: One of the questions we have is this: You have carried on the journey of spreading Adler's and Dreikurs's ideas throughout the world, with your tireless effort, with NASAP, ICASSI, and international travel. You had the opportunity to go in various directions with your career but chose to go this one. The question is why?

Eva: That's a good question, and you guys are all good in what you are doing. I did not always do Adlerian work. For quite a few years I did experimental research, but after some years it helped me understand Adlerian psychology.

My dad was not happy with science for psychology, and for good reasons. He grew up in a time when behaviorism was there, and strict determinism was the model, and he had lots of reasons why he would distrust a strict scientific-research–based approach. When I realized the depth of truth about his ideas, I nevertheless realized there were things missing, which is why I wanted to learn experimental psychology, to see what it could offer to strengthen Adlerian psychology. And the things that I did research in, no Adlerian would ever assume I did. It was on verbal learning, it was on parafoveal-viewing of three letter words. You and other Adlerians don't know any of this research, but indirectly it bears on the Adlerian question of what the human is like.

My father was completely oriented around a top-down approach. For him, cognitive processes dominated everything. I knew from experimental psychology that that's not true. Bottom-up processes also play a large role in human functioning. I needed to understand how these bottom-up processes work in order to understand how the human mind or brain deals with complex information. Remember that Herb Simon's approach was focused on information processing, and that's the nature of artificial intelligence. Everything was conceptualized in terms of information processing. We are talking about information flow, essentially. If everything is top-down, the way Adler and Dreikurs proposed, it would seem that this takes considerable time. Bottom-up processing can be fast. I needed to explore for myself what the limits are of the top-down and bottom-up approach. Parafoveal vision (when you see stimuli in the periphery rather than in the center of vision) seemed to me to provide a bottom-up approach for perception. One of my students was measuring word recognition in terms of the Bruner-Postman approach to perception, which was based on the top-down interpretation, of beliefs determining perception. I don't know if you remember those early studies, that when you are given an ambiguous stimulus you can interpret it in a number of ways, and many times it is a top-down process that determines how you interpret the stimulus. Well, he was trying to achieve a tachistoscopic presentation of stimulus material, and we published it in a 1979 paper on the effect of motivation on perceptual processing. It was published in the *American Journal of Psychology*.

I had thought for sure that the information that the brain processes needs to be present for several seconds before it becomes meaningful,

but he got it down to a second or so. Well I got a tachistoscope. Unfortunately it's no longer in service. It's called a Gerbrand's tachistoscope, and it had some high-powered methods for fast stimulus presentations. You could get a presentation as fast as 5 or 10 milliseconds with a special mechanism that this tachistoscope had. So I did quite a few years of work with that tachistoscope. What I found, which for me is extremely valuable, is that humans can process information at somewhere between 5 and 10 ms, which is enormously fast. A reflex is about 100 ms. Brain information studies have been done on how fast it takes for information to travel from one part of the brain to another, and it is something like 80 ms. So, when you are talking about 10 ms, the normal person who sees it reports it as a flash, and comes up with a statement "I saw nothing." This was published in the *Psychonomic Bulletin* in the 1990s. I wrote several articles on this. Essentially, you present a very rapid stimulus repeatedly without a masking stimulus, and the dependent variable is the number of presentations that it takes before the person can tell you a three letter word. The person starts with F or X or something, and the person thinks she or he is guessing. In fact, it is not fully guessing. An enormous amount of information gets processed in that quick amount of time. And the average person has no insight about this. At an experimental level you can test this, although subjectively the person would never know that one is processing that much information in 10 ms. At an experiential subjective level, the average person would tell you "I saw nothing."

One of the interesting things that we know is that bright people have much faster brain processing than others. When I was at Northwestern and I was testing these students who were all very bright, they were able to recognize the syllables with very few presentations. I was astonished to find this. What I was testing for was the effect of motivation, because an arousal mechanism should help speed this. That is the nature of arousal. The transfer of information is much faster under high arousal than under low arousal. I had half the people hungry and half the people not hungry, and I also found the effect of hemispheric asymmetry. This research was published in the 1990s in the *Psychonomic Bulletin*. The fact that you can, in bottom-up processing, get so much information, and that the brighter individual will get a lot more information in a shorter time than a less bright individual, was for me very interesting. Everybody can get a lot of information in 10 ms or less. This knowledge helps you know how to explain the Adlerian principles for how people make decisions. Adler and Dreikurs said that we make choices and decisions all the time, and this is interpreted subjectively by people as being a very slow, conscious process. We

know: "no, it's not." Choices or decisions can be made implicitly (out of awareness), and information processing can be extremely rapid. The tachistoscopic studies were a help for me to understand this aspect of mental life. My research did not address this issue, but it provided me with a great deal of data to show that in fact via very fast processing we can take in a lot of information and make decisions. We pick up huge amounts of information in a very small amount of time, and we don't know we're picking it up.

Roy: That's how we make decisions.

Eva: Yes, though it takes extra seconds, then, for the brain and the mind to work on all of this.

Roy: So, you stoked something in me, and that's why private logic is so scrambled sometimes. Because we are making these decisions so rapidly. I'd like to say, Eva, what you are saying is that you went a step further even than your father and Adler in the sense of building the cases, don't assume the brain controls, assume that the individual consumes information so rapidly and makes decisions.

Eva: Well, hang on. I think you have to read my motivation book to recognize what I'm trying to say. I really urge you to do that. At any given time, the brain uses whatever is available. Most of the time we rely on stored knowledge which the brain has.

Roy: Ok.

Eva: The whole concept of an adaptation is that we're always adjusting our behavior—and here we go back to Piaget and assimilation and accommodation and so on—we're always taking in information, and we are always integrating what is already stored with what's coming in. That's the nature of adaptive behavior. In psychosis like schizophrenia, the individual is no longer taking in adaptive information or is no longer adapting behaviorally to the new incoming information. The person reacts on the basis of what is already in the system. In this way the person perverts incoming information, by twisting what's coming in. When you're open to a common sense perspective, you're not twisting the information but taking it in as it occurs. What you do with that depends on various stages of processing. You can do a lot of things with that information. You can continue to be influenced by the incoming information, and then you are doing the assimilation, which is integrating the new information with what is already in the system. You know that my dad was a great believer in synthesis, based on the Hegelian principle of incoming information. Are you familiar with Hegel's principles? Everything is based on synthesis. You are taking the information in and you are looking at the alternatives, and then you are trying to integrate all of it. This is a constant process that the mind does. We are

always doing this, in every way, about everything. Now, what Adler added is that we're directing it towards goals. Adler and Dreikurs have gone beyond a reactive model. According to Adlerian psychology, we're processing information at a proactive level.

From the Adlerian point of view, we are always proactively doing things. Our thoughts and actions are not only based on reality coming in, and not only based on what is in the head in terms of memory storage, but in terms of anticipated outcomes, because of the nature of the goal directedness. Nothing has been written on this, I'm just telling you what I know. The whole point of my having had such a long journey away from my dad's ideas is because of my need to know what's going on. I was doing all of this research as much to let me know, and then try to persuade psychology as a whole "this is how these things happen." I haven't done a lot of persuading yet because I've had too many irons in the fire. I've had to cover too many grounds. When I go to an APA convention or a psychonomic convention, somebody recognizes me: "Oh you're the parafoveal view researcher." Oh, I am, but that was only a means to an end. That was a means to understanding how does the mind work, and how could we do the complex things that Adler says we are doing. My conclusion is that we are doing bottom-up stuff, we are doing top-down stuff, we are integrating it, and we are also integrating it not only in terms of the immediate situation but in terms of a prospective one.

Bill: Plenty of methodologists I've studied have a similar philosophy. In a book I read recently the author, who studied Hegel and others, said "things come in threes." In one sense that's what we are talking about.

Eva: My dad believed in Hegel's three processes. He was also influenced by Kant but I think mainly through Adler. My sense is that my dad didn't pursue academic writing. I have the impression that Adler read all of this stuff, Adler talked about it, and my dad picked up the important materials. My dad was a very bright person, but he didn't think of himself as a scholar. He didn't want to be a scholar. He was, but he didn't want to think of himself that way. I know he read Kant, because he was supposed to. He learned Greek, he learned Latin, he learned lots of things, but he rebelled being a good student. That was not a big thing for him.

Roy: He's kind of analogous to Adler.

Eva: Yes, yes. He was influenced by Kant and Hegel through Adler. My husband, who is a philosopher, informed me that Adler's constructs of private logic and common sense came from the works of Kant. Bill Linden taught me that. I'm giving you this third leg, because you have to take goal-directed behavior into account at all times in an Adlerian

model. For Adler and my dad, everything we do is forward oriented. Psychology is beginning to understand that this is the way the human mind works. Theories of hunger, for example, were based on a homeostatic model which was not forward looking; it was based on homeostasis—to get back to where you were. The modern theory of how hunger works is a feed-forward system, not a feed-backward system. Psychology is constantly moving towards this understanding that everything is based on consequences. Contemporary views of consequences are not in terms of a hedonic system, such as Skinnerian reinforcement, but in terms of a broad set of consequences, such as goal outcomes.

Bill: You are using the term *goal*; Adlerians also use the term *fictional goals*. Could you just clarify that a bit?

Eva: Yes, it's always fictional because everything is transformed through our private filter. My dad used to tell me this, and I could never understand it. As I've matured in my thinking, it begins to make more sense now. The talk I gave this morning included that. There's nothing we do that is outside of our own private logic. We can only go in those terms. We learn academic things, and we accept them and believe them as if they were our own experience but we make choices about what scientific facts we accept and what we don't. We've learned that the Earth is round, but none of us have ever experienced that the Earth is round. Unless you are an astronaut, the "round Earth" is beyond any of our human experiences. There's no way we can directly perceive that. In terms of bottom-up processing, it will always look flat. But we have to accept knowledge that comes to us at an academic level. But it's based on the private logic of "I trust these people, I trust that what they are telling me is true, I'm better off for believing that than believing in a flat Earth," etc. So we always bring something of our private logic to our common sense, is what I'm saying. It's never devoid of a private logic component. Everything we do has a private logic component. Aristotle and Plato's idea of "know thyself," I interpret that as "know your own private logic." The more you know your own private logic, the better you can relate to the world around you effectively and the more you can see where it is interfering with your adaptive behavior.

Roy: Eva, we'd like to go on for two more hours, because you are such a wonderfully insightful person in the sense of what you have given us today.

Eva: I don't know if it will be enough.

Roy: I think it will be more than sufficient.

Bill: Let's look at more of these interview questions. Are there any of these you would like to answer?

Eva: In terms of the future, I would just dearly love for Adlerians themselves to have a better understanding of Adlerian psychology so they don't get hung up with traps. People get hung up with traps. . . . This morning at the NASAP convention I would say the presenters were relatively free of traps, although they forgot the importance of private logic. I don't see how you can ever talk about Adlerian psychology without talking about private logic. I would say the main thing is for Adlerians themselves to have keener insights of Adlerian ideas. Not to get caught up in traps, not to get caught up in status symbols. Many Adlerian ideas can be shown to be supported by non-Adlerian research, and I'd like to see more articles demonstrating that relationship. You (Roy, Bill, Kelly Gfroerer) have done such good research, and I'm very glad. I hope you keep doing research, not about specific methods but underlying truths. I value what Hamid Alizadeh [co-author of a research article] did, for he tested Adler-Dreikurs ideas. He pointed out that "here are the methods of training teachers to help children, and does it help the children or doesn't it?" And the answer was so strong that "it helps the children." We need to have more fundamental research addressing what is going on. I'm hoping that what Kelly and I are doing with the Positive Discipline trainers will be to pinpoint the issues. We are trying to be careful in the questions we're asking and what kind of instruments we're using, so that we'll be able to say when we are done "these and these cognitive changes are occurring when you get Adlerian training." Specific cognitive changes happen when you get Adlerian training on parenting. We don't want only to know that Adlerian parenting helps you, but in what specific ways will such training help.

In my talk today, a newcomer was asking how can he learn to be Adlerian? He was a chair of a psychology department at a university. What can he do that is different? There are some very simple changes you can make. For example, instead of telling somebody to do something, ask a question. Children are never asked a question, they are always told something. When you ask a question, the child is astonished because nobody asks for the child's opinion on anything. The typical interaction is not to ask a question but to tell something to the child. That's such a small behavioral change, and yet it's so profound in its psychological impact. Why? You are treating another as equal, you are asking for a dialogue, you are having an exchange between two equals who have mutual respect. You have a very small behavioral change that has huge emotional, social, cognitive impact. That's what I want Adlerian psychology to focus on. Not the superficial things—you do this and you do that—but what small changes in behavior have profound psychological impact, and then to understand why they do.

Asking a question is an example of that in my opinion. I'd like for us in Adlerian psychology to move as leaders in this way.

Bill: Does that involve empirical research?

Eva: Absolutely. I'm an experimental psychologist at heart. You have to have the data. Remember experimental psychologists are not "correlational" people. They manipulate things in order to see the change it produces. I never grew up in my training at graduate school with a correlational model. I grew up with the experimental "dependent and independent variable" model. And that's the nature of what I'd like to see happen, that is, we're looking for specific independent variables and specific dependent variable changes they bring. That's what I'd like to see happen in Adlerian psychology. Hopefully it sets the stage for all of psychology.

Bill: Thank you so much for your contributions.