

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC INTERVIEW AS INSPIRATION FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Steinar Kvale

Aarhus University, Denmark

A qualitative research wave has swept through the social sciences during the last decades. Interviews, textual analyses and natural observations have come into widespread use as modes of inquiry. The qualitative research movement is interdisciplinary, and an opening of the social sciences to the humanities has taken place, drawing on hermeneutics, as well as narrative, discursive, conversational and linguistic forms of analysis.

The science of psychology has until now remained outside the qualitative research movement. This is rather strange, as key modes of qualitative research, such as the interview, work through human interrelationships, which are the subject matter of psychology. Further, substantial areas of current psychological knowledge were initially brought forth through qualitative interviews. In particular, this pertains to Freud's psychoanalytic interview, which has also inspired subsequent interview research. Piaget's interviews of children's thought and Adorno and co-workers' interviews about the authoritarian personality illustrate this point. The Hawthorne interviews with industrial workers and the consumer interviews by Dichter were also inspired by the psychoanalytic interview.

In an attempt to further psychological interview research today, I shall take these historical interview inquiries as point of departure. Rather than to follow the methodological and paradigmatic direction of the qualitative research wave, I will pursue a pragmatic approach, taking the significant knowledge produced by psychoanalytic and other psychological interviews as basis. Pointing to the paradox that knowledge originally produced by qualitative interviews has become generally accepted, but the interview method producing this knowledge generally rejected, I will also address the methodical marginalisation of qualitative research in psychology. In the concluding part I shall outline two different therapeutic and academic paths of interview research by addressing questions about human interrelations and methodology, objectivity of knowledge and ethical tensions, which arise when treating therapeutic interviews as research.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PSYCHOANALYTIC INTERVIEW

I will here discuss the psychoanalytic interview as a mode of knowledge production, first by pointing to the significance of psychoanalytically produced knowledge and then by outlining key aspects of the psychoanalytic interview. Thereafter I will discuss later academic and commercial interview inquiries inspired by psychoanalysis and also mention a philosophical interest in the knowledge generation of the psychoanalytic interview.

Significance of psychoanalytically produced knowledge

For the year 2000 anniversary Time Magazine selected “top 20 scientists and thinkers” forming the culture of the 20th century. The cover pictured Freud and Einstein in the foreground. In the portraits of the two psychologists included – Freud and Piaget – their abilities to patiently listen to and observe their subjects’ behaviour were emphasised as important traits of their research.

A century after its inception, psychoanalysis still has a professional impact on psychotherapy, continues to be of interest to the general public, to other sciences, and to represent a challenge to philosophers. Psychoanalysis has throughout the history of psychology contributed strongly to generating research, and its concepts have been assimilated into the mainstream of psychology and into the larger culture. Central themes in current textbooks of psychology are based on knowledge originally derived from the psychoanalytic interview, for example regarding dreams and neurosis, sexuality, childhood development and personality, anxiety and motivation, defence mechanisms and unconscious forces. To give a quantitative indication of the pervasive influence of psychoanalysis, it can be pointed out that the *Encyclopedia of Psychology* (Corsini, 1994) contains more than twice as many references to Freud than to any of the other pioneers producing psychological knowledge, such as Wundt, Pavlov, Watson, Piaget or Skinner.

The significant knowledge generation of psychoanalysis is not confined to Freud's original insights. Later psychoanalysts, such as Jung and Adler, Fromm and Horney, Erickson and Rollo May, continued to produce important knowledge of the human situation through their therapeutic interviews. Also the current focus on a “narcissistic” personality and culture, a clinical term developed theoretically by Freud, originated with clinical descriptions from the psychoanalytic interviews of Kohut, Kernberg and Mitscherlich in the 1960s.

Psychoanalytic interview research

The psychoanalytic interview is in psychology usually treated as a therapeutic method, and its therapeutical efficiency is a matter of controversy. I will here address the psychoanalytic therapeutic interview as a method of research.

The focus is on the concrete descriptive and interpretative knowledge derived from the psychoanalytic situation, what Klein (1973) has termed the “clinical theory” of psychoanalysis. The present approach is inspired by the existential and the critical emancipatory analyses of psychoanalytic therapy by Boss (1963) and Habermas (1971) respectively. Both scholars analyse the mode of understanding of the psychoanalytic situation, while dismissing Freud’s speculative meta-psychological theories. For the sake of simplicity, I will here disregard other schools in the psychoanalytic tradition, as well as later therapies - such as client-centred therapy, family and system therapy – and limit the discussion to the case of Freud’s classical psychoanalysis, due to its historical priority and theoretical significance.

To Freud the psychoanalytic interview was not only a method of treatment, but it was also the research method upon which psychoanalytic theory is based: "It is indeed one of the distinctions of psychoanalysis that research and treatment proceeds hand in hand"(Freud, 1963, p.120). In Box 1 I have outlined seven key aspects of the psychoanalytic interview relevant to understanding its potential as a research situation. They are derived from Freud's writings on

therapy and technique (1963), and they have been discussed more in an earlier context (Kvale, 1999a).

Box 1. Seven aspects of the psychoanalytic interview

The individual case study. Psychoanalytical therapy is an intensive case study of individual patients over several years which allows for multiple observations and repeated controls of observations and interpretations of the patients statements and behaviour.

The open mode of interviewing. The psychoanalytical interview takes place in the structured setting of the therapeutic hour and proceeds in an open, often indirect manner. The patients' "free associations" corresponds with the therapist's "evenly-hovering attention" in which one proceeds "... aimlessly, and allows oneself to be overtaken by any surprises, always presenting to them an open mind, free from any expectations" (Freud, 1963, p. 120).

The interpretation of meaning. An essential aspect of psychoanalytic technique is interpretation of the meaning of the patients' statements and behaviour. The therapeutic interpretations are open to ambiguity and contradictions, and to the multiple layers of meaning of a dream or a symptom.

The temporal dimension. Psychoanalytic therapy unfolds over several years in a historical dimension. Freud's innovation of seeing neurotic disturbances in a meaningful biographical perspective provided the therapist with a uniquely rich context for interpreting the patients' dreams and their neurotic symptoms.

The human interaction. Psychoanalytic therapy takes place through an emotional human interrelation, with a reciprocal personal involvement. The emotional transference is employed by the therapist as a means to overcome the resistance offered to the therapist when attempting to make the patient's unconscious conscious to him. The psychoanalysts do not seek to eliminate their own feelings towards their patients, but to employ this "countertransference" in the therapeutic process as a reflected subjectivity.

Pathology as topic of investigation. The subject matter of psychoanalytic therapy is the abnormal and irrational behaviour of patients in crisis. The pathological behaviour provides a magnifying glass for the less visible conflicts of average individuals; the neuroses and psychoses are extreme versions of normal behaviour, of what has gone wrong in a given culture.

The instigation of change. The mutual interest of patient and therapist is to overcome the patients' suffering from their neurotic symptoms. Despite the patients having sought treatment voluntarily, they exhibit a deeply seated resistance towards changing their self-understanding and behaviour. While understanding may lead to change, the implicit theory of knowledge in psychoanalysis is that a fundamental understanding of a phenomenon is first to be obtained by attempting to change the phenomenon.

These seven aspects of the psychoanalytic interview have commonly been regarded as merely practical aspects of the therapeutic technique, or as sources of error for a scientific research method. The mode of understanding of the psychoanalytic interview falls outside a conception of psychological science as seeking objective knowledge in the form of unequivocal, immutable and quantifiable facts through impersonal standardised and repeatable observations. From the present perspective it is the very aspects of the psychoanalytic interview depicted above, which have led to its rejection as a scientific method, that contribute to the

significant psychoanalytical knowledge production about the human situation and its philosophical relevance today.

Interview researchers in psychology need today not necessarily always cross the border to the other social sciences and the humanities and import the latest methods and paradigms of the qualitative wave. By sticking to their own trade, psychologists may find many of the necessary interview tools within their own therapeutic backyard.

Psychoanalytically inspired academic interview research

The psychoanalytic therapeutic interview has inspired major investigations in the history of academic and commercial psychology. I shall now discuss two academic interview investigations: Piaget's interviews with children and Adorno and co-workers' interviews with authoritarian personalities.

Piaget's interviews on children's thought. Piaget was a trained biologist, who became interested in epistemology. As a means of understanding the human acquisition of knowledge he instigated innovative studies of children's thought. He let the children talk spontaneously about weight and size of objects and noticed the manner in which their thoughts unfolded themselves, combining naturalistic observations, interviews, simple tests, and quasi-experimental designs.

Piaget's early work was inspired by psychoanalysis, he undertook a training analysis and also briefly analysed some patients, and joined the Swiss Psychoanalytic Society (see Litowitz, 1998). His paper on "Symbolic thought and the thought of the child" (1923), presented at the Seventh Congress of Psychoanalysis in Berlin, starts with drawing analogies between the thought of the child and the forms of symbolic thought uncovered by Freud's and Jung's psychoanalysis.

When working with Simon on the development of intelligence tests, Piaget focused on what the children answered incorrectly and the reasons they gave for the wrong answers, thus believing that the errors may reveal the underlying structures of children's thought. This was in line with psychoanalysis taking the abnormal behaviour of the patients seriously, searching for underlying structures of the irrational thought. His "clinical method" was inspired by the psychoanalytic interview: "If we follow up each of the child's answers, and then, allowing him to take the lead, induce him to talk more and more freely, we shall gradually establish for every department of intelligence a method of clinical analysis analogous to that which has been adopted by psychiatrists as a means of diagnosis" (Piaget, 1923, p 276; see also the preface by Clarapède in Piaget, 1971, 1st edition 1926).

Later Piaget became more critical of psychoanalysis, while continuing to enter in dialogue with psychoanalysts and to write in psychoanalytical journals. In current textbook accounts of Piaget's research, and in the many investigations it has instigated, the experimental aspect has dominated, while the clinical interviewing approach and its psychoanalytic inspiration is rarely mentioned.

The authoritarian personality study by Adorno and co-workers. Psychoanalytic interviews in Germany in the 1930s had uncovered an authoritarian personality syndrome. In the work by Fromm, Horkheimer, Marcuse and others (1936) at the Frankfurt Institute of Social Re-

search this authoritarian syndrome was traced to the social and family structures giving rise to fascism. Adorno and co-workers followed up the German psychoanalytic and Marxist analyses of anti-Semitism in a large scale research project in the United States on the relationship of personality and prejudice - *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford, 1993; 1st edition 1950).

The theoretical impetus for the study came from psychoanalysis. Methodologically, the project was an innovative combination of questionnaires and clinical interviews; the inspiration for the latter from psychoanalysis goes forth in the interview chapter of *The Authoritarian Personality*. The best way to approximate an adequate view of the whole person was through the freedom of expression, the interview offered, as it permitted inferences of the deeper layers of the subjects' personalities behind an antidemocratic ideology. The indirect interview technique with a flexible interview schedule consisted of "manifest questions" as suggestions for the interviewer to pose in order to throw light on the "underlying questions", derived from the project's theoretical framework. These underlying questions had to be concealed from the subject so that undue defences would not be established through the subjects' recognition of the real focus of the interview. The authors emphasised the training of their interviewers; close to half had undergone psychoanalysis. The interviews were analysed qualitatively in relation to the theoretical framework of the study and they were used as a basis for individual case studies. The interview results were compared with the findings from the questionnaires, and the interviews also served to check upon the validity of the questionnaires.

The quantitative findings and the construction of the questionnaires, in particular the Fascism-scale, have dominated the psychological reception of *The Authoritarian Personality*. The extensive interview procedures – in this study treated on an equal level with the questionnaires – have hardly been noted in later psychological reports. A footnote in the concluding chapter, indicating that a sensitive observer of the human situation may also arrive at similar results as a large scale psychological research project, has also gone unnoticed: "There is a marked similarity between the syndrome which we have labelled the authoritarian personality and 'the portrait of the anti-Semite' by Jean-Paul Sartre. Sartre's brilliant paper became available to us after all our data had been collected and analysed. That this phenomenological 'portrait' should resemble so closely, both in general structure and in numerous details, the syndrome which slowly emerged from our empirical observations and quantitative analysis, seems to us remarkable" (p. 475) (See Sartre's *Anti-Semite and Jew*, 1965, 1st edition 1946; Hannush, 1973).

Psychoanalytically inspired commercial interview research

I shall now turn to two historical studies of commercial psychology, which also were inspired by the psychoanalytic interview. Their objective was to increase efficiency and profits in the domains of production and consumption - the Hawthorne studies of human relations in industry and the motivational consumer interviews as pioneered by Dichter.

The Hawthorne interviews on human relations in industry. The investigations at the Hawthorne Chicago plant of Western Electrical Company in the 1920s have had a major impact on later industrial production. Experiments on the effects of changes in illumination for pro-

duction led to unexpected results – work output and morale increased when lighting of the production rooms was improved, as well as when lighting was decreased.

In order to investigate the reasons of these bewildering findings, the workers were also interviewed, and the results suggested that the management's display of human interest to the workers could be a key factor in increasing their morale and industrial output. The unforeseen findings were followed up in what may have been the largest interview inquiry ever conducted - - *Management and the Worker* (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964; 1st edition 1939). More than 21,000 workers were each interviewed for over an hour and the interview transcripts analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. The purpose of the study, which was initiated by the psychologist Mayo, was to improve industrial supervision. In a sophisticated method chapter interviewing is presented as a new mode of industrial research, inspired by clinical psychology and anthropology. The authors mention the influence of Janet, Freud, Jung, and in particular Piaget, whose clinical method of interviewing children they found particularly useful. (It may be added, that Janet had based his theories of psychopathology on more than 5,000 cases of clinical interviews; cf. Ellenberger, 1970).

In their indirect clinical interviews Roethlisberger and Dickson recognised that the social relation existing between the interviewer and the workers in part determined what was said. They allowed their workers to speak spontaneously and did not limit themselves to the manifest content of the intercourse, nor listened not only to what the worker wanted to say, but also to what he did not want to say, and did not treat all that was said as either fact or error. Roethlisberger and Dickson regarded several years of training at actual interviewing as required to become a proficient interviewer. In later psychological accounts of the study's findings about human relations in industrial production the study's more than 21,000 interviews are seldom mentioned.

Market interviews and focus groups. The design and advertisements of consumer products are today investigated by quantitative and qualitative approaches, the latter particularly in the form of focus groups. Dichter reports in *The Strategy of Desire* (1960) a pioneer study from 1939 on consumer motivation by purchasing a car. It was based on case stories with more than a hundred detailed conversational interviews. His indirect interviewing technique encouraged the respondents to talk freely about a subject, rather than to answer "yes" or "no" to a question. He depicted the interview technique as inspired by the diagnoses of psychoanalysts and termed it a "depth interview" and also a "non-directive interview". According to Dichter the uncovering of the symbolic meanings of cars and the hidden motivations of driving a car decisively changed the marketing of automobiles. While giving a detailed and sensitive presentation of the non-directive interview technique, the overall design of Dichter's motivational interviews was less systematic than in the Hawthorne studies.

Today, combinations of qualitative interviews and questionnaires play a major role by the prediction and control of consumer behaviour. Probably a major part of the qualitative research interviewing today takes place within market research; thus in the year 1990 more than 110,000 focus groups were conducted (Greenbaum, 1999). The extensive use of qualitative research interviews in market psychology today is hardly recognised in textbooks on psychological methodology.

What can be learned from therapeutic and therapeutically inspired interviews?

The historical interview studies reviewed above suggest that psychological interview researchers today need not reinvent the wheel, but may learn from classical psychological interview inquiries in the therapeutic, academic and commercial domains. I shall here first summarise some features of the above studies in relation to the seven aspects of the psychoanalytic interview outlined in Box 1 above, and thereafter draw in the broader style of psychoanalytic research with an emphasis upon the training, the theory and the culture of the interviewer.

Seven aspects of psychoanalytic interviews revisited. The psychoanalytic interview has provided direct inspiration for the open and indirect interview techniques and for the interpretations of meaning of later interview inquiries. The *open mode of interviewing* is a thoroughgoing characteristic of the four interview studies discussed above, which allowed the research subjects to talk freely, rather than reacting to predetermined standard questions. The mode of questioning was not totally non-directive, the manifest questions posed to the interviewees could be derived from underlying theoretical questions.

The interview inquiries were directed towards the *interpretation of meaning*, unfolding the complexities of the subjects' answers, and not forging them into predetermined categories for subsequent quantification. The studies entailed a tolerance to ambiguity; rather than seeking for unequivocal facts, they listened not only to what a person manifestly said, but also to what a person did not want to say. It should though be noted that in these classical psychological studies, there was little reported about the methods used for analysing the interviews. Psychological interview researchers may here learn from the methods of textual analyses of the humanities, as they are now being applied in the qualitative research of the other social sciences (see e.g. Lincoln and Denzin, 2000).

As regards to *pathology*, this was not the topic of the investigation of the four interview studies, but they were all open to the irrational elements of their subjects' answers. Piaget thus directed his interviews towards the errors in the children's thought and the Adorno group addressed the unconscious defences of the authoritarian personalities interviewed. The Hawthorne investigators refrained from treating all that was said as either fact or error and Dichter studied unconscious and irrational motives of consumer behaviour. We thus find a direct inspiration from psychoanalysis in the four interview inquiries discussed here regarding the open and indirect mode of interviewing, the interpretation of meaning, and of taking apparently irrational interview answers seriously – "If this is madness, there is method in it".

Psychoanalytic research is predominantly based on therapeutic interview *case studies*. The four later interview inquiries discussed here were to a considerable extent case studies, characterised by a methodological eclecticism where interviews were applied as one among several methods to unravel the meaning of the phenomena investigated, such as natural observations, experiments, tests and questionnaires. The studies went beyond the single subject case to encompass a larger number of interviewees; Freud and Piaget reported observations from multiple patients and children, both the authoritarian personality study and the Dichter's motivational consumer study included more than hundred interviews, and the Hawthorne study over 21,000 interviews.

It may be noted that in the light of these historical interview studies some dichotomies of current paradigmatic debates dissipate into pseudo issues - such as quantitative vs. qualita-

tive, and exploratory vs. hypothesis testing. Thus neither quantitative nor qualitative techniques were treated as more scientific or more legitimate, they rather served as different and supplementary tools to obtain different forms of knowledge about the phenomena of interest. The other current dichotomy also absent in these studies is the conception of qualitative inquiries as merely exploratory to subsequent scientific questionnaire and experimental investigations. The many interviews of the Hawthorne study were thus conducted after the original experiments in order to explain the unexpected experimental findings about the effects of illumination upon work. In the authoritarian personality study one of the uses of the interviews was to validate the findings from the questionnaires.

Some of the key aspects of the psychoanalytic interview outlined earlier were not transferable to the academic and commercial interview inquiries discussed here, such as the extended *temporal dimension* of several years with the intense emotional *human interaction* of the psychoanalytic interview and the *instigation of changes* in the persons interviewed. Ethical dilemmas raised by a transfer of such aspects of the psychoanalytic interview to research settings will be discussed in the concluding section of this chapter.

It is paradoxical that, within the discipline of psychology, some of the most lasting and penetrating knowledge of the human situation has been produced as a side effect of helping patients to change their lives. One implication of the knowledge potentials of the therapeutic situation may be a move from treating professional practice merely as the application of scientific theories, towards also regarding professional practice as a powerful site of producing knowledge of the human situation. There are today scholars, who take practitioners' knowledge serious in its own right, often as inspired by postmodern and pragmatic philosophy (e.g. Fishman, 1999; Gergen, 1994; Polkinghorne, 1992; Schön, 1987). A rehabilitation of professional practice as a site of psychological knowledge production need not necessarily lead to an unreflective practiciness devoid of theory; the history of psychoanalysis testifies to the possibility of theorising from the therapeutic situation.

The training, the theory and the culture of the interviewer: Psychoanalytic research goes beyond the seven aspects of the psychoanalytic interview situation discussed here. They are subordinated a general style of research which puts a strong emphasis on the training, the theory and the culture of the interviewer.

The experience and the *training* of the interviewer is a key aspect of the interview studies discussed here. The academic and personal training of the therapist over several years is a presupposition for conducting psychoanalytic therapy and research. Piaget had undertaken a psychoanalytical training and analysis and followed psychoanalytic seminars, in the authoritarian personality study close to half of the interviewers had undergone psychoanalysis, and in the Hawthorne study several years of training at actual interviewing was considered necessary to become a proficient interviewer. The extensive training of the interviewers in the classical studies discussed here is in stark contrast to the novice interviewing in much qualitative research today.

The psychoanalyst seeks during the therapeutic hour to listen with an evenly-hovering attention to what the patient tells, whereas the subsequent interpretations draw upon psychoanalytic *theory*. Piaget's studies of children's thought were based on his epistemological conceptions of the general development of human thought. The authoritarian personality study by Adorno and co-workers was inspired by psychoanalytic theory of personality formation

and defence mechanisms. The extensive theoretical basis of these investigations contrasts to the atheoretical empiricism of many current qualitative interview studies.

The early psychoanalytic inquiries, in particular of Freud and Jung, were informed by an extensive knowledge of human *culture*, of the knowledge of the human situation recorded in classical myths, literature and art. In academic and commercial interview studies inspired by psychoanalysis, it has mainly been the interview technique, more than the openness to human culture, which has been taken over from psychoanalysis. Also within the psychoanalytic tradition an academic formalisation has taken place, where a theoretical focus on internal ego mechanisms, and of therapy as the repair of ego functions, became stronger than the cultural changes throughout the 20th century and their impact upon human behaviour. The cultural orientation of classical psychoanalysis contrasts with a cultural abstinence of academic psychological research, where human civilisation is often ignored or treated as a source of error in a modern scientific quest for universal cognitive mechanisms or laws of human behaviour.

Philosophical relevance of the psychoanalytic interview

The psychoanalytic generation of knowledge – encompassing the mode of understanding of the therapeutic interview and the psychoanalytic style of research – has not only been a central source of knowledge in psychology, but has also been a major topic of interest to philosophers. While rejected by a positivist philosophy of science, psychoanalytic knowledge has remained a challenge to thinkers in Continental European philosophy. Although critical of the speculative and reductionist trends of Freud's naturalistic metatheory, they have addressed the unique nature of the personal interaction of the psychoanalytical situation, its potentials for personal change, and its contributions towards knowledge of the human situation.

Among philosophers addressing psychoanalysis, Sartre's existential mediation of psychoanalysis and Marxism in *The Problem of Method* (1963) can be mentioned. So can Ricoeur's phenomenological and hermeneutical discussion of *Freud and Philosophy: Essays on Interpretation* (1970), and Habermas' critical hermeneutical analysis of psychoanalysis as a model for an emancipatory social science in *Knowledge and Human Interests* (1971). In France the analyses of the linguistic nature of the unconscious given by Lacan and other psychoanalysts have provided inspiration for philosophers.

While academic psychologists have taken little notice of such reconceptualisations of knowledge, therapists have been more attentive towards developments in philosophy throughout the 20th century. Thus, Swiss psychoanalysts, such as Binswanger in the 1930s (see May et al., 1958) and Boss (1963), addressed the potentials of Heidegger's existential analysis of being for understanding the psychoanalytic interview and their patient's being-in-the-world. Laing's early books, for example *The Self and the Other* (1962), were inspired by Sartre's existentialism. Postmodern philosophy, which has hardly entered academic psychology, has been taken up by family and systemic therapists to reflect on the conversational and relational aspects of their therapeutic practice (e.g. Andersson, 1997). The key human aspects of therapeutic interviews appear from these philosophical positions as pivotal for obtaining penetrating knowledge of the human situation, rather than as sources of error in the quest for objective facts.

In important aspects the psychoanalytic interview, as presented in Box 1 above, is close to conceptions of knowledge developed within existential, hermeneutical and postmodern philosophy (Kvale, 1996; 1999a;b). The case study, again coming to the fore in social science research, is in line with the emphasis upon situated knowledge and the philosophical interest in casuistry. Understanding the interview as a mode of research corresponds with the hermeneutical and neopragmatic focus on the conversation as the locus of knowledge. The importance of interpretation of meaning brings psychoanalysis close to the hermeneutical tradition, where it has been addressed as a “depth hermeneutics” and as a “hermeneutics of suspicion”. The interpersonal inter-relation as the site of psychoanalytic knowledge production is in line with the relational approach of phenomenology and of social constructionism, where the individual is replaced by the relationship as the locus of knowledge. The importance of changing the patient’s understanding and behaviour corresponds with a dialectic and pragmatic emphasis on the intertwinement of knowing and acting, where knowledge grows out of practice and is again validated by its impact on action. External legitimation of knowledge by appeals to some grand metanarratives is then replaced by a focus on the impact of the knowledge. In colloquial language – the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MARGINALISATION OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Before I return to knowledge potentialities and tensions of therapeutic and research interviews in a final section, I will here mention some psychological critiques of psychoanalytic research and also point out a selective disattention to psychoanalytic and academic interviews. It remains a paradox of a scientific psychology that, although knowledge generated by the psychoanalytic interview has become a central part of psychology as well as of our culture, and as just mentioned, an intriguing topic for philosophers, the psychoanalytic interview is rejected as a research method.

Psychological critiques of psychoanalytic research

Pointing out the importance of the knowledge produced by psychoanalytic interviews does not imply a global endorsement of psychoanalytic theory with its many speculative postulates and trends of individualising, infantilising and sexualising human activity. Nor does it imply an in toto acceptance of psychoanalytic case and interview research, which is beset with a multitude of methodical pitfalls (see e.g. Wallerstein & Sampson, 1971). There are many methodic problems with the private nature of psychoanalytic observations, the lack of systematic recordings, and in particular with overgeneralisations from selected cases. It should be noted that overgeneralisations to normal human behaviour in natural settings, whether they come from pathological clinical cases or from artificial laboratory experiments, are inherent dangers for the ecological validity of psychological research. The fact that such overgeneralisations occur does, however, not in general invalidate clinical interviews or experiments as psychological research methods.

The present analysis suggests that therapists need not always look for other research methods, but may today stick to the craft of interviewing, where they already have expertise in techniques of questioning and interpretation of meaning, and employ the unique knowledge potentials of the therapeutic situation for research purposes. This does not imply a carte

blanche for any therapist to declare oneself a researcher and uncritically produce entertaining case stories. On the contrary, the above emphasis of the personal and theoretical training of classical psychoanalysts as well as knowledge of the many methodological pitfalls of the case method, and the relevance of linguistic and textual analyses from the humanities, put extra strong demands on the expertise of therapeutic researchers.

The present approach does not imply the psychoanalytic situation as an orthodox sanctuary, but may encompass flexible combinations of methods. The psychoanalyst Stern (1985) has thus investigated infants' experience of their world – retrospectively through patients' remembrances of their childhood and simultaneously through observations of infants' behaviour. Today some therapists are employing their own therapeutic cases. For example on anorexia, as research material in combination with the patients' diaries, questionnaires and research interviews with the patients, conducted by the therapist and by colleagues, some also drawing the cultural attitudes towards eating and fasting as found in literature, painting and advertisements. A flexible use of research strategies, for example also of academic psychologists critically interviewing therapists about the rich experience of psychological phenomena they accumulate from their many patients, may contribute to overcoming some of the over-interpretations and overgeneralisations from therapeutic case studies.

Psychological neglect of the psychoanalytic interview

Major parts of psychological knowledge have been generated by a method, which does not exist in psychological methodology. General textbooks of scientific psychology today survive parasitically on knowledge produced by a psychoanalytic method, which is denied a scientific status. Two ways out of this therapeutic research paradox emerge. One solution would be to follow up the methodological censorship of the psychoanalytic research interview to also censor the knowledge it has generated, and ban psychoanalytically produced knowledge from textbooks of psychological science. One alternative solution, pursued in the present chapter, is to regard the psychoanalytic interview as one among many psychological research methods, and investigate its research potentials.

Research methodology occupies a major position in current programs of psychology. One searches in vain, however, in psychology textbooks for any mention of the major source of psychoanalytic knowledge – the psychoanalytic interview. For example, in the 13th edition of *Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology* (Atkinson et al., 2000), Freud is the author most often referred to, while the main basis of his knowledge – the psychoanalytic interview – does not exist as a research method in the textbook.

The scientific status of qualitative research is a cultural phenomenon. In contrast to their non-existence in most psychological methodology texts from the United States, qualitative research methods are today attaining a place in textbooks from Great Britain and Germany. Even psychoanalysis as a research inquiry is included in German literature on qualitative research (e.g. Flick et al., 1991). On the broader international scene, however, the United States blackout of qualitative research dominates; thus in *The International Handbook of Psychology* (Pawlik & Rosenzweig, 2000), published under the auspices of *The International Union of Psychological Science*, therapeutic and research interviews are hardly mentioned; they do not enter the book's chapter by Estes on *Basic Methods of Psychological Science*.

Even in more open approaches of the social sciences, which draw extensively on methods from the humanities, the psychoanalytic interview does not appear as a research method. Thus in the monumental 1000 page *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), with a multitude of methods and paradigms presented, therapy is not included as a research method, and the qualitative researcher having had the largest impact on human culture in the 20th century – Freud – does not exist in the index.

We may ask why qualitative research until now has been methodically marginalised within a psychological science. Perhaps quantitative methods in psychology have, beyond their scientific value in obtaining knowledge of the human situation, also served as a scientific legitimisation of a new science. Externally, the dominance of quantitative methodology may have provided the discipline of psychology with a line of demarcation to competing professions in the market of human relations – historically from theology and today from the many competitors on the therapeutic market (Kvale, 2001). Internally, the monopoly of quantitative methodology may, for a discipline characterised by a Babelian theoretical fragmentation, have served as a unification of psychology, a methodological unification, which may today be threatened by qualitative dissidents. In the above-mentioned handbook of international psychology such concerns appear. They are supported in the chapter on *Theoretical Psychology* in which the present fragmentation of psychology is addressed: “What has remained is a theoretically de-centred discipline that nevertheless is still methodologically uniform, despite the rising pressure from what is broadly (but somewhat misleadingly) labeled as qualitative psychology” (Stam, 2000, p. 556).

Even more paradoxical than the academic disregard of the psychoanalytic research interview is that this neglect is also mirrored within the psychoanalytic tradition. The psychoanalyst Rapaport pointed out, after more than half a century of psychoanalytic research, that while the major body of evidence for psychoanalytic theory lies in the field of accumulated clinical observations, “the lack of clarification as to what constitutes a valid clinical research method leaves undetermined the positive evidential weight of the confirming material” (1959, p. 141).

The therapeutic neglect of the research potentials of the therapeutic interview does not only concern psychoanalysis. Few therapists today seem aware of the research potentials of the clinical case study, and in their Ph.D.-dissertations exclusively apply experimental and statistical designs to the clinical domain, sometimes with some fervour reminding of an “identification with the aggressor”. Recent therapies, such as family therapy, have produced a number of significant and clinically relevant studies for practitioners. However, this therapeutic research has not been widely recognised and tends not to be regarded as “true” research, even by clinicians, as pointed out by Chenail and others (Atkinson, Heath & Chenail, 1991; Chenail, 1992). Currently, there are, however, trends towards addressing the research potentials of the therapeutic situation (e.g. Frommer & Rennie, 2001; McLeod, 2001). The present discussion may be seen as an attempt of self-assertion therapy for the therapeutic researchers' low self-esteem concerning the knowledge potentials of their therapeutic practice.

RESEARCH POTENTIALITIES OF THERAPEUTIC INTERVIEWS

In this final section I shall return to key aspects of the psychoanalytic interview, in particular the extended temporal and emotional interaction and the instigation of personal changes, and

discuss some implications for interview research today. The present position is that while academic interview researchers may learn from therapeutic interviews, they should not try to imitate them. By taking account of the ethical differences of a therapeutic and a research relationship two different paths interview research emerge. The first therapeutic interview path departs from the standpoint that key aspects of the psychoanalytic interview, which aims at helping the interviewees change through a temporally extended emotional human interaction, are ethically out of bounds for academic interview research. The therapeutic interview as such should then be reflected and refined as a research procedure. The second academic interview path departs from the standpoint that while the intensive emotional interaction of the therapeutic interview are ethically out of bounds for academic interview inquiries; these may, however, still have much to learn from the psychoanalytic interview and classical interview inquiries inspired by psychoanalysis.

The two paths of interview research involve different rules of the game, different methodical and ethical issues, and they entail different crafts to be learned. The following discussion may highlight both some of the knowledge potentials and the hazards when moving into the field between therapeutic and academic interviews. It will not result in any step by step procedures for therapeutic and academic interview research, but may hopefully point out fruitful directions for pursuing interview research in psychology.

Psychological research as human interaction

The psychoanalytic interview involves an intense emotional human interaction, it is part of personal relationship over several years, and it goes beyond the verbal dimension to include intuitive and bodily knowledge. For a psychological science based on eliminating the human factor from methods of investigating the human situation, the psychoanalytic interview, based on this very human interaction, must be dismissed as unscientific.

Psychoanalytic inquiry deliberately furthers an intense human interrelationship, provoking strong feelings of transference and countertransference. The slow pace of the therapeutic conversation, with the trust established through a long-term personal interrelation, opens for layers of self-disclosure not accessible in brief research interviews.

In contrast hereto, academic psychology is essentially a psychology of strangers, a psychology, which constructs knowledge of human experience and behaviour on the basis of brief chance encounters. In psychological experiments and tests, and often in qualitative interviews, the subjects will be anonymous strangers the researcher meets for a short period, rarely for longer than an hour. Academic psychology has until now largely remained a tourist psychology, constructing a short-term knowledge of the human situation on the basis of instantaneous snapshots.

The knowledge obtained in a therapeutic interview goes beyond the explicitly formulated verbal dimension to encompass tacit and bodily modes of knowing. Much of the therapists' knowledge is based on an intuitive listening to what goes on in the therapeutic relationship. Freud (1963) thus recommended that the therapists aimlessly listen to their patients with an evenly-hovering attention, and therefore refrained from taking notes during the therapeutic session, as it might interfere with an attitude of open listening.

Therapeutic researchers may today enrich their interpretations by drawing on linguistic and narrative modes of analysis. It should nevertheless not be forgotten that the observational basis of therapeutical interpretations encompasses the lived human relation of the therapy encounter, including the bodily presence of the patient. In the therapeutic situation, the wealth of information provided by facial gestures and bodily postures is essential and has been systematically employed within psychoanalytic character analysis and the vegetotherapy developed by Wilhelm Reich.

The therapeutic attention to the personal interaction in the interview, the open listening and observing, the focus on a bodily human being, may also be of value to academic interview research. Linguistic verbal modes of analysis are restricted to an impoverished disembodied material, desituated from the human presence of the interview interaction. Current interview research may be subject to the tyranny of verbatim transcripts and formalised methods of analysis. One may speculate that if the tape recorders had been available in Vienna at Freud's time, there would have existed no powerful psychoanalytic theory or practice today; instead there might perhaps remain a small sect of psychoanalytic researchers reading and categorising their transcripts, and discussing their reliability, rather than attentively listening to the multiple layers of meaning revealed in their embodied therapeutic interactions.

Qualitative research as methodology or as craftsmanship

When the human relationship of the patient and the therapist are decisive for the generation of psychoanalytic knowledge the question of the methodical basis of this knowledge becomes critical. The psychoanalytic interview falls outside strict conceptions of method by analytic philosophers, such as: "A method is a set of rules which can be used in a mechanical way to realise a given aim. The mechanical element is important: a method shall not presuppose judgement, artistic or other creative abilities" (Elster, 1980, p. 295).

When qualitative interviews eventually enter psychological methodology we may perhaps come to encounter a new qualitative positivism. This may be in form of attempts to overstep human judgement in the interpretation of meaning with a quest for mechanical methods of formalised step by step rules and a heavy reliance on computer programs for the interpretation of interview texts. While such procedural rules and computer programs may be useful at intermediary stages and as tools in interview research, I will here, following the Dreyfus model of skill learning, regard research interviewing as a skill, where context-free rules characterise novice behaviour, whereas experts increasingly rely on situated emotionally involved intuitive judgements (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986).

Rather than searching for a methodology free of human judgement, I understand qualitative interviewing as a human interaction, and as suggested by Mishler (1990), a craft. The quality of the knowledge produced in an interview depends upon the craftsmanship of the researcher. As a craft interviewing does not follow content- and context-free rules of method, but rests on the technical mastery and the reasoned judgements of a qualified researcher acquired through accumulated experiences of an extended period of training. An earlier attempt to spell out techniques and procedures of conducting and analysing interviews concluded with tentative rules of procedure as useful initial helps, while the decisive factor remained the researcher's judgements by the application of rules according to the content and context of the interview (Kvale, 1996). The emphasis on the interviewer as a craftsperson does not ac-

credit the interviewer a mystical infallible status of “the big interpreter”. The interpretations and knowledge claims put forth by the interview researcher need, as in any scientific endeavour, be documented and explicitly argued, with the ideal of making the line of reasoning transparent for the reader to follow and evaluate critically.

In contrast to an analytical positivist ideal of psychological research devoid of human judgement, the flexibility of approach and the importance of well reasoned judgements put a large emphasis on the training of the therapist, on his or her expertise and maturity (see e.g., the chapter *Learning the Artistry of Psychoanalytical Practice* by Schön, 1987). The level of expertise required to make therapeutic observations and interpretations, in particular the timing of the interpretations, makes this form of research unavailable for novice researchers following a standard method.

Learning the craft of research takes place through practice, and through the study of good exemplars of research practice. Interviews with, and biographies of, Nobel laureates in the natural sciences document how they learned research in practice through the personal relationships of apprenticeship within strong research communities. It is here less transferable knowledge, rules and techniques, that are learned, than an attitude and a vision, a gut feeling of what makes good science; it is a style of thinking encompassing not only the cognitive skills, but also the values and norms of the science (see Kvale, 1997).

Eisner (1991) has gone beyond a craft approach to research by arguing for art as a model for educational research, which involves a connoisseurship regarding the subject matter of inquiry. In interviews with social scientists at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioural Science in Stanford, Eisner & Powell (1999) found five pervasive themes throughout the interviews which also mark artistic modes of thought and aesthetic forms of experience: imagination, somatic knowledge, empathic knowledge, as sense of place, and the social-cultural influence on motivation. Again, we encounter a discrepancy between the demands of a scientific methodology devoid of human judgement with empirical studies of elite scientific behaviour.

When the researcher is regarded as a craftsperson or an artist, rather than a methodologist, the importance of studying textbooks on methodology recedes in relation to training the craft in research practice. It is thought provoking – with the widespread use of psychoanalytic knowledge in the social sciences and the humanities today – that hardly any textbooks on psychoanalytic research methodology exists. Perhaps we, in some cases, encounter an inverse relationship between an emphasis upon research methodology and the significance of the knowledge produced.

I shall conclude the discussion of methodology and craftsmanship by relating two cultural disciplines where the person and the craftsmanship of the researcher are decisive. Foucault (1973) has pointed out how psychoanalysis and ethnology occupy a privileged position in our knowledge with an inexhaustible treasure-hoard of experiences and concepts, calling into question of what seems to be established. He finds the reason for their kinship and symmetry is their going beyond the consciousness of man to face the furrows and dividing lines in Western thought which makes man a possible object of knowledge.

The present focus is on the research approaches of the two disciplines. Psychoanalytic inquiry and anthropological field work both involve intensive case studies, with open methods of observation and interviews informed by theory, and with extensive interpretations of indi-

vidual and cultural meanings. The interpretation of meaning is essential, in psychoanalysis the meaning of individual activities and in anthropology the meaning of cultural activities; classical psychoanalysis went beyond the biography of the person to also draw extensively upon cultural situatedness of human activity. The therapeutic process and the anthropological field work are long-term inquiries moving at a slow pace, with ample opportunity for repeated controls and cross-checking of observations and interpretations. Yearlong acquaintance with the people studied leads to personal bonds, and also to the dangers of the therapist being unduly influenced by his or her countertransference, and of the anthropologist “going native”. In psychoanalysis and anthropology the central research instrument remains the person of the researcher, with his or her specific experience, expertise and perspective. Asked about anthropological method the anthropologist Jean Lave thus answered: “I think it is complete nonsense to say that we have a method ... the only instrument that is sufficiently complex to comprehend and learn about human existence is another human. And so what you use is your own life and your experience in the world” (Lave & Kvale, 1995, p. 220).

Objectivity of knowledge produced in interviews

When the person of the interviewer and his or her craftsmanship is essential to obtaining knowledge the question arises as to the objectivity of the knowledge. Qualitative interviews, and in particular therapeutic interviews, have been criticised for being subjective and thus lacking objectivity. An interview inquiry is admittedly subjective in so far as the person who is the interviewer is the central research instrument and the knowledge is produced through the inter-subjective relation of the inter-view. I shall now discuss whether the intrinsic subjectivity of therapeutic and academic interviews excludes the production of objective knowledge with regard to four meanings of objectivity.

First, objectivity in the meaning of *free from partisan bias* is a general aim of research, and distortion by personal or professional bias and prejudice is a danger in all research. Bias is reduced by the researcher’s craftsmanship, by systematic crosschecks and verifications of the quality and reliability of the knowledge generated. Tape and video recordings allow for some control by others of the interview interaction and of interviewer influence, such as an inadvertent use of leading questions. Intensive training of therapists and interviewers can make them aware of their personal influence on the interaction. When reporting the interviews, the documentation, and the lines of argumentation, for the interpretations put forth, and also the investigator’s perspective can be explicitly brought forth.

Second, objectivity, in the sense of *intersubjective agreement*, is a common requirement of research. Intersubjectivity in the form of “member checks” is possible when the therapeutic or the academic interviewer checks his or her interpretations with the interviewee. Intersubjectivity in the form of “peer checks” may be obtained when recordings from interviews allow colleagues to inspect, categorise and evaluate interview interaction and interpretations.

Etymologically, the term “inter-view” refers to what is between the views of two subjects. In a dialogical conception of intersubjectivity, the interview attains a privileged position, with a conversation and negotiation of meaning between the interviewers and their subjects. We may here speak of *communicative validity*, in the sense of testing observations and interpretations in a dialogue; i.e. testing the validity of knowledge claims together with the subjects investigated, as well as with the interpretative community of colleagues.

Third, objectivity may mean being adequate to the object investigated, letting the object speak, *reflecting the nature of the object researched*. The objectivity of a method then rests upon its relation to its object, and depends upon the nature of the object investigated. With the object of the interview understood as a conversational subject in an intersubjectively negotiated social world, the interview as a conversational and intersubjective production of knowledge obtains a privileged objectivity regarding the human domain. The interview is sensitive to and reflects the nature of the object investigated - in the interview the “object” speaks.

Fourth, objectivity may also mean pragmatically *allowing the object to object*. Latour (2000) draws on this meaning of objectivity in the sense of giving the objects of the natural sciences an opportunity to object to what is told about them. He dismisses the social scientist images of the natural sciences as “physics envy”; from the perspective of empirical studies of natural science research: “The imitation of the natural sciences by the social sciences has so far been a comedy of errors” (p. 7). Contrary to social scientists’ belief in imitating the objectivity of the natural sciences by impartiality and complete mastery of the laboratory set-ups, Latour maintains that

“If social scientists wanted to become objective, they would have to find the very rare, costly, local, miraculous situation where they can render their subject of study as much as possible able to object to what is said about them, to be as disobedient as possible to the protocol, and to be as capable to raise their own questions in their own terms and *not* in those of the scientists whose interests they do not have to share! Then, humans would start to behave in the hands of the social scientists as *interestingly* as natural objects in the hands of natural scientists” (p.10).

Latour points to how the social science literature on housewives and gender-roles has changed after feminism has rendered recalcitrant most of the potential interviewees. This opened for objectivity in the sense of “...ability to propel novel entities on the scene, to raise new questions in their own terms and to force the social and natural scientists to retool the whole of their intellectual equipment” (ibid.).

We may add that an interview, in principle, allows “the objects to object”. The interviewee has - in contrast to a research subject choosing among the predetermined response alternatives of a standardised questionnaire or an experimental set-up - the option of rejecting, or reformulating in his or her own terms, the questions posed, to introduce new questions, and to object to the interpretations given by the interviewer. Whether the interview objects actually object, depends on the nature of the interviewee and the power relations of the interview situation.

Throughout a century of psychological science, the therapeutic interview has been one of the rare situations where psychological subjects could talk at length in their own terms, raise new questions, and also resist and object to the psychologist’s interpretations of their behaviour. The openness of the classical psychoanalytical situation, letting the patient talk and the therapist offering occasional interpretations, gives ample room for the patient’s objections and strong emotional resistance toward the therapist’s interventions. Classical psychoanalysis deliberately follows the path of maximum resistance in treating the patients’ objections. According to Freud “The whole theory of psychoanalysis is ... in fact built up on the perception

of the resistance offered to us by the patient when we attempt to make his unconscious conscious to him” (1967, p. 68).

In his last article in 1937 - *Constructions in psychoanalysis* - Freud (1963) addressed some common objections to the validity of the psychoanalyst’s interpretations, in particular regarding the patient’s objections to the therapist’s interpretations. The therapist makes constructions about the forgotten past of the patient, and he conveys the constructions to the patients. Freud acknowledged that the patient’s ability to object to what the therapist says about them may be counteracted by the therapist’s authority and suggestive influence.

Freud then draws in what may be termed communicative and pragmatic validation of interpretations. He did not rely entirely on the patient’s self-understanding and verbal communication; he treated neither the patient’s direct "yes" nor "no" to his constructions at face value as sufficient confirmation or disconfirmation; they were both ambiguous and could be results of suggestion, as well as of resistance, in the therapeutic process. He went beyond merely verbal “member checks” and recommended more indirect forms of validation, inferring from the patient's reactions after he had offered an interpretative construction. Acknowledging that a patient's reactions to the therapist's constructions may be the expression of legitimate dissent as well as of unconscious resistance evoked by the subject matter of the construction, Freud would carefully observe the patient's subsequent behaviour for indirect forms of confirmation, such as changes of the patient's free associations, dreams, the recall of forgotten memories, and alteration of neurotic symptoms. We may here speak of a *pragmatic validation*, which goes further than verbal communication; it represents a stronger knowledge claim than an agreement through a dialogue - "Actions speak louder than words."

I have here discussed a common objection to interview inquiries as lacking objectivity by drawing in four conceptions of objectivity – free of bias, intersubjective agreement, reflecting the nature of the object investigated, and finally, allowing the object to object. An interview inquiry may, in principle, produce objective knowledge in all four senses, allowing for communicative and pragmatic validation of knowledge claims. With the conceptions of objectivity outlined here, the psychoanalytic interview, rather than lacking objectivity, pushes the limits of objectivity in social science research, allowing the objects investigated emotionally and verbally to object to what the researcher tells about them.

Ethical tensions of therapeutic and academic interviews

Therapeutic and academic interviews aim at helping patients change and producing knowledge, respectively. They are different ethical situations, precluding any simple transferral of therapeutic techniques to research situations. Thus the provocation of strong emotional objections from the subjects investigated, and thereby obtaining objective knowledge in the sense allowing the object to object as discussed above, is part of an implicit contract for therapeutic interview, but is ethically out of bounds for academic research interviews.

Ethics becomes as important as methodology when pursuing the two paths of therapeutic and academic interviewing. This concerns the dilemma of mixing therapeutic and research interests in the same interview situation, the possibilities and rights of the interviewees to object to what is said about them, the effects of the interpretations given upon the subjects

interpreted, as well as upon the broader culture, use of indirect questioning modes in a larger social context.

In therapy the main goal is a change in the patient, in research it is the advance of knowledge. A therapist needs to consider the ethical tensions by drawing the role of the therapist and the researcher closer together, in particular whether a strong research interest may interfere with the therapeutic process. Freud thus warned against formulating a case scientifically while treatment is proceeding, as it could interfere with the therapist's ability to listen to the patient with an open mind (1963, p.120). On the other side an academic interviewer's ability to listen attentively may in some cases lead to quasi-therapeutic relationships, for which most interviewers neither have the training nor the time to enter into. In particular, long and repeated research interviews on sensitive personal themes may lead the interviewee into a therapy-like relationship. The creation of close therapeutic interrelationships over several years, which may be required for obtaining insight into the deeper layers of personality, are ethically out of bounds for academic interviews.

Objectivity in the sense of creating extreme situations where the objects are maximally provoked to object to the interviewer's interpretations is likewise ethically out of limits for academic research interviews. The provocation of extreme patient reactions and taking the resistance and objections of the patients seriously may be one reason for the contributions of psychoanalysis in raising new questions and bringing forth new understandings of the human condition. A therapeutical ethical licence with regard to academic ethical codes permits the creation of extreme situations of inquiry that open for objectivity in the sense that of allowing "the object to object", in word and in body. Thus, rather than treating therapy as merely a practical application of theoretical knowledge, we may regard the therapeutic relationship, with its unique intertwinement of ethics and objectivity, as one privileged production site for knowledge of the human situation.

The possibilities for interpretations and validation of interpretations differ in therapeutic and academic interviews. When an academic interviewer makes interpretations, which go beyond the self-understanding of an interviewee, several ethical issues are raised, such as: Should subjects be confronted with the new interpretations of themselves, which they may not have asked for? And what should be done about disagreements between the subject's and the researcher's interpretations of a theme? Put sharply, in therapy it may be unethical if the therapeutic conversations the patients have asked for, and often paid highly for, do not lead to new insights or emotional changes. In research interviews, which the interviewees themselves have not asked for, it may be unethical to instigate new self-interpretations or emotional changes. The penetrating interpretations and repeated critical checks of the subjects' statements, which may instigate deep changes of their self-understanding and personality, are part of the therapeutic contract, but out of reach for research purposes.

An inherent contradiction in pursuing scientific knowledge and ethically respecting the integrity of the interviewee has been discussed by Fog (1992). As a therapist also conducting separate research interviews she addresses the dilemma of the researcher wanting the interview to be as deep and probing as possible at the risk of trespassing the person, on the one hand, and wanting to be as respectful to the interview person as possible at the risk of getting empirical material that only scratches the surface, on the other hand. She reports the example of a woman who repeatedly and energetically tells the interviewer how happy she is in her

marriage. The woman also gives many verbal and non-verbal signals denying the happiness, and reports situations where she is angry about the marriage. The information obtained by the interview is thus ambiguous and puts the interviewer in a conflict between scientific and ethical considerations. Should she accept at face value the woman's version, or should she follow her hunch that the woman is denying the realities of the marriage and probe further and point out to her the many inconsistencies and contradictions in what she tells about her marriage? A consequence of the latter could be a radical challenge of the woman's understanding of herself and her marriage. This would have been part of an implicit contract of a therapeutic interview, but is definitely beyond the contract of a normal research interview, and was not attempted in this case.

The ethical issue of the impact of the therapist's interpretations goes beyond the therapeutic relation. Psychoanalytic cases have, in line with trends of psychoanalytic theory, often been reported within a perspective of a therapeutising individualisation, infantilisation and sexualisation of human activity. With the compelling force of therapeutic narratives based on a unique access to the biographies and the daily lives, the dreams and the fantasies of the patients, a one-sided therapeutising perspective on human activity had a strong impact on the self-understanding of men and women in Western culture throughout the 20th century. The individualising perspective of psychoanalytic interpretations reflected a modernist culture, an individualistic culture towards which psychoanalysis has itself contributed.

Ethical issues of the interaction within therapeutic, academic and commercial interviews are also situated in a broader social context. Within a therapeutic relationship it is ethical to "By indirections find directions out" - here exists a common interest of both therapist and patient to promote change, and indirect forms of questioning and validation can be necessary parts of the joint venture of helping the patient change. In academic research, however, indirect interviewing in order to get beyond the subject's defenses violates an ethical requirement of the subject's informed consent. In the authoritarian personality study an indirect interview technique was deliberately applied in order to get beyond the subjects' defenses and obtain knowledge about their reasons for anti-Semitism. Concealed modes of questioning become ethically more questionable in commercial interviews with opposing interests of the parties involved. The Hawthorne interviews served the management interest in increasing the workers' morale and productive output, and motivational market interviews serve to manipulate the behaviour of consumers without their knowledge. While qualitative interviews sometimes within humanistic and feminist psychology are viewed as a progressive alternative to behaviourism, we should not forget that historically, as well as today, a large part of psychological qualitative interviewing takes place in the interest of management control of workers and in particular by the manipulation of consumer behaviour.

While the vested and conflicting interests and power contexts of commercial interview research are rather visible, also potential less obvious partisan interests and power contexts of apparently impartial academic interview research should be taken into account. Interview interventions, which can be ethically desirable within a joint therapeutic venture of helping a person change, may become ethically questionable in academic settings and unethical in larger social contexts with opposing economical and political interests, such as between management and workers. A focus upon therapeutic interviews as research situations highlights tensions by the use of human relationships for research purposes, which in less visible forms

also pertain to academic interview research, tensions between methodology, ethics and politics in the production of knowledge of the human situation.

CONCLUSION

Knowledge originally generated in psychoanalytic interviews has changed the ways we understand our selves and our world and today belongs to the core of the psychological discipline. I have here attempted to spell out some aspects of the mode of understanding of the psychoanalytic interview and also documented how it has inspired classical interview studies within academic and commercial psychology.

Two different paths for pursuing interview inquiries in psychology today have emerged - a therapeutic path and an academic path – leading to different ethical and research situations. On the first path, therapists, rather than being hampered by low research self-esteem, may conduct research by sticking to their trade, and develop its unique potentials for obtaining knowledge of the human situation. Following Freud's approach of letting research and treatment proceed hand in hand today puts strong demands on the training and expertise of therapist researchers today, with the need for drawing upon insights in qualitative research in the social sciences, textual analyses of the humanities and philosophical conceptions of knowledge taken place since Freud's time. On the second path, academic interview researchers in psychology may learn from the knowledge potentialities and intricacies of the human interaction in therapeutic interviews, adapting aspects which are transferable to research contexts, as done earlier by Piaget, Adorno and others, and also taking account of later developments in qualitative social science research, the humanities and philosophy.

This chapter has not concluded any straightforward transfer of psychoanalytic interview techniques to academic research interviews, nor with any easy step by step procedures for interview research. Rather than suggesting any approach of therapeutic and academic tracks of interview research, cautions are raised concerning a scientific intellectualisation of the therapeutic treatment and an emotional therapeutising of the academic interviews. Psychoanalytic research goes beyond a specific interview situation to also encompass the training, the theory, and the culture of the interviewer. More than suggesting specific interview techniques the psychoanalytic interview raises principal challenges to established conceptions of psychological methodology. The therapeutic aim of helping persons change allows for therapeutic interventions which are ethically out of bounds for academic purposes of knowledge production; differences, which make the therapeutic situation one extreme and privileged site for generating psychological knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1993). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Norton.
- Anderson, H. (1997). *Conversation, language and possibilities: A postmodern approach to therapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Atkinson, B., Heath, A., & Chenail, R. (1991). Qualitative Research and the Legitimation of

- Knowledge. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 17, 175-180.
- Atkinson, L., Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., Bem, D. J., & Holen-Hoeksema, S. (2000). *Hilgard's introduction to psychology*. 13th Edition. New York: Harcourt.
- Boss, M. (1963). *Psychoanalysis and Daseinsanalysis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Chenail, R. (1992). A case for clinical qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 1, (1), 1-7.
- Corsini, J. R. (Ed.). (1994). *Encyclopedia of psychology*. 2. Ed. New York: Wiley.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dichter, E. (1960). *The strategy of desire*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine*. New York: Free Press.
- Ellenberger, H. F. (1970). *The discovery of the unconscious*. New York: Basic Books.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye – Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W., & Powell, K. (1999). Art in science. Draft. Paper presented at the 107th Conference of the American Psychological Association in Boston, Mass, August 21, 1999.
- Elster, J. (1980). Metode. *PaxLeksikon IV*. Oslo: Pax.
- Fishman, D. B. (1999). *The case for pragmatic psychology*. New York: New York University Press.
- Flick, U., v. Kardoff, E., Keupp, H., v. Rosenstiel, L., & Wolff, S. (Eds.). (1991). *Handbuch qualitative Sozialforschung*. München: Psychologie Verlag Union.
- Fog, J. (1992). Den moralske grund i det kvalitative forskningsinterview. *Nordisk Psykologi*, 44, 212-229.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *The order of things – An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freud, S. (1963). *Therapy and technique*. New York: Collier.
- Freud, S. (1967). New introductory lectures. In *Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, 22. London: Hogarth.
- Frommer, J., & Rennie, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The methodology of qualitative psychotherapy research*. Engele: Pabst (in press).
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Realities and relationships. Soundings in social constructionism*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Greenbaum, T. L. (1998). *The handbook of focus group research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hannush, M. J. (1973). Adorno and Sartre: A convergence of two methodological approaches. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 3, 297-313.
- Klein, G. S. (1973). Two theories or one? *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 37, 102-132.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews - An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kvale, S. (1997). Research apprenticeship. *Nordisk Pedagogik - Nordic Journal of Educational Research*, 17, 186-194.
- Kvale, S. (1999a). The psychoanalytic interview as qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5, no.1, 87-113.
- Kvale, S. (1999b). Constructing knowledge through inter views. In W. Maiers, B. Bayer, B. Duarte Esgalhdo, R. Jorna, & E. Schraube (Eds.). *Challenges to Theoretical*

- Psychology*. New York: Captus Press.
- Kvale, S. (2001). The church, the factory and the market as metaphors for psychology – Scenarios for psychology in the postmodern age. In: C. v. Hofsten & L. Bäckman (Eds.). *Psychology at the turn of the millenium, Vol. 2: Social, developmental, and clinical perspectives* (in press).
- Laing, R. (1962). *The self and others*. London: Tavistock Press.
- Latour, B. (2000). When things strike back – a possible contribution of science studies. *British Journal of Sociology* (in press).
- Lave, J., & Kvale, S. (1995). What is anthropological research? An interview with Jean Lave by Steinar Kvale. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8, 219-228.
- Litowitz, B. E. (1998). Freud et Piaget: une fois de plus. *Bulletin de psychologie*, 51, (5), 437 [English translation: <http://www.piaget.org/GE/1999/GE-27-4.html#article1>]
- May, R., Angel, E., & Ellenberger, H. F. (Eds.). (1958). *Existence - a new dimension in psychiatry and psychology*. New York: Basic Books.
- McLeod, J. (2001). *Qualitative research in counseling and psychotherapy*. London: Sage.
- Mishler, E. G. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 415-442.
- Pawlik, K., & Rosenzweig, M. R. (Eds.) (2000). *The international handbook of psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piaget, J. (1923). La pensée symbolique et la pensée de l'enfant. *Archives de Psychologie*, 18, 273-304.
- Piaget, J. (1971). *The language and the thought of the child*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1992). Postmodern epistemology of practice. In S. Kvale (Ed.): *Psychology and postmodernism*, (pp.146-165). London: Sage.
- Rapaport, D. (1959). The structure of psychoanalytic theory: A systematizing attempt. In S. Koch (Ed.). *Psychology: A study of a science, III* (pp. 55-183). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ricouer, P. (1970). *Freud and philosophy: An essay on interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. & Dickson, W. J. (1964). *Management and the worker*. New York: Wiley.
- Sartre, J. - P. (1965). *Anti-Semite and Jew*. New York: Schocken.
- Sartre, J. - P. (1963). *The problem of method*. London: Methuen.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. London: Jossey-Bass.
- Stam, H. J. (2000). Theoretical psychology. In: K. Pawlik, & M. R. Rosenzweig, (Eds.) (2000). *The international handbook of psychology*, (pp. 551- 569). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stern, D. N. (1985). *The interpersonal world of the infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Time*, March 29, 1999.
- Wallerstein, R. S. & Sampson, H. (1971). Issues in research in the psychoanalytic process. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 52, 11-50.