

6

Charlotte Bühler *Scientific Entrepreneur in Developmental, Clinical, and Humanistic Psychology*

WILLIAM R. WOODWARD

University of New Hampshire

This chapter will situate Charlotte Bühler (1893–1974) as a professional woman in developmental psychology and humanistic psychology. I will give special attention to *The First Year of Life* (Bühler, 1930), “The Human Life Course as Psychological Problem” (Bühler, 1933), *From Birth to Maturity* (Bühler, 1935), *The Child and His Family* (Bühler, 1939) and *The Course of Human Life* (Bühler & Massarik, 1968). Bühler belongs to the late first generation of women in psychology. Bühler’s case is exceptional in that she had



two children, did not take time off from her career, and secured family and extracurricular funding to support herself, her husband, and dozens of students in Austria up to 1938. In the United States as an émigré from 1940 to her death in 1974, she shifted to private practice to provide increasing support for a retired husband. She stood out as a creative scientific manager, writer, clinician, and theoretician in developmental psychology across the life span.¹

Figure 6.1 Charlotte Bühler.
(Courtesy of the Bühler Archive and
Director Achim Eschbach. With permission.)

FAMILY BACKGROUND AND EARLY YEARS, 1893–1912

Charlotte Malachowski was born the first child of Hermann Malachowski (1853–1934) and his wife, Rose Kristeller Malachowski (1873–1942?), in Berlin, Germany. She wrote, “Although descended from a largely Jewish family, I was confirmed and raised Protestant, as was the custom in the assimilation period then. Personal as well as metaphysical needs led me early to pursue the question of the existence of God” (Bühler, 1972, p. 9). Her father was an architect who designed numerous government buildings and worked with Alfred Messel (1853–1909) on the construction and expansion of the first German department store. Her mother was frustrated by the educational advantages of her brother, the art historian Paul Kristeller (1863–1931). She entertained lavishly and dressed in expensive outfits but regretted not having more education and opportunity, which her daughter sought to rectify in her own life (Bürmann & Herwartz-Emden, 1993). “Our travels belong to the most significant cultural influences that I owe to my parents.... I still cherish the unusually deep impression that the museums of Belgium and Holland made on me as a 9 to 12 year old” (Bühler, 1972, pp. 12–13). Charlotte wrote that her mother wanted to become a singer, that she took lessons in Greek and Latin while auditing courses at Berlin University (1972, p. 12). In the end, however, both parents allowed her to develop as she wished.

UNIVERSITY STUDIES, 1913–1916

Studying at a succession of universities, like many German students in that time, she sampled life in Freiburg in the Black Forest and Kiel on the North Sea, ending up in Prussian Berlin and Bavarian Munich during 1913 to 1916. “For me it was certain that I wanted to study psychology as a major in order to get clarity about human life, if not about God and the universe” (p. 14). She ranged far and wide in her courses, taking philosophy in Freiburg with Heinrich Rickert (1863–1936) and Edmund Husserl (1859–1938), though she was unimpressed by Jonas Cohn (1869–1947) in psychology class. In any case, philosophy and psychology were not yet separate disciplines. Returning to Berlin, she attended the lectures of Benno Erdmann (1851–1921) and Georg Simmel (1858–1918), philosophy of religion from Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), and some medical courses. The decision for liberal arts over medicine became “a huge problem,” but her subsequent courses confirmed her choice: She sampled national liberal historian Friedrich Meinecke (1862–1954) and Swiss art historian Heinrich Wölfflin (1864–1945), who drew from Wundt for his stylistic analysis and held that art resembled the human body, such as house façades as faces.

In spring and summer 1914 she attended both the Psychological Institute and Women Teacher’s College in Kiel. Worried about her father’s gambling habit, she wanted to have a teaching degree to fall back on. She was also concerned about Prussian attitudes toward women. She returned to Berlin for the winter semester and took the teacher’s examination at Easter 1915 (Birren, 1971; Bühling, 2007, pp. 32–33, 193).

Au: Please check heading levels throughout chapter for accuracy. Thanks.

Au: Please give source in parentheses, not just page number.

She also fell in love and became engaged: “for the first time I experienced love paired with sexual needs, which had developed very slowly in me” (Bühler, 1972, p. 16). Then war broke out; Heinz Horstman was sent to the Russian front and returned in an unstable mental condition. He broke off their engagement, saying he needed a wife “oriented to care and attention.” Evidently he recognized her ambition. She remarked in retrospect, “I felt not only the loss of my first love but a rejection as the woman that I was” (1972, p. 16).

Obtaining an endorsement from the Kiel Psychology Institute director, Goetz Martius (1853–1927), she took her dissertation idea on “psychological thought processes” to Carl Stumpf (1848–1936; Chapter 4, *Pioneers IV*) in Berlin. With typical strong will, she declined his suggestion to write about “feeling sensations” for a prize competition “because his ideas did not persuade me and my own research plans were closely connected with my personal train of thought” (Bühler, 1972, p. 17). Recognizing her unusual self-direction, and perhaps impressed by her family background, Stumpf wrote a warm letter of recommendation to Oswald Külpe (1862–1915) in Munich. Her mother brought her to Munich and installed her in a rooming house in fall 1915. Stumpf’s unmarried sister hosted her socially. Professor Külpe impressed her with his kind interest in her experiments and his personality. But he died suddenly of an infection contracted in a military hospital during the Christmas break in 1915. He was only 53 years old, and his death came as a “thunderbolt.”

Würzburg School Experimental Roots

By the time of Külpe’s death, Charlotte had read the work of the Würzburg School on imageless thought and seen its promise. Experimenting psychologists, including Stumpf in Berlin and Külpe in Würzburg, had begun to challenge positivism in psychology and philosophy (Ash, 1995; Kusch, 1995). Positivism meant treating sensations, cognitions, and feelings as elements of consciousness and association as the law of their combinations. Inspiration for this challenge came from Alexius Meinong in Graz, Austria, and William James in Cambridge, Massachusetts. James called attention to the Psychologist’s Fallacy of saying, for example, that we do not retain the perception of one eye when we combine it with the perception of the other eye. Rather, we fuse the sensations into one. Wilhelm Dilthey in Berlin called for the study of “lived experience” and recommended the study of lives, but he lacked empirical methods. Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) advanced phenomenology as descriptive psychology, the theoretical claim that experiences have primacy over complexes of sensations. Charlotte had listened to his lectures in Freiburg.

These revolutionary currents in psychology and philosophy came together in the work of Karl Bühler. He had a reputation for challenging Wundt: “Bühler’s investigation was much more ambitious than his colleagues. His stimulus materials were complex questions requiring extensive thought processes.... Perhaps the success of the Würzburger attack can be measured by the virulence of the reply” (Mandler, 2007, pp. 85, 88). He was well known for his work on thought processes (Bühler, 1907), and the topic became central to Charlotte’s dissertation. Thought psychology (*Denkpsychologie*) represented a bold challenge to the psychology of Wilhelm Wundt and Hermann Helmholtz. In choosing Külpe’s laboratory over

Stumpf's, Bühler thus affiliated with the Würzburg experimental program in psychology. The model of cognition involved "mental set" and "directed thought" rather than conscious cognitions. She recalled that she was surprised to find Bühler visiting her laboratory daily, yet her experiments were "not dissimilar" to his (p. 18). In claiming that he pursued her, she was being disingenuous, as archival materials suggest that she was actively courting him and that he had a long-standing girl friend at the time (Eschbach, September 27, 2010, personal communication; Bürmann & Herwartz-Emden, 1993, p. 207; Bühring, 2007, p. 194). They married in April in Berlin in the presence of Kurt Koffka and his wife and Johannes Lindworsky, a Jesuit father who had studied with Külpe and Bühler.

AU: Give full citation to be clear.

CHILDREN AND STUDIES OF THOUGHT PROCESS, 1916–1922

Her first year of marriage was difficult due to pregnancy interfering with the continuation of her studies. She also felt rejection among Bavarian professors' wives as "a student married to a professor" and a North German. In addition, Karl suffered stress from serving as military doctor in the mornings and lecturer on logic in the afternoon. Meanwhile, she gave birth to a daughter, Ingeborg, on February 23, 1917. She also completed a dissertation on "Thought and Sentence Construction" in fall 1917 under Erich Becher (1882–1929) and Clemens Baeumker (1853–1924), at a time when Becher gained Külpe's chair (Bühring, 2002, p. 186). She published "on thought processes" (Bühler, 1918a) and "sentence formation" (Bühler, 1919), and her later work on life span development drew upon Karl's thought psychology indirectly, in that she emphasized "goal orientation" and self-direction. At Karl's urging, she also published her first book (Bühler, 1918b) in the conviction that fairy tales exercise the child's mental functions of thought, empathy, and desire. This book went through seven editions. Child psychologist William Stern (1871–1938) commented approvingly about Bühler's little book in later editions of his textbook (1987).

Karl, meanwhile, published *The Intellectual Development of the Child* (1918), which became a leading text in the field. It was based on his own brand of thought psychology and the psychology of language. As a result of his promise as a scientist, he gained a professorship in Dresden in October 1918. Charlotte gave birth to a son, Rolf Dietrich, on June 2, 1919. She later completed a *Habilitationschrift* on the psychology of literature (1920) under Oskar Walzel (1884–1944) at Dresden, and she immediately became a *Privatdozentin* with the right to teach (Bühler, 1972, p. 21).

She made two more detours before turning to life span work. The first involved the psychology of youth, stemming from a contract with the state to study youth criminality statistically. The Prussian State government invited Karl to take on the project. He, in turn, recommended Charlotte to continue his work on perception and language. Her second detour grew out of her own diary along with three others given to her, which she compiled into a small book, *The Mental Life of Young People* (Bühler, 1922). The book became a huge success, complementing the contemporary work of philosopher and educationist Eduard Spranger (1882–1963). She expanded the project to 79 diaries in 1929 (5th ed.), and by 1934 the

Vienna Institute had received 93 donated diaries (Bühling, 2007). This work thus stretched over a decade. We see here how Bühler combined literary talent with psychology as she pursued her question “how a person ought to live human life appropriately” (Bühling, 1972, pp. 22–23). “My success was unexpectedly large but I was not satisfied with myself because I felt that this book did not reach the theoretical level I was striving for” (p. 23).

She claimed that she was happy in Dresden, but her husband complained of limited opportunities because psychology remained a marginal discipline at the technical university, and he gladly accepted a call to Vienna after placing second on the list for Berlin when Wolfgang Köhler was called there.

THE EARLY VIENNA YEARS: EARLY CHILD DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE AND U.S. FUNDING, 1922–1928

When Karl then received a prestigious appointment to Vienna in 1922, he negotiated a psychological laboratory. The conditions of acceptance in Vienna were propitious with the Vienna city government under Social Democratic control (Ash, 1987, p. 146). The city provided laboratory space in the School Board building and later hired both Karl and Charlotte to teach at the Paedagogical Academy, while the Ministry of Education paid salaries to an assistant and a maintenance worker. A recently passed school reform law endorsed a “unified school” that superseded a class-based one (Benetka, 1995; Weinzierl, 1981).

Soon after they arrived in Vienna, a colleague from another discipline recommended her for a 10-month stay in the United States. The historian Alfred Francis Pribram (1859–1942) was in charge of recruiting applications to the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fund. He was known for a book in English on the causes of the First World War. She recalled that “the honor was too great to deny, despite the enormous personal sacrifice of a 10-month separation from my husband and children. In addition I feared this foreign land unknown to any European.” During her stay in 1924–1925 she made the acquaintance of leading figures in psychology. She visited Edward Lee Thorndike (1874–1949) at Columbia and Arnold Gesell (1880–1961) at Yale, sending home much American psychological literature. Her critiques of these and other leading psychologists, which I will examine next, reveal a scientific mind of great originality.

In her autobiography (Bühler, 1972), she wrote that she recoiled from studying reflexes like the American behaviorists John B. Watson and Arnold Gesell. Instead, she took up the study of “the entire behavior of the child,” especially social behavior (Bühler, 1931). She said she adapted the method of studying chicks employed by Thorlief Schjelderup-Ebbe and David Katz. Thus, her initial inspiration seemed to be the study of animal behavior. She did not credit her husband for her scientific methods, though she was otherwise generous in acknowledging his theoretical ideas. Both were syncretic thinkers who integrated the work of others (Ash, personal communication, October 3, 2010). Karl earned a reputation as a strong critic of behaviorism in his *The Crisis in Psychology* (1927) (Wellek, 1964).

She, on the other hand, seems to have welcomed behaviorism's approach in general, though not the emphasis on reflexes and conditioning (Bühler, 1929). For example, she replaced the "behavior items" of Gesell and Vladimir Bechterev (1857-1927) with the term "performances, which proves to be the much more successful and productive viewpoint" (Bühler, 1930, p. 14). Attentive to her own priority, she claimed that Gesell did not acknowledge her idea of development as a sequence and of a development quotient, akin to the intelligence quotient (Bühler, 1972, p. 26). She did credit her husband for the conception of motor and inhibitor, which he called the hedonalgic reaction. She gave the example of a boy who smokes. He may react negatively to smoke, but he does it anyway (Bühler, 1930, p. 17).

Her early interest in the lives of infants may have stemmed from her own child rearing, albeit with the help of a governess. Her decision to study infants at this time is noteworthy too in that the conditions of her Rockefeller support were to study school children. She and Hetzer later admitted that they may have strayed from the Vienna School Board's plans for pedagogical reform (1939a; Ash, 1987, p. 151). "I thought that if I studied humans at the beginning of their lives, I would learn to understand the goal directions of life" (Bühler, 1972, p. 26).

She sharpened her observations and her theoretical framework through discussion with Edward Lee Thorndike at Columbia University. She saw a problem in his "quantitatively defined behavioral units," that is, the learning curves of which he was so enamored. "Even today I find that the selection of various units into numbers is a fundamental problem" (Bühler, 1972, p. 26). She corresponded with Thorndike for years: "there was a certain rivalry" (Hetzer, 1982, p. 193).

She may have overstated her financial prowess when she reported that they received a 10-year fellowship of monthly funds beginning in 1926 (Bühler, 1972, p. 26). Mitchell Ash found documents in the Rockefeller archives only for support of \$4,000 per year beginning in 1931 (LSRM, Box 57, Folder 51). After the Nazis took over in Austria and a conservative city government was installed, this sum was cut in half for 1936 and 1937 and then dropped altogether (Ash, 1987, p. 155). The funds, in any case, found valuable use in supporting graduate student assistants. The Böhlers were hardly alone in receiving aid. The Laura Spellman Rockefeller child study program led to the funding of many institutes in the United States and Europe, including Jean Piaget's institute in Geneva (Samelson, 1985). Her role in securing this prestigious funding cannot be overestimated, however. It was an extraordinary accomplishment for a woman in that era.

In the first 3 years from 1923 to 1926, the Böhlers had one assistant, Helmut Boeksch. When Charlotte returned to Vienna in 1925, now 32 with children aged 6 and 8, Karl had gotten the institute rolling with three divisions: (1) experimental psychology directed by himself and assisted by Helmut Boksch until 1929, then by Egon Brunswik; (2) economic and social psychology, headed by Paul Lazarsfeld, then by Herta Herzog and Marie Jahoda-Lazarsfeld; and (3) child and youth psychology, which he assigned to her to direct.

In 1926 Charlotte convinced the Child Reception Center to assign a teacher, Hildegard Hetzer, to assist her in child development research. Lotte Schenk-Danzinger joined them in 1927. Paul Lazarsfeld, at the time a high school teacher on leave, reported that Karl left the administration to his "full professor assistant"

Au: The citations sometimes don't match the ref list. Only the edition you are referring to should be in the ref list; it's not necessary to give all the editions. You could give the original publication date if the date you are citing is not the first edition, but this citation, for example, has multiple years listed in the ref list but you list only 1929. Please revise throughout where applicable.

Au: Bühler 1939a not in ref list; please advise.

Au: LSRM citation not in ref list.

Charlotte, who had “an almost Prussian ability to organize the activity of many people in various places” (Bühling, p. 54, quoted in Lazarsfeld, 1969, p. 161).

Charlotte’s opportunity to build a research and teaching institution came with a personal cost (Bühler, 1972, p. 22). Her children told her as adults that she did not give them enough time. She admitted that this remains “certainly one of the greatest problems of the career woman.” Whereas many émigré women denied the importance of gender in their professional careers, Bühler did acknowledge it (Chodorow, 1989, p. 200, cited in Ash, 1995, p. 239). She did hire a governess, thanks to financial help from her parents. And they did own an expensive Packard.

Unique in the German-speaking countries and perhaps in the world, her team began literally dozens of fruitful collaborations with young doctoral students as well as guests from abroad. They directed a laboratory for round-the-clock observation of the child, including full body measurements and “the observer separated ... by a glass wall” (Bühler, 1930, p. 4), comprising “an apparatus for total observation of the child” (Benetka, 1995). This was high-level science directed to technocratic reform. None of the other child study centers that the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial funded had such resources, including human resources. At the Wednesday Colloquia, students, professors, and postdoctoral graduates would come together to discuss the latest research (Benetka, 1995; Bühling, 2007, pp. 94–96). Karl Bühler never reacted sharply to those who sometime dominated the discussion but turned the discussion to a new topic (Kardos, 1984). One imagines that he conducted himself in the marriage with equal grace.

FRUITS OF HER LABORATORY: COLLABORATIVE EMPIRICAL STYLE AND THEORETICAL MASTERY

Her book *The First Year of Life* (Bühler, 1930) represented a team effort, originally published under several coauthorships in German. Curiously, it appeared in English only under Charlotte’s name. Two more women, Pearl Greenberg and Rowena Ripin, did the English translations. Clearly she had an administrative talent in building a team effort, while she functioned as scientific manager and theoretician.

Charlotte and her team took aim at several leading psychologists as she advanced Karl Bühler’s pleasure theory against psychoanalytic pleasure theory. Drawing upon his child psychology book (1918, section vii), she argued that Freud’s claim for the pleasure of sucking (*Befriedigungslust*) ignores the “function pleasure” (*Funktionslust*) of nourishment (Bühler, 1930, p. 45).

She also embraced her husband’s developmental critique of the Gestalt school. She wrote that Koffka, in *The Growth of the Mind* (1921) implies that the child has the mind of an adult, “well established in all directions” (Bühler, 1930, p. 50). By contrast, he does not even consider the possibility that the newborn makes a forward-turning reaction independent of a stimulus.

Criticizing Bechterev’s “defense movements,” she argued that infants have both flight movements, like turning their head away when their nose is cleaned and movements toward objects, such as seeing and grasping a rattle (Bühler, 1930, pp. 22, 54). She found the presence of both positive and negative activities in the

organism's repertoire from the very onset of life. She also improved on Arnold Gesell's 24-hour observations by doing a 9-day observation (pp. 129–135). She explained how her husband's approach differed: He was interested in perceptual and cognitive structures, especially language. His theory of speech acts in 1934 served as a precursor to that of Wittgenstein after World War II (Eschbach, 1989, p. 400).

Still, she was dissatisfied because she wanted to write a more theoretical work. "Only with my book 'Childhood and Youth' [*Kindheit und Jugend*] (1928) was I convinced that I could theorize adequately" (Bühler, 1972, p. 24). In it she introduced a five-phase scheme for the life course (*Lebenslauf*): (1) a functional phase of childhood; (2) youths begin to assert themselves by setting goals; (3) acting more maturely with productive work; (4) new tensions and intellectual connections sought and result (*Ergebnisse*); and (5) new personal relations as persons reach their conclusion and look backward. She was only 35 when she postulated this scheme, and it would continue to evolve into a humanistic theory of human development that is based on relatively healthy individuals. It is worth noting that Piaget in Switzerland and Oswald Kroh in Germany also proposed stage theories of child development at around this time. But she viewed life as a project and self as a structure that protects "the whole person" from being deconstructed by neurosis (Derobertis, 2006, p. 54).

Scientific Couples

A book on scientific couples (Abir-Am & Outram, 1987) found three instances (including Marie Curie) where the wives "succeeded in maintaining an independent scientific credit rather than being assimilated into the husband's reputation," due to the wives' "great talent and determination" as well as their "husbands' progressive, liberal, or unconventional beliefs and attitudes" (p. 11). This fits Bühler, who wrote retrospectively about complementary research interests: "The fact that Karl and I worked in such diverse fields came as a benefit to our students though of course there was only one full professor for psychology." In Europe at the time a single full professor often directed the assistant and associate professors of an institute, who were paid only from student fees:

I myself was at least promoted to Associate Professor in 1929, though without salary. Fortunately, I had a sufficient income from my books and lecture tours to cover our child care and household help. (Bühler, 1972, p. 27)

Note the sex role assumption that her income covered domestic expenses. Surely it benefited their scientific partnership that she worked in a related area that qualified them to receive external funding for school-related projects. Karl was also "stepping outside of the conventional marriage patterns" while benefitting from the "emotional and sexual assets" of an attractive wife (Abir-Am & Outram, 1997, p. 12). A Dutch interviewer reported "an unusually good looking, confident self-conscious woman, arriving now—slender, sporty, average size, in bright

Au: In the ref list Abir-Am and Outram is 1997. Please advise.

Au: Citation and pg number needed for quote.

Au: 1997 inserted here, but if it is changed in the ref list to 1987 to match previous citation, please revise here.

sand-colored summer dress, shining hair... She is accustomed to awaken notice and become the focus of attention.... She speaks meanwhile in flowing English” (Ammers-Küller, 1935, pp. 276–277). Socially, she outshone her husband, who was “more restrained,” coming from modest circumstances, though he “was an extremely charming, entertaining, and inspiring man” (Kardos, 1984, pp. 31–39, quoted in Bürmann & Herwartz-Emden, 1993, p. 209). Intellectually, she was clearly his match. Her scientific output of books and articles, as reviewed here only in part, equaled or even surpassed his. She wrote as a scientific entrepreneur for many and varied audiences.

Both Karl and Charlotte gave lectures in most European countries, and each enjoyed extended stays in the United States. In 1929 they attended the International Congress of Psychology in New Haven, and she remained for the winter at Barnard College. In 1930, he lectured at Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and Harvard and received a call to Harvard. He was inclined to settle there, but as Charlotte later wrote, “I loved Vienna and my circle of co-workers and found America at the time culturally unattractive. If I had guessed how America would develop and change culturally in the 1940’s, I would not have approved that fatal decision of Karl to decline” (p. 27). This was not the only time that she decided their fate. It happened again under threatening political circumstances. Her husband declined an offer from Fordham University in 1937, and then she persuaded him to accept it only to have it withdrawn early in 1938. “The reason was the intervention of a cleric colleague who notified the Curia in Rome that the Catholic Karl Bühler entered a Protestant marriage and raised his children Protestant” (Bühler, 1965, p. 188). The betrayal came, she surmised, from Johannes Lindworsky, who attended their wedding and taught psychology in Rome (Bühling, 2007, p.124). In March 1938, he was arrested by the Nazis and released months later.

“THE LIFE COURSE”: MULTIPLE METHODS IN RESEARCH, 1929–1938

During the later 1920s, Buhler had a testing program on children up to the sixth year of life. She completed another book with Hildegard Hetzer in 1932, and it appeared in English in 1934: *Testing Children’s Development from Birth to School Age*. They tried to improve on Binet, Stern, Thorndike, the National Army Tests in the United States, and Gesell by testing the child’s “total level of development” (Bühler, 1934, p. 30): “a good test should have the same function as a good diagnosis,” to be followed up with “proper treatment” through education and child guidance (p. 19). “We never spoke about what it cost in effort for Charlotte Bühler to gain the agreement of the municipal authorities and to maintain their good will” (Hetzer, 1984, p. 19). Hetzer, who lived with the Böhlers, also provided child care for their two children (Bürmann & Herwartz-Emden, 1993).

More or less concurrently, Charlotte spent several years working with colleagues to assemble a detailed theory of the life course (Bühler, 1933). She acknowledged the help of studies of technicians and actors (Grete Mahrer), sports and life stages (Frieda Sack), dangerous moments in the lives of athletes and mountain

Au: Citation needed with quote.

Au: Hetzer 1984 not in ref list.

climbers (Klaus Mohrmann), the lives of Liszt and Bruckner (Rudolf Schramek), works on life psychology reviewed (Ruth Weiß), achievements of workers and women's lives (Maria Schalit), philosophers and business lives (Paula Klein), politicians and journalists (Hedwig Kramer), the life of Bismarck (Erich Kollmann), the life of Casanova (Else Freistadt), the lives of farmers (Martha Fischer), and Vienna nursing homes (Marie Lazarsfeld, Margarete Andics). She singled out Miss Else Frenkel, "who led the younger colleagues in their research," acknowledging her "deep understanding and indefatigable cooperation" (p. ix). Frenkel later married Egon Brunswik, Karl's most famous student, who gained a professorship at the University of California–Berkeley.

The resulting book in German, *The Human Life Course as Psychological Problem* (Bühler, 1933), contained six chapters: (1) Behavior and Objective Data, (2) Experience and Subjective Data, (3) Work or Results, (4) The Phase Problem, (5) Basic Structure of Life Courses, and (6) Entire Structure and Partial Structure of Life Course. She reported that 250 lives support this work, including 50 from rest homes and 200 life stories from the literature, reworked by Egon Brunswik and Else Frenkel. Bühler explained that their team was not interested in individuals or individual types or with their development. Rather, they sought "developmental rules" and "a formal structure of this phenomenon." Then they applied this science to individual cases. The human being is not steered by instincts, as in psychoanalysis. Humans can be selective and "may even go against their own 'nature' and still believe that they are fulfilling themselves," as in Father Paul Gin hac, "who confessed that every minute of his life he condemned himself to death, in the name of his faith" (Bühler, 1959). The book received some 48 reviews, for the most part praising the structural approach to life span as a whole (Bühling, 2007, pp. 90–91).

Only a few members of the psychoanalytic community secretly participated in their colloquia at the Institute, among them Siegfried Bernfeld, Ernst Kris, Friedrich Hacker, Paul Schilder, and Rudolf Ekstein (Bühling, 2007, p. 106; Ash, personal communication, October 3, 2010). Benetka (1995) refers to "the double life" of many Institute participants who dared not mention psychoanalysis in front of the Böhlers but who obtained analyses anyway. One such future analyst sensed significance in this book as well as a shortcoming. Paul Schilder (1933) reported that "C.B. has the tendency to overestimate the work, the objective mind, over the mental process that is undocumented. One has again and again the feeling that moral evaluations come into play for the author unconsciously" (p. 569). She may have taken this to heart, judging from her effort to get training in clinical psychology in the next phase of her life.

A New Education Fellowship took Charlotte to England in 1935, where she began a practice at the Parents' Association (Ash, 1995, p. 246). Lectures there led to a translation of a popular book, *From Birth to Maturity*, in 1935. She showed that the child maintains its balance in the face of external stimuli, drawing on her own institute's researches and others. In a hostile review, psychoanalyst Susan Isaacs noted that "the somewhat arrogant need to lay claim to her own method leads the author to confusion of judgment and leads her to minimize the researches of others" (Isaacs, 1937, p. 383).

Au: Page number for quote.

Au: Page number.

MEASURING PARENT–CHILD RELATIONSHIPS, 1931–1939

The large role that family has on the social development of a child became the basis for her next collaborative project, *The Child and His Family* (1939). The data collection had occurred in 1931–1933. She and coworkers examined both parent–child relationships and sibling relations in 17 middle-class families. Bühler developed a system for measuring the interactions between parents and children that were evaluated by the purpose and situation under which the reaction took place (Bühler, 1939). Bühler’s team measured relationships between siblings by “contacts”; they could be verbal or nonverbal, two-phased (93.83%) or multiphased (6.17%), including phases of “approach [has taken the initiative] and response [to another’s advances].” She called particular attention to the attitude of the interaction, classifying statements as neutral, for, or against another person. She conjectured that if interactions between siblings or between parents and children failed to express attitudes overtly, either positive or negative, “relations in their true colors” may not emerge and there is a dilemma that must be resolved (Bühler, 1939, pp. 16–20). The interactions reflect their views of love, affection, and romance, which in turn help to predetermine relationships the children will have. This includes romantic relationships as well as platonic and future parental relationships. Recall that she had not yet received training in clinical psychology, and she carried the torch for a soft behavioral approach to human social interaction emphasizing “behavioral tendencies.” Her book bristled with bar graphs of “intentions”: social, pedagogical, organizational, charitable, and economic (p. 19), in addition to “intended purposes” of affection, instruction, guidance, consideration, giving help, asking help, and taking care (p. 85).

The Vienna research style became the model for later empirical research institutes, such as the Bureau of Social Research at Columbia under Paul Lazarsfeld (1969) and the Cologne Institute of Sociology under Rene König. The director would guide projects under a common theme, such as the aforementioned books demonstrate. Students received considerable freedom to construct their own research project (Benetka, 1995, pp. 64–67). Karl was averse to any kind of “representing” of the institute, recruiting students, or showing visitors around (Hetzler, 1987, p. 19). Yet students came from around the world. If this testimony is accurate, Charlotte must have served as the entrepreneur who marketed the shop.

ESCAPE FROM NAZI AUSTRIA, 1938–1939

The political situation had been changing since the late 1920s in Vienna. The conflict between the Social Democrats and the clerical-conservative Christian Social movement became increasingly violent. The signature of Karl Bühler, Alfred Adler, and Sigmund Freud on a petition in 1927 testifies to this (Ash, 1987, p. 162n). Engelbert Dollfuss instituted a dictatorship in 1934, and the cooperation of city and national officials gradually came apart. Her work for the socialist city government exposed her to criticism from the Right when the Dollfuss dictatorship took over.

Au: Source and page number for quote.

Au: "n" ok in page number here?

Traveling again to the United States, France, and England as a Rockefeller Fellow in 1935, Charlotte did not listen to the warnings of emigrated German colleagues. Meanwhile, a change had occurred at the Rockefeller Foundation. The Medical Division now administered the Rockefeller funding of the Vienna Institute instead of the Social Sciences Division. A 1934 report mentioned “too large a percentage of students of inferior quality” coming from foreign countries (Ash, 1987, p. 155). In 1936, the Böhlers petitioned the Ministry for money, receiving a fifth of what they had received from the foundation. They gathered private support from a patrons’ group. On November 17, 1936, police raided the Research Center for Economic Psychology and arrested five staff members for using the center’s rooms as a secret mail drop for the Social Revolutionary underground.

In 1937, the Böhlers received joint calls to Fordham University; however, this time Charlotte wanted to accept, and Karl did not. Finally he gave in and they accepted for fall 1938, but it was too late. The Nazis annexed Austria on March 12 while she was in England. The Nazis arrested Karl and released him in May. He had the choice of early retirement or forced emigration (DAÖW, 1938, cited in Ash, 1987, pp. 158, 164n). In the meantime, Charlotte Bühler had received a visiting appointment in Oslo.

RETRAINING IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND FINDING A FOOTING IN THE UNITED STATES, 1938–1950

Charlotte had a benefactor in Oslo who provided housing, and the university invited her and Karl to give lectures. In 1939 she was appointed professor at Trondheim Teacher’s Academy, and in 1940 she was called to a professorship at the University of Oslo, as successor to Helga Eng. Karl landed a professorship at Scholastica College in Duluth in 1940 and then St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minnesota, with the assistance of the American Psychological Association’s Emergency Committee in Aid of Foreign Psychologists (Ash, 1985). She left Oslo on March 29 on the last free flight out of Norway; the Nazis took over April 10. Later she wrote, “I knew that my life would be ended if I fell into the hands of the Nazis” (Bühler, 1972, p. 32). She paid for her flight with a summer position at Berkeley, thanks to their friend Edward Tolman. She was hired at St. Catherine College in St. Paul. Tragically, her widowed mother was deported to a concentration camp and murdered, presumably, in 1942.

Lacking graduate students, they tried to gain positions in the East, and she taught for 2 years at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. She also founded a child guidance center and commuted to teach at City College of New York by invitation of Gardner Murphy. Now 47, she tired of living separately from Karl, who was teaching back in St. Paul. She had gotten to know Bruno Klopfer in New York, who interpreted her Rorschach test himself, and she next took up a position in clinical psychology at the Minneapolis General Hospital. She became interested in diagnosis and psychotherapy. Suffering “inner collapse,” she worried that “without studying the motivational process at a deeper *niveau* [level] and penetrating psychoanalysis theoretically and practically, I could no longer suitably lead my own search for full understanding of the life course” (Bühler, 1972, p. 35).

This decade was more fruitful professionally than her slowed publication rate showed. Her manual for the administration, scoring, interpretation, and statistical treatment of Rorschach scores established her as a leader in this clinical field (Bühler, Bühler, & Lefever, 1949). She included her husband as coauthor, and, indeed, he seems to have helped her to precisely interpret the cognitive and emotional content of the protocols. A wartime committee and a general editor, Gardner Murphy, asked her to reflect on “the problem of Germany” (Bühler, 1945): “Is German war-mindedness due to personality maladjustment in the clinical sense?” (p. 93). She studied seven sets of 12 families each from Germany, Austria, Norway, Holland, and England and two from the United States. She recommended re-education in Germany, compulsory nursery school, child-guidance clinics, and political education. Germans would be “unresponsive to the casual and empirical ideology that Anglo-Saxons handle so successfully” (p. 107). One wonders what her findings would be today.

Au: two families or two sets of families?

In 1945 they moved again, to Pasadena, California, where their son had started work on his doctorate and married an American. Charlotte was hired by the Los Angeles County General Hospital, an offer of professorships in psychology at the University of Southern California fell through, and Karl took a clinical position at Cedars of Lebanon Hospital. This therapeutic turn “meant ... a new beginning in the direction that I had recognized already in Europe as urgently necessary for my further development. For Karl, however, there was unfortunately no corresponding renewal” (Bühler, 1965, p. 189). Lewis Coser (1984) may have missed the mark in claiming that “stimulating exchanges with students and colleagues” were “denied her in America, and her work suffered as a result” (p. 41).

In 1951, at age 58, 11 years after immigrating, she finally began to publish research articles again, this time with her newfound clinical orientation (Bühler, 1954, 1959). She also built up a private practice in child psychology and then increasingly with adults. She and colleagues developed psychodrama with children and youths. She also began group therapy with adults and became active in the Group Psychotherapy Association of Southern California, becoming its president in 1957–58.

COLLABORATION ON A BOOK FOR TEACHERS AND COUNSELORS, 1952

There are important needs families meet for children. It is when these needs are not met that emotional disturbances can develop. The needs Bühler found most influential in the stability of the individual were emotional security, the home as “a refuge and guide,” and behavior that does not exhibit the idea that affection must be earned by children (Bühler, 1952).

Au: Bühler 1952 not in ref list.

In *Childhood Problems and the Teacher* (Bühler, Smitter, & Richardson, 1952), published at age 59, she established her reputation in school psychology, contributing to the professionalization of educational psychologists and school counselors. In this book, once again, she assembled a network of collaborators: Faith Smitter, a director of child guidance in Santa Barbara, composed chapters on “the role of home and school” and on “the teacher’s approach to problems.” Sibyl Richardson,

coordinator of research and guidance in the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools Office, presented “situational difficulties” and “work with parents.” In a chapter on “the teacher’s study of individual children,” Richardson presented methods of observation records, the personal interview, standardized tests, sociometric analysis, reaction stories, art expression, interviews with adults, and cumulative records in folders (Bühler et al., pp. 143–154). Franklyn Bradshaw wrote on “remedial work in school.” In her own opening chapter, she cited Lawrence K. Frank’s (1949) book on projective techniques, Erik Erikson (1940) on play therapy, and Florence Goodenough on children’s drawings (Goodenough & Harris, 1950). Her syncretic style worked well to legitimate a range of techniques to mostly female primary and secondary school teachers.

HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY, 1959–1974

In the latter 1950s, Bühler worked with Abraham Maslow to promote a third force in psychology based on the primary role of values in life. In 1961 they founded the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. In 1970 Charlotte lectured in Amsterdam at the First International Congress on Humanistic Psychology (Baumgartner, 2010). Their group included Kurt Goldstein, H. L. Ansbacher, J. F. T. Bugenthal, Rollo May, Henry Murray, David Riesman, Carl Rogers, Ernest Schachtel, Adrian van Kaam, and Anthony Sutich. She announced this in *Psychologie im Leben unserer Zeit* (1962), translated as *Values in Psychotherapy* (1962), which sold 170,000 copies and was translated into Dutch, Italian, Finnish, Spanish, Hebrew, English, Portuguese, and Swedish.

She had a gift for publicizing her research. She published *An Introduction to Humanistic Psychology* with Melanie Allen in 1972. She was now 79. As Samantha Ragsdale (n.d.) remarked, citing Bugental (1975), “she seems never to quit.” Her crowning collaborative project, *The Course of Human Life* (1968), featured the chapters of eighteen colleagues, both clinicians and academicians. She theorized about determinants of goal setting. She acknowledged Abraham H. Maslow, who “encouraged the senior editor to bring her earlier studies on the course of human life into the frame of present-day American psychology” (p. vi).

In one of her six chapters, she questioned “How does the emotional impact of adequate or inadequate maternal love and care affect a child’s goal setting?” (Bühler, 1968, p.174, citing Murphy, 1962; Spitz & Wolf, 1964; Bowlby, 1944). We recall her worries about her own child rearing. “My children, with whom I am thankfully close friends, told me as adults that I had not given them enough time. They had the benefit of an excellent governess for years with whom I discussed many problems as they came up ... here lies one of the greatest problems of the wife who is active in a career” (1972, p. 22). Her leading concepts for the lifespan remained “self fulfillment” and “self-determination,” and she certainly lived them.

Au: Citation OK?

Au: Year for Frank OK?

Au: I don't see a citation for Bradshaw in the ref list; please advise.

Au: Citation for Goodenough OK?

Au: This is not listed in the refs.

Au: Bugental 1975 needed in ref list.

Au: In the ref list, these are two different titles. Per previous query, all German titles should be revised to their English version, but here I didn't revise to *Psychology in the life of our time* because you cite it as a different translation. Please advise/revise.

Au: 1968 doesn't match up with this title.

Au: Bowlby 1944 and Spitz and Wolf 1964 not in ref list.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS ON AN ENTREPRENEURIAL WOMAN PSYCHOLOGIST

It is a shame that Charlotte Bühler has not taken her rightful place in developmental psychology textbooks. As a valuable step in this direction, one developmental and philosophical psychologist has not only analyzed her originality *vis á vis* Freudian theory and ego psychology but also has laid out her stage theory of self-development. Although she comes close to other humanistic models, such as Karen Horney, Carl Rogers, and Abe Maslow, none of them had an articulated stage theory as she did. Yet “Bühler felt that there was potential insight to be gained by leaving intact alternate conceptual frameworks.... She was able to profess a more dialogal [sic] developmental theory than most developmental psychologists” (Derobertis, 2006, p. 71). Even in her major collaborative work (1968), she repeatedly showed where her contributors agreed and disagreed with her, all in a positive spirit of advancing developmental knowledge. In an interview between her husband and John Burnham (2006) in the 1960s, she interrupted to suggest that she also be interviewed (p. 22). She was not shy about promoting herself. Yet she graciously promoted others in countless edited chapters and co-authored works. She excelled in scientific collaboration and leadership. Her colleague James Bugental at the Cedars of Lebanon Hospital in Los Angeles wrote:

Charlotte Bühler was a very real and at times formidable person who knew her own mind and set about doing things the way she believed they should be done. She could be imperious, humble, tough, gentle, petty, generous, formal, companionable, creative, curiously blind, and a whole array of other ways. In short, ... a fully rounded human being. Yet not all of her attributes were as balanced as that list suggests. Charlotte was seldom boring, often courageous. She was usually on the move, active, doing, involved. She never seemed to have less than four important projects going at the same time. When she was in a room, you knew it; and when she was a part of a task group—be it a committee, a board of some kind, a group of authors—she was an influential part. (1975–1976, pp. 48–49)

Looking back at her entire life course, two women scholar-biographers note that Bühler “barely mentioned the fact that she was one of the first women to penetrate the domain of psychology” (Bürmann & Herwartz-Emden, 1993, p. 219). Others have observed that it was typical of women to downplay the significance of gender in their professional work (Ash, 1995; Chodorow, 1989; Johnston & Johnson, 2008). Yet the idea of a woman attaining a full professorship was unlikely in German-speaking and English-speaking countries (outside of women’s colleges). She began her studies during World War I in a decade when women were first allowed in Prussian universities. She must have had to struggle like other women against the social attitude that a married woman’s place was in the home. She generally acknowledged the positive side, for example, that it was an honor to be offered an assistant position by Carl Stumpf. She did note that “I found unacceptable the prevailing view in Germany that women could never be creative, whereas

AU: Burnham 2006
not in ref list.

AU: Bühler
1975–1976 not in
ref list.

I knew that I would be able to be creative if the opportunity was given to me and if I had an appropriate education” (Bühler, 1972, p. 15). She became the *de facto* administrator of an institute of international acclaim, while her husband “towered above Freud in social respect and scientific recognition” in Vienna at the time (Lebzelt, 1969, p. 38ff). She shared in his glory, but her reputation grew in the United States while his declined. She never achieved a full professorship, despite earning eminence. Instead, she capitalized on the post-World War II boom in clinical psychology through skillful networking with numerous leading male figures, such as Bruno Klopfer and Abraham Maslow.

Certainly she was an exception to the pattern of the first U.S. generation of women psychologists who earned a PhD before World War I (Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987). That first generation had to choose between career and marriage, and they did not have children. She married and had children as well as a career. The first U.S. generation was limited to employment in women’s colleges; we have no data on German women in that generation. The second U.S. generation moved on to “women’s work” in academia, chiefly in developmental and clinical psychology. This fits Bühler; who in Vienna achieved associate professor without pay in 1929. Her work in U.S. academia also belonged to the margins in clinical settings, with temporary academic teaching positions. She displayed “a quieter, more sporadic, and less organized form of feminism,” like women of the second generation (Johnston & Johnson, 2008, pp. 63–64).

Charlotte Bühler was a highly determined individual who also juggled multiple roles. She was a woman who seemed to have the energy to do it all. She was also a mother and continued her education through her pregnancy and continued her career throughout the lives of her two children. She made the fulfillment of a human life more and more her major focus. Emphasizing technique, she sought a “less scholastic and broader frame of reference” than the Allport-Vernon test, coming up with the Life Goal Inventory in 1964 (Bühler, 1968, p. 99). This consisted of 86 questions, an empirical approach. Acknowledging Lois Murphy’s use of psychoanalytic explanations (1962), Bühler wrote that she herself “sees the id, ego, and superego triad as an incomplete conceptualization of creativity and of those aspects of conscience which are the result of self-realization” (1968, p. 99). She maintained that early cultural goals are key, citing Anne Roe’s (1953) finding that scientists come from homes with cultural interests (p. 181). Cultural deprivation may paralyze a person. She was attentive to class differences, an unusual feature among U.S. psychologists. In Vienna, she studied upper middle-class families “to avoid extreme situations at the outset of our work” (Bühler, 1939, p. 3). Yet she maintained a keen eye for class differences in all her writings.

Not every psychologist can achieve a best seller at the age of 76. Her popular book in 1969 bore the poetic German title, “If life is to succeed.” The English translation in 1971 carried the more mundane title *The Way to Fulfillment: Psychological Techniques*. She presented case after case of persons seeking meaning in life. Her chapter “Love and Sex” noted that Freud conflated the two concepts. A working-class woman told of having sex in cemeteries without romantic attachment. Her middle-class women spoke in generalities, unable to grapple with sex. Fulfillment, she concluded, comes from joining the physical and the psychological.

Why is Bühler unknown outside of German-speaking countries? I can think of several reasons. Her major life span book in 1968 was an edited one, whereas Carl Rogers and Viktor Frankl wrote single-authored books. In addition, she could have been overlooked because she was a woman and a foreigner. Moreover, life span psychology emerged as a field after she died, with Daniel Levinson and Gail Sheehy in the United States and Ursula Lehr, K. Werner Schaie, and Paul Baltes in Germany. I found little secondary literature on her reception in life span psychology. She was so broad—spanning developmental, clinical, humanistic, life span—that it is hard to peg her. She was a remarkable woman.

She returned to her native land in 1972 so that her son could care for her after a hip operation. Then she expressed misgivings about missing her community in southern California. However, she was grateful for a life well lived, and she expressed appreciation for the opportunity to become involved with her son's children when they were growing up in California. She missed being more involved with her daughter's children in Norway. Charlotte died on February 3, 1974, at the age of 80. She left us with this parting question and answer:

But how does a person know that he has made the “right” decision, or that he has lived “right”? Curiously enough, people do know this, and need no one to explain it to them. Their innermost self tells them. They know whether they ought to be praised or condemned for the way they have lived and for the decisions they have made—provided that they are capable of being honest about themselves and are not neurotically blinded. (Bühler, 1971, p. 208).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bühler, C. M. (1930). *The first year of life*. New York: John Day.

This multiauthored book offered qualitative and quantitative measurements of very young children in an adoption center and in private homes in Vienna. Numerous observers observed 69 children for 24 hours a day in 8 hour shifts during 1926. The women researchers defended larger units of behavior than observed in behaviorism and Gestalt psychology.

Bühler, C. M. (1935). *From birth to maturity. An outline of the psychological development of the child*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner. Further editions 1937, 1945, 1951. Translated by E. W. Menaker.

This little book, derived from lectures given in England, concerns the “normal average child” but discusses personality deviations as well. It raised eyebrows among British psychoanalysts and mental testers, yet it put the Vienna Institute on the map with similar ones at Yale, Columbia, Iowa, and California and elsewhere.

Bühler, C., & Massarik, F. (Eds.) (1968). *The course of human life. A study of goals in the humanistic perspective*. New York: Springer.

Bühler brought humanistic psychology into the mainstream of child development and life span psychology with this edited volume. She proposed that there are different degrees to which humans experience their lives as a whole. For example, they often fail to develop the right sex–love relationship and to accomplish what they could have. The book offered new ideas for psychotherapists and educators.

Bühler, C., & Allen, M. (1972). *Introduction to humanistic psychology*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

This was her signature book. She noted a crisis in Western Civilization involving discontent and abuses of relationships. She proposed encounter groups for people to fill this emptiness. A humanistic psychology can help to define what people think is a healthy and meaningful life.

REFERENCES

- Abir-Am, P., & Outram, D. (Eds.) (1997). *Uneasy careers and intimate lives. Women in science, 1789–1979*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Allen, M. (1980). Bühler, Charlotte. In B. Sicherman & C. H. Green (Eds.), *Notable American women. The modern period* (pp. 119–121). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Ammers-Küller, J. van (1935), Charlotte Bühler. In J. Ammers-Küller, *Bedeutende Frauen der Gegenwart. Zehn Frauenbildnisse* [Significant women of the present: Ten portraits of women] (pp. 269–300). Bremen: Schünemann.
- Ash, M. G. (1987). Psychology and politics in interwar Vienna: The Vienna Psychological Institute, 1922–1942. In M. G. Ash & W. R. Woodward (Eds.), *Psychology in twentieth-century thought and society* (pp. 143–164). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ash, M. G. (1995). Women émigré psychologists and psychoanalysts in the United States. In S. Quack (Ed.), *Between sorrow and strength. Women refugees of the Nazi period* (pp. 239–264). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ash, M. G. (1998a). Bühler, Charlotte. In J. A. Garraty (General Ed.), *American national Biography online*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ash, M. G. (1998b). Bühler, Karl. In J. A. Garraty (General Ed.), *American national Biography online*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Baumgartner, E. (2010). Charlotte Bühler. In H. Gundlach (Ed.), *European pioneer women in psychology* (pp. 75–88). Milan, Italy: F. Angelli.
- Benetka, G. (1995). *Psychologie in Wien: Sozial- und Theoriegeschichte des Wiener Psychologischen Instituts, 1922–1938* [Psychology in Vienna: Social and theoretical history of the Vienna Psychological Institute, 1922–1938]. Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag.
- Birren, J. (1971). Four interviews for a biography of Charlotte Bühler (1967–1968). In conjunction with the American Psychiatric Association. Unpublished manuscript, Washington, DC.
- Bühler, C. (1918a). Über Gedankenentstehung. Experimentelle Untersuchungen zur Denkpsychologie. Inaugural-Dissertation [On the origin of thoughts: Experimental research on thought psychology]. Leipzig: J. A. Barth. Published in *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 80, 129–200.
- Bühler, C. (1918b). Das Märchen und die Phantasie des Kindes [Fairy tales and fantasy in the child]. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Psychologie*, Beiheft 17. Republished with J. Bilz, Munich: Barth, 1968, introduced by H. Hetzer (4th ed., 1958, 5th ed., 1961, 6th ed., 1971, 7th ed., Berlin: Springer).
- Bühler, C. (1919). Über die Vorgänge bei der Satzbildung [On the processes of sentence formation]. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 81, 181–206.
- Bühler, C. (1920). Entdeckung und Erfindung. Zwei Grundbegriffe der Literaturpsychologie [Discovery and invention. Two basic concepts the psychology of literature]. *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 15, 43–87.

- Bühler, C. (1922). *Das Seelenleben des Jugendlichen* [The mental life of young people]. Jena: Fischer. 6th ed. Stuttgart: Fischer, 1967. Translated into Hungarian, Swedish, Spanish, Dutch, Japanese.
- Bühler, C. (1929, 1931, 1967). *Kindheit und Jugend* [Childhood and youth]. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 4th ed. Göttingen. Translated into Polish, Swedish, Icelandic, Spanish.
- Bühler, C. (1930). *The first year of life*. New York: John Day. Translated by P. Greenberg & R. Ripin. [Published in German with 3 co-authors, H. Hetzer, K. Wolf, and L. Koller.] doi:10.1037/11625-000
- Bühler, C. (1931). The social behavior of children. In C. Murchison (ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 374–416). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Bühler, C. M. (1933). *Der menschliche Lebenslauf als psychologisches Problem* [The human life course as a psychological problem]. Leipzig: Hirzel. 2nd ed., Göttingen: Hogrefe, 1959.
- Bühler, C. M. (1935). *From birth to maturity. An outline of the psychological development of the child*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner. Further editions 1937, 1945, 1951. Translated by E. W. Menaker.
- Bühler, C. (1939). *The child and his family*. With the collaboration of E. Baar and others. Translated by H. Beaumont. New York: Harper. German: *Kind und Familie*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1937.
- Bühler, C. (1945). The problem of Germany. Dr. Bühler's reply. In G. Murphy (Ed.), *Human nature and enduring peace* (pp. 93–107). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bühler, C. (1954). The reality principle. Theories and facts. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 8, 626–647.
- Bühler, C. (1959). Theoretical observations about life's basic tendencies. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 13, 561–581.
- Bühler, C. (1962a). Goals of life and therapy. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 22, 153–175. doi:10.1007/BF01873506
- Bühler, C. (1962b). *Psychologie im Leben unserer Zeit* [Psychology in the life of our time]. Munich: Droemer Knauer.
- Bühler, C. (1962c). *Values in psychotherapy*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Bühler, C. (1965). Die Wiener Psychologische Schule in der Emigration [The Vienna Psychological School in emigration]. *Psychologische Rundschau*, 16, 187–196.
- Bühler, C. (1968). Psychotherapy and the image of man. *Psychotherapy*, 5, 89–94. doi:10.1037/h0088673
- Bühler, C. (1969). *Wenn das Leben gelingen soll. Psychologische Studien über Lebenserwartungen und Lebensergebnisse* [If life is to succeed: Psychological studies of life expectations and results]. Munich: Droemer Knauer.
- Bühler, C. (1971). *The way to fulfillment. Psychological techniques*, translated by David J. Baker. New York: Hawthorne (English translation of *Wenn das Leben gelingen soll*).
- Bühler, C. (1972). Charlotte Bühler. In L. Pongratz, W. Traxel, & E. G. Wehner (Eds.), *Psychologie in Selbstdarstellungen* [Psychology in self-portrayals] (pp. 9–42). Berne: Hans Huber. English translation in progress by K. Weihs, York University, under the direction of A. Rutherford.
- Bühler, C., & Allen, M. (1972). *Introduction to humanistic psychology*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Bühler, C., Bühler, K., & Lefever, D. W. (Eds.). (1949). *Development of the basic Rorschach score, with manual of directions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Western Psychological Services.
- Bühler, C., & Hetzer, H. (1927). *Inventar der verhaltensweisen des ersten Lebensjahres* [Inventory of modes of behavior in the first year of life]. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Bühler, C., & Hetzer, H. (1935). *Testing children's development from birth to the school age*. Translated from 1st ed. (1932) by H. Beaumont. New York: Farrar & Reinhart.
- Bühler, C., & Massarik, F. (1968). *The course of human life. A study of goals in the humanistic perspective*. New York: Springer. Bühler, C., Smutter, F., & Richardson, S. (1952).

- Childhood problems and the teacher*, with a chapter on remedial work by F. Bradshaw. New York: Holt.
- Bühler, K. (1907). Tatsachen und Probleme zu einer Psychologie der Denkvorgänge, I. Über Gedanken [Facts and problems for a psychology of the thought processes. I. On thoughts]. *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie*, 9, 346ff.
- Bühler, K. (1918). *Die geistige Entwicklung des Kindes* [The intellectual development of the child]. Jena: Fischer. 6th ed., 1930.
- Bühler, K. (1927). *Die Krise der Psychologie* [The crisis in psychology]. Jena: Fischer.
- Bühler, K. (1930). *The mental development of the child: A summary of modern psychological theory*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bühling, G. (2002). Charlotte Bühler: Der menschliche Lebenslauf als psychologisches Problem [The course of human life course as a psychological problem]. *Bedeutende Psychologinnen. Biographien und Schriften* [Significant female psychologists: Biographies and writings] (pp. 183–198). Weinheim & Basel: Beltz.
- Bühling, G. (2007). *Charlotte Bühler oder Der Lebenslauf als psychologisches Problem* [Charlotte Bühler or the life course as a psychological problem]. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Bürmann, I., & Herwartz-Emden, L. (1993). Charlotte Bühler: Leben und Werk einer selbstbewußten Wissenschaftlerin des 20. Jahrhunderts [Life and work of a self-conscious female scientist of the 20th century]. *Psychologische Rundschau*, 44, 205–225.
- Bugenthal, J. F. T. (1975). Toward a subjective psychology: Tribute to Charlotte Bühler. *Interpersonal Development*, 6, 48–61.
- Burnham, J. (2006). Interviewing as a tool of the trade: A not-very-satisfying bottom line. In D. B. Baker, (Ed.), *Thick description and fine texture: Studies in the history of psychology* (pp. 19–37). Akron, OH: University of Akron Press.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1989). *Feminism and psychoanalysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Coser, L. A. (1984). *Refugee scholars in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Derobertis, E. M. (2006). Charlotte Bühler's existential-humanistic contributions to child and adolescent psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 46, 48–76. doi:10.1177/0022167805277116
- Erikson, E. H. (1940). Studies in the interpretation of play. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 22, 557–671.
- Eschbach, A. (1989). Karl Bühler and Ludwig Wittgenstein. In A. Eschbach (ed.), *Karl Bühler's theory of language* (pp. 385–406). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Frank, L. K. (1949). *Projective methods*. *American Lecture series Monograph 10*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Gavin, E. A. (1990). Charlotte M. Bühler (1893–1974). In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook* (pp. 49–56). New York: Greenwood.
- Goodenough, F. L., & Harris, D. B. (1950). Studies in the psychology of children's drawings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47, 349–433.
- Hetzer, H. (1982). Kinder- und jugendpsychologische Forschung im Wiener Psychologischen Institut von 1922–1938 [Child and adolescent research in the Vienna Psychological Institute from 1922 to 1938]. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie*, 14, 175–244.
- Hetzer, H. (1987). Karl Bühlers Anteil an der kinder- und jugendpsychologischen Forschung im Wiener Institut [Karl Bühler's part in the child and adolescent research at the Vienna Institute]. In A. Eschbach (Ed.), *Karl Bühler's theory of language* (pp. 17–32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Isaacs, S. (1937). Review of *From birth to maturity*, by C. Bühler. London: Kegan Paul. (1935). *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 18, 326–327.

- Johnston, E., & Johnson, A. (2008). Searching for the second generation of American women psychologists. *History of Psychology, 11*, 40–72. doi:10.1037/1093-4510.11.1.40
- Kardos, L. (1984). Erinnerungen an Karl Bühler [Reminiscences of Karl Bühler]. In A. Eschbach (Ed.), *Bühler-Studien*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, Vol. 1, pp. 31–39.
- Koffka, K. (1921). *Die Grundlagen der psychischen Entwicklung; Eine Einführung in die Kinderpsychologie*. Osterwiek am Harz: Zickfeldt. Translated as *The growth of the mind: An introduction to child psychology*. London: Paul, Trench, 1924.
- Kurz, E. M., & Velichkovsky, B. M. (2006). Charlotte und Karl Bühler in Dresden: A chapter in the history of German and international psychology. Technische Universität Dresden, Fachrichtung Psychologie. <http://tu-dresden.de>
- Kusch, M. (1995). *Psychologism: A case study in the sociology of philosophical knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Lazarsfeld, P. (1969). An episode in the history of empirical social research. In D. Fleming & B. Bailyn (Eds.), *The intellectual migration. Europe and America, 1930–1960* (pp. 250–367). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lebzeltel, G. (1969). Karl Bühler—Leben und Werk [Karl Bühler life and work]. In G. Lebzeltel (Ed.), *Karl Bühler: Die Uhren der Lebewesen und Fragmente aus dem Nachlaß* [Karl Bühler: The clocks of living things and fragments from the archive] (pp. 7–70). Vienna: Böhlau.
- Mandler, G. (2007). *A history of modern experimental psychology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Murphy, L. (1962). *The widening world of childhood*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ragsdale, S. (n.d.). *Charlotte Malachowski Bühler, Ph.D. (1893–1974)*. Retrieved from <http://www.webster.edu/~woolfm/charlottebuhler.html> 4/18/2010
- Roe, A. (1953). *The making of a scientist*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Samelson, F. (1985). Organizing for the kingdom of behavior: Academic battles and organizational policies in the twenties. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 21*, 204–224. doi:10.1002/1520-6696(198501)21:1<33::AID-JHBS2300210104>3.0.CO;2-F
- Scarborough, E., & Furumoto, L. (1987). *Untold lives: The first generation of American women psychologists*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schilder, P. (1933). Charlotte Bühler: *Der menschliche Lebenslauf als psychologisches Problem* [The human life course as a psychological problem]. *Psychologische Monographien*, ed. Karl Bühler. Vol. 4, Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1933.
- Stern, W. (1987). *Psychologie der frühen Kindheit bis zum sechsten Lebensjahr* [Psychology of early childhood to the sixth year of life] (12th ed.) Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. First edition 1914.
- Weinzierl, E. (1981). Sozialdemokratische Schulpolitik und ‘Einheitsschule’ in der Ersten Republik [Social democratic school politics and the idea of a general public school in the First Republic]. In R. Olechnowski & E. Weinzierl (Eds.), *Neue Mittelstufe. Skizze eines Modells für die Sekundarstufe I* [A new middle stage: Sketch of a model for teaching classes 7–10]. Vienna: Herder.
- Wellek, A. (1964). Karl Buehler. *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie, 116*, 3–8.

