Chapter 3

HOW ARE YOU? AND HOW AM I?
Ego states and inner motivators

Fanita English

Editors’ note: English’s ‘concentric circles’ model of the Child ego state and her stages of child development first appeared in 1977. They have and continue to be heuristically satisfying as working models for TA practitioners. Over and over again, we have found that this is the model that trainees respond to and on which they can build their own thinking (for example, Wood 1997). For this reason, we asked Fanita to update and re-introduce her model in the light of her more recent work on unconscious motivators. Readers can study the original model in detail in ‘What Shall I do Tomorrow’ in Graham Barnes’ Transactional Analysis after Eric Berne (1977). Her work on Scripts can be found in the Transactional Analysis Journal (1987, 1988, 1992, 1994, 1998, 1999), and on motivators in the videotape, The Forces Within Us.

In this chapter, I shall re-view my earlier model of ego states – and the Child ego state in particular – in the light of more than twenty years further experience and scientific discovery. I will begin by describing the notion of age-related Child sub-systems, and link them to therapeutic practice. I will then briefly overview the three motivators (first described as drives in 1987), and explore how they dynamically animate the structure of the person. I conclude with some ‘treatment pointers’.

Nature/nurture and development

How, exactly, does the structure of our personality evolve, and how do we integrate memories and conclusions that later affect us functionally?

Fifty years ago Watson and Crick discovered DNA, the depository of hereditary instructions in the cell. Differences in DNA sequences make each person’s heredity unique, in addition to which, every person’s experience in growing up is unique. Nevertheless, fortunately for therapists, there are plenty of common denominators among human beings, so it is worthwhile learning all we can about development and behaviour.

The human body is thought to contain around a 100 trillion cells, and, since June 2000 when the decoding of the human genome sequence was formally announced, a flurry of new studies are being undertaken about the plasticity of ‘that maestro of the genome, the human cell, which at every instant is reading off hundreds of thousands of genes on a scale of activity that has until now been far too complex to track’ (Wade 2001 p.8). Messages from both neighbouring and far away cells continually arrive at the cell’s surface, bearing instructions that the receptor proteins convey to the interior. Then genes are
turned on or off by various proteins which are constantly interacting with one another.

This is true also for cells of the human brain, which, at the last count, has eleven billion neurons that can each make up to 50,000 synapses (Gazzanica 1992, p.50)

However, as stated by Nicholas Wade, in Life Script (2001), (the title refers to the assumption of biologists that human “scripts” can be determined biologically), ‘the interpretation of the genomic script is likely to prove as hard as the sequencing,...doubtless because of biologists’ still substantial ignorance as to how the genome works.’ (p. 68) He adds that, according to new research, ‘the human genome seems to be 3.1 billion bases in length in the DNA. The rest of the terrain (in each cell) ‘.. is a graveyard of fossilized DNA, evolutionary experiments that didn’t work, and dead genes on the road to extinction’.

Given the astronomical number of potential interactions on the cellular level, let alone those on the total biological and psychosomatic levels of each individual, we can certainly assume that we are affected in significant ways during formative periods of life and even later; but the ways in which we are affected may be as complex as the biological influences. The psychobiologist, Robert Orenstein, (1993, p.10) states it well: ‘Contemporary neuroscientists are just beginning to peer into the complex connections among brain, behaviour and personality. This interaction begins before birth and, perhaps most surprisingly, continues throughout life. He adds: “there is a kind of ‘co-development’ that takes place based on the interaction between biological inheritance and the environment in which we live.” Or, as Allen (2001) has put it, because of environment-dependent gene expression, ‘nurture can be considered to become nature’ (p. 260).

Until such time as such interactions can be traced more specifically, we must still depend on accumulated empirical and clinical knowledge to conceptualize structural development and functional processes. Empirically, it is clear that development proceeds in predetermined stages, and that a dynamic process of “co-development” takes place all the time.

So for example - nobody can teach a child to walk before he/she is ready. Yet at a certain predictable stage, a child is “motivated” by internal forces to stand, take some steps, walk, then, later, run and further experiment with jumping, climbing, and so on. What precedes walking are many efforts; from stretching helplessly to reach something, to ignominiously crawling and perhaps even being pulled away by a Major Power - a caretaker. (Why did they take away that lovely vase just as I wanted to pull it down?) But there are also positive strokes, for achieving first steps for instance.

Similarly no one ever made a child utter his/her first words, nor later struggle with speech. The mysterious forces that motivated us to walk and connect physically with our environment, differently to simply being passively handled by others, also motivated us to struggle to express ourselves in more ways than by cries that could only be understood by our caretakers. Language
then becomes an important tool for communicating with others. However, while the infant brain is capable of hearing, learning and reproducing any sound in any language, in fact the only languages that can be fluently learned by a particular child are the ones spoken around him/her, be they English, Spanish or Chinese. This shows the importance of the fit between our physiological readiness and our interpersonal and affective relationships. Progress in the process of communication, all the way to becoming able to articulate in words what began as nebulous inchoate impressions or feelings, illustrates the “co-development” mentioned above.

**Structure of the Child**

Present-day studies with imaging of the brain show that, unlike most other organs, the brain maintains many of its archaic structures. Although it is still not possible to show effectively how thoughts and complex emotional reactions combine to affect different areas of the total brain, Berne’s view that ‘childhood states exist as relics in the grown-up’ (Berne, 1961 p.30) was prescient, and led him to develop his original structural and functional models of three ego states as distinctive systems of thoughts, feelings and potential behaviour. He also indicated that each ego state has its own system for thinking, feeling and behaving.

However, I believe it is insufficient to think of just one childhood ‘relic’ as making up the Child ego-state. Rather, the Child contains successive ‘relics’—or sub-systems, as I prefer to call them, by analogy to Berne’s use of the word ‘system’ for each distinct ego state. He did suggest a second-order structure, but I find its details unsatisfactory. Before he was five years old, little Johnny did not exist as a C-1 Demon or as a P-1 Electrode. But he did exist as a fully-fledged baby, then a one-year old, two year-old, and so on, with particular characteristics for each age.

Therefore I prefer to conceptualize the Child with ‘subsystems’ that correspond to sequential chronological stages of development, and to emphasize that each sub-system of the Child has its own system for thinking, feeling and behaving, according to the equivalent chronological age. Thus, in working with clients, it is important to be aware that there is a vast difference between the typical thoughts and feelings of, say, a five-year old, and a one-year old. This means that functionally, in the ‘now’, a person will transact differently from a one-year old Child sub-system than from, say, a five-year old Child sub-system. Allen & Allen (2002) also refer to layered levels of transference and the transpersonal consequence.

Furthermore, at the time they were internalized, similar messages from caretakers and the environment got interpreted differently at different times, according to the level of maturity. Therefore, each of these layered operational sub-systems, composed of neural networks (Allen 2001), contains a large number of ‘conclusions’ based on messages and memories of experiences, most of which are useful in the formation of the person’s personality, although some may be dysfunctional. It is these archaic conclusions and
consequent behavioural patterns that cause difficulties in the client’s current life, and it is these that must be worked with. It does not mean aiming to cancel the whole script. That would be trying to throw out the baby with the bathwater. For example, Tom, who had a new boss, became overly scared whenever this boss came into his office. Tom kept feeling an impulse to hide under his desk at such times. Why? This problem had not existed with his old boss. Yet the new boss was not more demanding than the previous one; on the contrary, he was more supportive.

When Tom brought up his dilemma in group, he realized a connection; this new boss usually allowed the door to slam behind him whenever he walked into Tom’s office, even if it was to praise him. Hearing the door slam brought on a survival ‘conclusion’ for Tom that he was in danger, and must hide. As a child, Tom had taught himself that when he heard the entrance door slam, it meant that his father had come home drunk and violent, and Tom must hide. Most other times, his father was loving and supportive of him.

Neurophysiologically we might say that Tom’s early experience with his father had sensitized that part of the brain responsible for alarm, (Allen and Pfefferbaum, 2001) and caused the conclusion that demanded hiding. Such conclusions are maintained in what Allen, (2000) following Squire et al (1993) and Gildebrand (in this volume), suggest is implicit memory, rather than in the explicit memory system which is associated with a conscious act of remembering. Nevertheless, after Tom recognized the cause of his symptom, he was no longer bound to the semi-automatic behavioral reaction of that conclusion. He still occasionally felt a slight twinge whenever his boss slammed the door, for conclusions do not necessarily disappear without a trace. They remain in the implicit memory system. But Tom learned to relax about it, and could also lightly ask his boss to avoid startling him this way, thus further reducing the number of occasions of the door being slammed, and the subsequent discomfort.

Tom’s conclusion, as a three-year old, about hiding under the bed on hearing the door slam, was good for his situation at that time, but of course it was potentially harmful in his office. In general, Tom’s script led to enthusiasm, achievement and good relationships. It would have been a mistake to assume, from the one scary unconscious conclusion, that Tom’s total script was harmful, or even that he had undue fear of authority figures. Even harmful conclusions are not in themselves representative of someone’s total script, although, along with ingrained memories of childhood messages and experiences, damaging conclusions may indeed affect some of the thoughts, feelings or behaviors of a grown individual, and thus loosely connect to his/her script. Other conclusions may continue to be important throughout life, and still others may be outdated but innocuous, just causing some “quirks” or eccentricities in a person without doing harm.

Accordingly, for a structural model to represent the Child ego state, I like to think of the formation of that Child as a system with sub-systems that correspond to successive stages of development layered sequentially, as within a tree.
A cross-section of a cut tree reveals sequential rings, each of which corresponds to previous years, with scars at points that correspond to occurrences at particular years. Some scars extend over several rings, sometimes all the way to the bark, while others are diminished in successive rings, or even disappear beyond marking just one or two rings. The rings are uneven; at some periods, the tree grew comfortably, and the ring corresponding to that period is wider; at other periods it is narrower, or crooked.

So, on Fig.1 hereunder, I draw sub-systems of the Child of a given person in circular fashion, representing the layered stages of development which persist in the Child ego state, each with its own conclusions. Particular memories or conclusions can be indicated by referring to their location in the subsystem that corresponds to the age when they originated.

Certain conclusions may be reinforced by being repeated at subsequent stages, or they may be offset by other conclusions at other stages, and thereby lose power. In the course of life, many may also be discarded into the “graveyard of fossilized DNA.”

Berne assumed that the Child ego state gets fixated at around age five to seven years, and it does seem that an initial outline of a person’s script gets formed then. But clinical evidence shows that the Child ego keeps developing and changing past that age, though perhaps not as radically as before; and so does the script.

A valid argument can be made to add circles, as I have done, to represent stages beyond the first seven years of the Child systems, and to see them as representing developmental stages of the Parent, for our Parent ego state also grows and changes, though at a far slower rate than the Child. It does appear, however, that past age seven, the Parent ego state operates as a distinct system with which one or another of the Child subsystems may dialogue internally, often verbally, while previous inner communication among Child subsystems is non-verbal and hard to recognize consciously. After about age five to seven, the equivalent to what I call ‘conclusions’ within Child subsystems may be remembered as conscious decisions. They can be verbalized, and may be in the Child or the Parent.

Some such decisions may reinforce certain conclusions in a Child sub-system, or may offset - but not necessarily cancel - some early conclusions. This applies particularly to persons who have had successively different parents and environments, as when parents were divorced, and when a child consciously chose a particular model for himself, as Bill Clinton did with John Kennedy. Such remembered decisions do then contribute to a person’s script, to reinforce certain aspects, or to divert them.

And then there is the Adult. According to Jean Piaget (1952), it is only past age twelve that a child has the capacity for abstract thought. This corresponds to the development of the Adult in Transactional Analysis. For the model I describe, the Adult can be thought of as the outer bark of the tree, which connects the inner part to daily reality, like rain or wind or sunshine, or being pecked by birds. This analogy holds also because our daily ‘reality’ changes
constantly as time goes by. What is Adult information today may be superceding beliefs in a prejudiced Parent, but may itself generate out-dated data for the Parent of tomorrow.

At adolescence, along with the effect of tremendous hormonal influences plus resulting new complicated social interactions, various aspects of Child sub-systems are revived, and there are new ways in which the script is fashioned all over again.

Figure 1 is intended to help the reader imagine the sub-systems mentioned above. By drawing the layers of development in circular fashion, we can visualize how different stages of development persist in the Child ego state, or perhaps even in the Parent as sub-systems, each with its own conclusions.

Of course, even though we can better illustrate the sub-systems of the Child by means of a structural diagram by using the analogy to a tree's cross-section, as shown below, for practical purposes the standard first-order PAC diagram (Parent, Adult, Child) may still be drawn as a functional diagram to illustrate transactions.

---

Fig. 1: A cross-sectional model of Child ego state development
The inner core in Fig. 1 represents infancy, and subsequent rings represent separately identifiable sub-systems that are added on each year. Each number identifies a separate sub-system, and, in formal script and ego state analysis, can be used to index, on a separate sheet, descriptive references of that stage, and conclusions of that period for each person in treatment. Some conclusions may exist in only one ring, and be relatively less potent, others in several rings, reinforcing each other.

For instance in the example of Tom, given previously, the conclusion that led him to want to hide when the door slams did not appear in infancy, but did at ages two, three and four. His arousal system was sensitized specifically to that kind of signal, as a threat calling for a particular behavioral reaction. By the time Tom was over five, he had developed other ways to cope with his father than hide under the bed; but the literal pressure to react to ‘door-slamming by father-figure’ still persisted in his implicit memory. However, it did not get symbolized to the extent of significantly affecting his script, for there were other compensatory memories.

Here I am tempted to add a personal example. I went to an English school, starting with Kindergarten aged four and a half. We were taught always to stand up whenever we heard the British national anthem. Recently, in bed, I watched a BBC programme on TV. When I suddenly heard - “God save our gracious Queen”, my whole body strained with the impulse to get up and stand! Here I was, born in a different culture, now in the U.S., at my advanced age, yet feeling powerfully pushed, semi-automatically, by an old conclusion resulting from what I was probably taught in Kindergarten, although I don’t consciously remember how or when.

Obviously this conclusion is not my script, yet it certainly almost automatically commanded a specific reaction - to stand to attention. However, when we can translate an implicit, unremembered conclusion into its conscious verbal equivalent, we can choose to obey it or not, as I did, by resisting the impulse to get out of bed on listening to the anthem.

The earlier the conclusion, the harder it is to resist, because it sits in implicit memory; so it is helpful to infer the period of its origin by using any other available data to do so. In this case, I know it could not predate Kindergarten. Had the conclusion existed in an earlier sub-system, at age two or three for example, it would have been harder to resist the impulse to stand up.

Identifying and working with early conclusions
Since implicit conclusions can become a part of the Child’s structure, how is a therapist to work with harmful conclusions in a grown person? It is helpful if a therapist is very familiar with child development, and has experience with actual children at different ages. This is because when a disturbing symptom is being discussed in the treatment session, the corresponding conclusion will be stimulated; the client is likely to functionally enter, albeit briefly, into the Child sub-system that corresponds to the age of onset of that conclusion. Recognizing this facilitates identifying the conclusion. Experience with typical
differences among various ages also helps to recognize shifts from one sub-sytem to another, or to Parent, which happens frequently for defensive reasons.

Nancy, a former client, whom I knew to be a successful college teacher, came to consult me about nightmares and panic attacks following a negative evaluation by a student. As she described her symptoms, interjecting that she knew her panic was irrational, for the negative evaluation was the only one out of twenty-nine highly positive ones, she blushed, fidgeted, and looked down at her hands, the image of a shame-faced two-year old.

Knowing that it is around the age of two that being shamed sets up certain conclusions, I asked whether she knew of something very embarrassing that happened at that age. Though she could not remember it herself, she recalled her mother telling her about how she had memorized a ditty at that age, but much to the mother’s embarrassment (she had bragged about this), little Nancy had failed to recite it when her father brought guests home.

After Nancy told that story, we found the connection to her panic. It was not the evaluation itself, but that an unexpected visitor had happened to visit her class just when the negative evaluation was being read, and had left before hearing the other, excellent evaluations. A conclusion had been triggered, which we might put into words as - “Terrible danger to fail in public”. This caused her subsequent nightmares and fears of impending doom.

As a side effect of dealing with this particular panic, Nancy also saw that this conclusion led her to be too perfectionist for fear of ‘goofing’, and she gradually became more relaxed in teaching.

In 1977, I rather arbitrarily defined seven sub-systems that correspond to seven stages of child development: infant (alive or withdrawing from life); baby (from omnipotence to impotence); exploring toddler (the power of mobility); ‘walky-talky’ (determination and imitation); contro (control and controversy); exister (formation of the defensive existential position); scripeter (what’s past and future). These are described in detail in *What Shall I do Tomorrow* (English 1977). In developing these seven sub-systems, I took into account research by Rene Spitz (1957, 1963) on infants, Erik Erikson (1963) and his followers on emotional development, Jean Piaget (1952a and b) and his many followers on differences in thinking at different stages regardless of intelligence, and Melanie Klein (1963), on therapy with children, in addition to many others on child development. Finally, there was also accumulated physiological data on particular ‘sensitive periods’ for onset and/or development of skills like walking and talking. However, overall, distinctions are based more on my own previous experience of years doing child therapy, and subsequent experience as a Transactional Analyst, rather than on scientifically verifiable material. They have proven to be heuristically useful and I continue to find them satisfying and helpful. However, the reader may prefer to use Stern (1985) or any other system that makes sense for them.

For therapists who lack practical training with children and have no access to young children at home, the best way to develop empathetic intuition about ages is to frequently observe actual children (at the playground, on airplane,
or wherever), note their age on observing their behavior, allow such experience to sink in, and then, for instance at parties or social gatherings, note similarities and differences in grown-ups at different moments.

There is a recognizable difference in appearance and manner if a client is crying from, say, helpless ‘Infant Child’ or, say, from what I call a ‘Contro’, (the equivalent to a two-year old seeking to control with a temper tantrum,) or from a seven-year old incipient Parent. You would communicate differently with a one-year old and a five-year old, wouldn’t you? This applies also to communicating with a client in one sub-system or another.

The therapist can then steer questions about the client’s circumstances at that age and develop a working hypothesis about the origin of a disturbing symptom. Then, while still maintaining her own Adult, she can modulate her own body language, tone of voice and vocabulary according to the age she is dealing with, and then seek to enlist the client’s Adult to define a dysfunctional conclusion consciously and decide about changing it.

**Dynamic motivation forces**

So far we have focussed on the structure of the Child and its subsystems. The standard functional model is useful to illustrate transactions between people and among our own ego states, in an elementary way. However, for treatment purposes, we must conceptualize a three-dimensional model to account for underlying unconscious forces that influence us perpetually through any one of our Child systems, our Parent and also, occasionally, our Adult.

As stated by Richard Restak, (2002) ‘Researchers now regard the brain not as a shell, but as an active, dynamic, supremely plastic structure that changes from moment to moment’. This must be reflected in how we view functioning ego states.

Sadly, Berne did not live long enough to expand on what he called the ‘three hungers’; namely, recognition, structure and stimulation. He focussed primarily on the need for strokes (‘recognition hunger’) as the principal motivating factor for the way we function, and he probably saw script formation as related to structure hunger. But he did not sufficiently allow for the underlying dynamic processes that motivate the establishment of conclusions, and activate responses to inner and outer stimuli.

To show these processes, which operate constantly, unconsciously most of the time, we must conceptualise a dynamic three-dimensional model with constantly moving parts whereby three motivating drives, or Motivators, as I now call them, take turns in affecting us unconsciously all the time, and how their influence is manifested functionally through our ego states.

**The three Motivators**

Our psychic energy is distributed among three Motivating Forces, (‘Motivators’), that are active from birth to death to promote our growth, development, and interaction with our environment, including script formation and implementation. They oversee the process whereby we integrate
implicit and explicit memories and ‘conclusions’ into our developing organism, and subsequently, they influence us accordingly. They affect our personality through successive stages from birth to adulthood to death, and simultaneously they affect us functionally all the time in response to internal and external stimuli. Each one of these three Motivators affects us differently, for evolution has promoted different activities for each. The three Motivators are:

*Survival, Expressive and Quiescence*
- The Survival Motivator operates for the survival of the individual.
- The Expressive Motivator operates for the survival of the species.
- The Quiescence Motivator relates us to the Cosmos, or spirituality.

**The Survival Motivator**

The influence of this Motivator can be noted from the very beginning of life, in the infant’s ability to breathe, suck at the breast or bottle, and signify pain and fear; as well as in the ability to register reassuring strokes. It is because of the Survival Motivator that children intuitively sense they cannot survive without help and must influence caretakers, and/or adapt to them for basic needs. Strokes represent reassurance that these will be provided, and allay recognition hunger. Eventually, as Berne correctly emphasized, stroke exchanges evolve symbolically as transactions, and thus set preferred patterns for communicating and relating with others.

Thus the Survival Motivator not only supports awareness of an attribute like hunger or thirst, for instance, to generate manifestations, (crying, then sucking by Infant Child, in this example) to affect the ‘environment’ (caretakers) so they offer the needed nourishment for survival, but it also supports the development of whatever patterns of behaviour brought literal or symbolic satisfaction to meet the need. In a grown-up, the same attribute (hunger, or the memory thereof, literally or symbolically) will motivate a person to seek food, literally or symbolically, and, by extension motivate to work for literal or symbolic food, like strokes or money.

The Survival Motivator also promotes the development of a basic existential position at the Exister stage, and this in turn leads to character type, as described previously.

**Survival conclusions**

As indicated previously, the Child ego state contains a large number of conclusions that are integrated into successive sub-systems. Each of the three Motivators has the ability to set conclusions; however, it is the Survival Motivator which sets most of them in response to caretakers’ messages (understood or misunderstood), especially when connected to strokes or shaming.

The function of Survival Conclusions is to supplement survival instinct (that animals have to a greater extent than humans), and to generate appropriate fear and caution in certain situations. For instance, a child must learn
to be careful of fire, and the Survival Motivator will register strokes (whether positive or negative) that establish the necessary survival conclusions and consequent ‘automatic’ caution about fire.

Unfortunately, the same mechanism operates also with experiences or ancient parental messages or models that may cease to be useful, and can be downright damaging to the grown individual. Yet the Survival Motivator will keep pushing to bring on responses based on old conclusions, whether useful or not, with their related reactive behaviours or inhibitions. This was illustrated with the example of Tom, given above, who felt like cringing under his desk when his boss slammed the door.

The example of Nancy, also given above, who became terrified when her Survival Motivator activated the fear of her two-year old Child for “failing” after a visitor heard a negative evaluation about her, is another example of how archaic conclusions can be brought to life by the Survival Motivator, with corresponding manifestations (fear, shame, and anxiety in this instance), that are no longer appropriate to the present situation.

The Survival Motivator also plays an important part in the development of the Parent ego state and activates it to develop, and seek to enforce, a variety of conscious or pre-conscious instructions, for better or worse. All such instructions are for the intended purpose of the survival of the individual, although they may turn out to be out-dated and counter-productive to a person’s present-day life.

I need not elaborate further on the Survival Motivator, for essentially all that is said in Transactional Analysis about the importance and effect of strokes applies to this Motivator.

The Expressive Motivator

Although the importance of the Survival Motivator is implicitly acknowledged in Transactional Analysis, with its emphasis on strokes, the equivalent importance of the Expressive Motivator is largely ignored. Perhaps this is because the Expressive Motivator manifests itself under diverse guises, like Berne’s ‘stimulus hunger’. Terms like ‘Free Child’, ‘Natural Child’, or ‘Little Professor’ are misnomers, in my opinion; for they refer to structure rather than dynamic function, which occurs when the Expressive Motivator manifests through one or another Child system. (Note that the Expressive Motivator can also manifest through Parent, as when a teacher is excited by something a student has done.)

Manifestations of this drive are often mistakenly assumed to be manipulative and covertly related to strokes. But the Expressive Motivator functions in response to inner stimuli, not strokes, urging action totally outside the stroke economy. Such inner pressures are due to evolution, and have served for the survival of our species rather than that of particular individuals. So the Expressive Motivator will often induce behaviour with total disregard for immediate potential consequences, for its goals are beyond those of individual survival.
In other creatures, lion cubs, for instance, playfulness is limited to practicing skills for future survival. Playfulness ends when maturity is achieved. Not so with humans, where the Child persists throughout life, and, with it, childlike qualities of playfulness, tendencies to risk-taking, and quest for excitement, (Berne’s ‘stimulus hunger’).

Relentless, insatiable curiosity, the propensity to adventure, experimentation, the constant quest for new ways to do things, the capacity for passionate investment in activities regardless of strokes or personal rewards, (though these may then come incidentally), have led humans through the ages to intrepid exploration, discoveries, innovation and social change, often at the cost of the lives of the very individuals thus motivated. Unlike other creatures, it is not only through procreation that humans survived. Mankind would have been killed off eons ago by more powerful creatures, had not the discoveries and creative inventions of our forebears, along with many other attributes of the Expressive Motivator, like imagination and the craving for free self-expression, turned our species into the most successful one on earth.

Expressive conclusions
Like the Survival Motivator, the Expressive Motivator sets conclusions in the structure of the Child. Most of these conclusions are set as a result of particular experiences of discovery, freedom or exhilaration during childhood, or by condensed memories of pleasure, often acquired dangerously and against dictates of individual survival. While these conclusions create some longing to repeat exciting experiences, for instance in the sexual arena, or in the course of exploration, they are not as numerous or as imperative in daily life as are Survival conclusions, since they are not reinforced by strokes. In general, the Expressive Motivator pushes for new experiences rather than reproducing old ones.

There are also many inner struggles between the dictates of the Expressive Motivator and the controls of Survival conclusions or Adult reality. This is how a famous painter describes them:

I am always between two currents of thought - first the material difficulties of turning round and round to make a living; and second the study of colour. I am always hoping to make a discovery here, to express the feelings of two lovers by marriage of two complementary colors - to express hope by some star, the eagerness of a soul by a secret sunset glow.

Vincent Van Gogh, from a letter to his brother, 1888

The Quiescence Motivator
This Motivator encourages us to “let go” of daily preoccupations, to meditate, listen to music, or to sleep. This has many positive values, but may also lead to excessive passivity.

The task of the Quiescence Motivator is to connect us with the universe
beyond our immediate environment. It supports appreciation of music, art, and diverse forms of spirituality. Ultimately, when the time is right, it might facilitate a peaceful death, but this does not correspond to Freud’s concept of a death drive, since Quiescence motivates to peacefulness rather than aggression.

Quiescence often intervenes helpfully when there is a conflict between the Survival and Expressive Motivators, for instance by bringing on breathing pauses, which allow space for broader perspectives than conflict.

Quiescence conclusion
These support peacefulness, inaction, nostalgia, feelings of identity with Nature and the Universe, broad-mindedness, tolerance and appreciation of sleep; but like Expressive conclusions, they are not as numerous or as powerful as Survival conclusions. They are often experienced as religious feelings or yearnings.

**Inner dynamic activity**

![Diagram](image)

Fig 2: The motivating of ego states

To imagine how these Motivators operate through our ego states, think of our ego states as being on the surface of consciousness, and Motivators beneath them (or above), each with many strands like a puppeteer’s wires connecting to each of our ego states. According to internal or external stimuli any one of the three Motivators may activate one or another strand, which corresponds to one or more of its attributes. This will manifest as a feeling, thought or an impulse to behaviour for one or another ego state, while other strands remain dormant.

We can imagine the unconscious activity of our Motivators by visualizing a three-dimensional model, and we can note the influence of one or another
Motivator by whatever attributes manifest in our thoughts, feelings or behaviors.

Since I don’t have a video or a puppeteer’s stage here, I can only offer you the diagram above to illustrate what I mean.

The above schema shows the three Motivators as distinct from one another, but with overlapping areas, since they represent the same source of life-energy. So there is a continuous flow of interchanging (and often combining or competing) influence from each Motivator to our ego states.

Rather than circles, functional ego states are shown as ovals above the schema of drives to convey the idea that this diagram must be seen three-dimensionally, with ego states on the surface of consciousness and with pre-conscious potential, while Motivators, as such, are unconscious.

Each of the three Motivators may be active or inactive at any given moment, with two combining very frequently in the course of being active. Each Motivator has numerous particular attributes (the puppeteer’s strands in the analogy above). These may establish any number or connections to influence any one of our ego states, usually a Child system or Parent, by manifesting as particular thoughts, feelings or behaviours.

Another way to imagine the operation of these Motivators is to anthropomorphize them as three dancing goddesses, the way the ancient Greeks imagined the effect of various gods or goddesses. They recognized that mysterious, often mutually contradictory forces from Olympus, which we now call the Unconscious, sometimes arbitrarily affected their thoughts, feelings and behaviors beyond conscious volition. Then, even without a three-dimensional model, you can visualize three goddesses that take turns in influencing us at each moment, as well as throughout our lives, in accordance with their different goals.

At a given moment only one Motivator may be active; then a second one may join and thus there can be a transition to where the second Motivator becomes primary, sometimes then bringing on the third Motivator while the first becomes temporarily inactive. Ideally, there is a healthy fluid balance between Motivators as first one, then another, comes to the fore. No Motivator can be totally excluded on a daily basis, but more time may be spent under the influence of one than the others. In many instances, there is a tug-of-war between the Survival and Expressive Motivators, or between one of these two and Quiescence. At other times, they work in conjunction. The Expressive Motivator may cooperate with the Survival Motivator in some areas, as in learning to talk and walk for a child, or being very excited by a project on the job.

Even though relatively smooth rotation among our Motivators is essential to daily function, in the course of our lives we are likely to go for preferences. So a particular individual, like Einstein, might function more of the time with one Motivator (Expressive), or a combination of two (Expressive and Quiescence), rather than the third; as long as two Motivators do not combine so tightly that they collude to consistently exclude the third, for then eventually
the excluded Motivator is likely to push through in a harmful way. However, presumably Einstein also depended on his Survival drive for daily routines, and it also influenced him in writing a famous anti-war letter he sent President Roosevelt.

**Some thoughts about treatment**

I will end with some personal reflections about working therapeutically with the client’s Child conclusions, in conjunction with his/her Motivators.

When working as a psychotherapist, I like to imagine a little video screen above each client’s head, on which I see him or her in scenes at different young ages; I try to figure out, from problems presented and behaviour in the treatment group, what may have been this or that conclusion in one scene or another.

To change the impact of one or more damaging conclusions, they must be:

1. identified
2. connected to corresponding childhood experiences or messages, understood or misunderstood
3. translated from their non-verbal personal code into verbal formulations that can be dealt with cognitively (many conclusions are inchoate; they are only in implicit memory in very young Child sub-systems, and need to be “translated” into explicit vocabulary)
4. discussed openly with the patient’s Adult, comparing the survival value these conclusions may have had in the past with problems they cause now.

I look at bodily reactions when a client’s symptom is referred to, or, sometimes, while another client in the group brings up something. At what point does the client show fear, or shame, or secret pleasure?

At the back of my mind is also the question; What is the client’s type? Is it Undersure, if the client adapts perhaps a little too readily to me or to the group? If so, I must make sure the client does not buy into an interpretation that may be inaccurate. Mild challenges to elicit more independence can be useful. Or is the client Oversure, assertive, likely to take on perhaps too much leadership in the group? If so, I must avoid direct challenges that risk turning into a power struggle. Some admissions of pain or helplessness may be good signs here, and require warm support.

In general, I am alert to changes of appearance or behaviour in what I call the “Super-now”; by that I mean that suddenly there is a ‘flash’ - or a fleeting moment of insight, often followed by a switch from one Child sub-system to another, or, defensively, to Parent. Such switches can be indications that we are on the right track; but also, that there is stress, and the client’s Survival Motivator feels too threatened by a frontal confrontation about an archaic survival conclusion, so I must back down temporarily.

Throughout, it is useful to think three-dimensionally about how the client’s Motivators are operating. In most instances, Survival conclusions cause the symptoms for which a client seeks treatment. They may have been developed,
at one stage of childhood or another, to inhibit behavior stimulated by the Expressive or Quiescence Motivators. Behavior patterns that may have seemed too rash or too passive at a previous time, and appropriately brought on cautions or challenges in that environment, may now need to be revised in the light of the client’s present reality.

Particularly if there is much resistance to positive change, I ask myself:

a is it a Motivator which is causing the present difficulty by maintaining the client in an unbalanced condition?

b which Motivator is it?

c is it because this Motivator is having too much influence, and is in conflict with the two others, or –

d because this Motivator does not have enough influence, and the two other drives are colluding to suppress the appropriate use of this drive?

e what value systems are involved? Motivators are a-moral. They influence us in ways that are evaluated as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ according to personal value systems. Do my value systems correspond to those of the client’s Adult, in evaluating ‘good’ and ‘bad’? If not, has the discrepancy been acknowledged and allowed for in the treatment contract?

Some trial and error interpretations, or hypotheses about unremembered past situations, may be offered. Doing so within group treatment is particularly helpful, because group members can contribute intuitive insights, and this also offsets the danger of undue suggestion by the therapist in terms of her own values. If there is empathetic rapport with the client, I may use a variety of treatment techniques, like Permission (Crossman, 1966) in order to modify a harmful conclusion or to reinforce other conclusions that offset the harmful one. Sometimes Gestalt ‘hot seat’ work is useful, to identify possible causes for implicit, unremembered, hurtful conclusions. It can lead to educated insights and, often, to reducing the force of harmful conclusions. I admit that I proceed from the premise that it is crucial to favour clients’ expressive needs, which may include the expression of anger at the therapist, because manifestations of the Expressive Motivator may have been frequently discounted by caretakers when the client was growing up, in the name of safety or cultural dictates. As I see it, a client’s passions require space, even if they are dormant. Appropriate outlets are important, lest the Expressive Motivator ‘revenge’ with truly harmful reactions to frustration. Here, however, is a caveat; certain psychotic or borderline patients, adolescents and children, may need more inner controls, rather than less. So here the therapist must be very careful not to give permissions without safeguards.

I have also found it useful to draw on the client’s Quiescence Motivator, to help the client re-establish balance when too immersed in emotional pain. By that, I mean that I teach short meditation or breathing techniques, and encourage clients to use them at moments of crisis. This has a way of disengaging a stranglehold from the Survival or Expressive Motivators, whenever one or the other pushes too hard for priority and instant action.
Ultimately, it must be the client's Adult who determines what it is he/she no longer needs or wants, or, rather, what it is he/she now wants in order to drop an unwelcome pattern of behavior. There may still be some short-lived discomfort for so doing, with an old threat and survival conclusion still coming up in a nightmare, for instance, the way an amputee continues to 'feel' the amputated limb for a while, until adjusting to its absence. This also applies to emotional rackets, where it is important to support new awareness of suppressed feelings so they blossom forth, although old racketeering patterns may still persist for a while. Finally, I know the client is going to manage very well without me when it appears that her/his Motivators are rotating pretty smoothly, and that he/she can comfortably maintain or reinstate dynamic inner balance.

For inner balance is not static; nor are joy and happiness. As in sailing, our boat may keel to one side, and we may need to tug on a sail so it leans the other way, making sure, each time, that our little boat does not keel over so far as to capsize. It is this process that gives zest to sailing – and to fully living life itself.

The author gratefully acknowledges much help from Dr. James R. Allen and Deirdre English in revising this chapter.
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