Autor: Rosa Sloin de Berenstein (APdeBA/UCES, Buenos Aires) and David Maldavsky (UCES, Buenos Aires)

Título: Research of a schizophrenic patient's main conflictive traits in the sessions, during the restitutive period, applying DLA

Aims: to investigate the main conflictive traits of a schizophrenic patient during the sessions.

Outcomes: the result of the investigation of narrations, speech acts and words suggested that during the sessions when the patient, in the restitutive period, needed to deal with his feeling of injustice (A1 and failed disavowal), his thought suffered the risk of falling into a chaotic state (O1 and failed foreclosure of reality and the ideal) and he tended to avoid the problem resorting to the embellishment of life (GPH and repression+characterological traits).

Main concepts

Wishes and defenses as well as their state (Table I)

Table I: wishes, defenses and states

Wishes	Defenses	State
IL	Foreclosure of the affect	Successful
O1 O2 A1	Disavowal	
	Foreclosure of reality and the ideal	Failed
A2 UPH GPH	Repression+characterologic traits	Successful/Failed
IL O1 O2 A1 A2 UPH GPH	In accordance with the goal	
	Creativity	
	Sublimation	
	Inhibition	

Sample: three transcribed sessions of the patient's treatment.

Panorama of the DLA instruments

I. Grid for the analysis of wishes in narrations + instructions for the analysis of defenses and their state

II. Grid for the analysis of wishes in speech acts+ instructions for the analysis of defenses and their state

III. Computerized dictionary for the analysis of wishes in words + instructions for the analysis of defenses and their state

- ☐ I is mostly useful for the study of processes that occur out of session.

- ☐ II is mostly useful for the study of intra-session processes.

- ☐ III might be useful to study the intra and extra-session processes.

Sample: three transcribed sessions of the patient's treatment.

<u>Marcelo</u>

The patient consulted because of his psychotic crisis, which included a disturbance of the thoughts. The first session (2006) corresponds to a moment in which his girlfriend, who pleased his wishes and was submissive, had just died of cancer. In the session the patient recalled the relationship with her, the process of her illness and the recent funeral and burial, and alluded to his body concerns and his fears of being harassed by a hostile army. In the second session (2008) the patient was dating a women who he described as arbitrary and despotic, who abused from her power over him. In an insistent way the patient would close the narration of the episodes where he appeared as an object of her mistreat with phrases of promise referred to the actions he would take to separate. The third session (2010) corresponds to the moment posterior to the separation from this couple. He alluded to his concern about finding a new couple.

Analysis of the narrations

The same wishes and defenses are combined in the three sessions:

IL is combined with foreclosure of the affect.

O1 is combined with foreclosure of reality and the ideal.

O2 is combined with disavowal.

A1 is combined with foreclosure of reality and the ideal.

The difference between the three sessions consists in the fact that in the second one the defenses combined with A1 had failed, with the consequent helplessness towards his feeling of injustice, and in consequence the patient traversed the risk of rushing into a cognitive chaos (O1 and failed foreclosure of reality and the ideal). The patient also resorted to the defensive embelishment (GPH).

Reliability: inter-judge consensus rating.

Analysis of the patient's speech acts

Instrument

Table II: Grid of speech acts

IL	O1	O2	A1	A2	UPH	GPH
state of things	Abstract deductions	Laments	offense, blasphemy and imprecation	proverbs verdicts and maxims	popular proverbs	praise
references to body state and processes	metaphysical and mystic thinking	complaints and reproaches	Curses	Religious and ritualized invocations	premonitions	congratulations
banality	logical paradoxes	condolences or commiseration	detracting and defamation	quotations	Advice	celebration
onomatopoeias of inanimate object sounds	metalanguage	asking for forgiveness and excuses	threats	references to aconsensual concrete fact	Warnings	dedicatory

forcing own speech in another's discourse	clue phrases	Demands	triumphal mockery	contracts	disoriented sentences	promises
flattery	ambiguity and lack of definition	requests and begging	incitement	conditional imperative	questions and statements about spatial or temporal localization	gratitude
accounts	denial that creates a logical contradiction in response to the other's statement	demand of love, recognition and emotional approval	power display to show off	orders, indications according with general law	recovering or maintainig thw orientation	private oath
catharsis	references to disturbed states of own body	affective manipulation	surrender or admission of defeat	public oath and imposition of obligations	interruptions of the other person's or the subject's own discourse	toast
echolalia or perseveration		feeling of subject's own or others' uselessness	intrusive interruption	valuation judgments and critical attitude, linked with moral, cleanness, culture and order	accompanying the other person's discourse	calling the listener´s attention
		appeasing submission	distortion	justification of statements, words and acts	greetings and other expressions to make contact	invitation
		empathic understanding	incitement	deduction, conjecture and concrete inference	cautious rapprochement and separation	expressing a wish
		exaltation of sacrifice	abusive orders to do something opposed to the general law	concrete generalization	excessive rapprochement	emphasis and exaggeration
		references to affective states	accusation and denunciation	expectation of concrete facts	suspicion - affirmation	dramatization

	references to states of weather, time and objects	confessions of doing somethingagainst the law or moral precepts	causal linking	pet words	examples
	references to performing an action or goingthrough a state	justification of transgressions of the law	classification	Apocopes	onomatopoeia of sounds of live objects

Table III: Frequency distributions of wishes in speech acts in 70 patients' discourses

		IL	O1	O2	A1
N		70	70	70	70
Mean		1,8352	,5673	3,5948	,5219
Standard Deviation		2,06247	1,21768	2,60572	1,63103
Asymmetry		1,725	4,934	1,375	5,820
Minimum		,00	,00	,00	,00
Maximum		9,77	7,85	14,29	11,95
Percentiles	10	,2185	,0000	1,0227	,0000
	20	,3058	,0000	1,2947	,0000
	25	,4377	,0000	1,5284	,0000
	30	,5852	,0000	2,0733	,0000
	40	,7069	,1488	2,4649	,0000
	50	,9539	,2662	3,0643	,0000
	60	1,3782	,4299	3,7671	,1370
	70	2,2131	,6221	4,4141	,3476
	75	2,5548	,7034	4,6736	,3920
	80	3,6318	,7781	5,6844	,5796
	90	5,3246	1,1395	7,4442	1,3172

Procedure: Analysis of the wishes in the patient's speech acts in each session and comparison between the respective results.

In Table V we also expose the comparisons between the results od the analysis of the patient's speech acts in each one of the three sessions.

Comments: O1 has grate importance in the sessions, which corresponds to the patient's tendence to allude to an abstract world, disconnected from the concrete reality. The average of O2 in the three sessions has a high value, which corresponds to the importance that the patient assignes to his affective states and the lovely claim. GPH's value is also high in the three sessions, corresponding to the histrionic tendences that the patient displayed. Another common trait in the sessions is the low value of UPH, as an expression of the poverty in the repertoire of resources related to the regulation of the distances. The first and the third sessions also show that the patient managed to develop scenes where he manifested his experiences of injustice (high value of A1), expression that was interfered in the second session.

We will take into account the following criteria for the evaluation of the differences:

- A difference between 25 and 34 percentiles is considered slight.
- Between 35 and 53: an important difference.
- Between 54 and 72: a very important difference.
- Between 73 and 92: an extremely important difference.
- Between 93 and 98: an extraordinarily important difference.

Table IV: comparison between the three sessions

Wish	First session (2006)		Second session (2008)		Third session (2010)	
	%	Percentiles	%	Percentiles	%	Percentiles
IL	2.48	+90	1.52	62	1.26	58
O1	0.93	85	1.01	88	1.17	92
O2	8.98	+90	6.58	86	3.97	64
A1	0.62	85	0	1 a 56	0.45	77
A2	48.30	15	51.90	33	51.76	32
UPH	17.03	15	12.91	4	17.58	24
GPH	21.67	85	26.08	94	23.81	92

IL: mean values; O1: the average of the three sessions is an extremely high value; O2: the average of the three sessions is a high value; A1: in the first and in the third sessions it has a high value, but it is difficult to determine the significance of the change due to the fact that the most expected is the zero value (which involves 56 percentiles), while in the second session the value is among the expected; A2: low mean values; UPH: the average of the three sessions is a very low value; GPH: extremely high values.

Reliability: inter-judge consensus rating.

Analysis of the patient's words

Instrument

DLA dictionary for the analysis of wishes in words

Frequency distributions of wishes in words

Table V: frequency distributions of wishes in words

	IL	O1	O2	A1	A2	UPH	GPH
N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Mean	6,4657	13,0425	10,9840	3,6124	30,6119	16,1742	19,1093
Standard Deviation	1,44869	2,32469	2,07304	1,39933	2,54179	2,55018	2,22735
Skewness	,141	,444	,681	,552	-,243	,332	-,373
Minimum	3,03	7,42	6,57	,00	24,80	10,67	11,61
Maximum	10,63	20,55	18,97	7,96	35,98	23,16	23,70
Percentiles 10	4,6675	10,6440	8,3044	2,1166	26,8120	13,3294	16,2477
20	5,4667	11,2650	9,0381	2,5450	27,8121	14,1160	17,2885
25	5,6110	11,5227	9,6988	2,6071	29,0047	14,2721	17,6753
30	5,6440	11,7730	9,9469	2,8534	29,7032	14,4946	18,1924
40	6,1386	12,5740	10,4616	3,1460	30,2469	15,2276	18,4578
50	6,5538	13,0212	10,9255	3,4503	30,8520	15,7554	19,3084
60	6,7751	13,3211	11,3777	3,6243	31,2555	16,8151	19,5853
70	6,9576	13,9496	11,9931	4,0055	31,9973	17,5303	20,2696
75	7,2321	14,3354	12,0838	4,4955	32,6320	17,9797	20,7243
80	7,4161	14,9322	12,4164	4,8787	32,8417	18,2649	21,0195
90	8,4874	15,7176	13,2954	5,7550	33,7681	19,7778	22,0820

Table VI: Results of the analysis in the level of words:

Wish	First session (2006)		Second session (2008)		Third session (2010)	
	%	Percentiles	%	Percentiles	%	Percentiles
IL	8.43	85	6.10	35	6.36	45
O1	11.12	15	11.03	15	15.17	85
O2	12.16	78	11.30	55	11.99	70
A1	3.48	55	4.93	85	3.94	65
A2	28.50	22	26.03	-10	29.89	35
UPH	15.38	45	17.67	72	14.25	24
GPH	20.94	78	22.95	+90	18.38	35

IL: high values in the first session and mean values in the following two (important decrease), O1: low values in the first two sessions and high in the third one (very important increase), O2: mean values, A1: mean values in the first and in the third sessions and high in the second one, GPH: high values in the first and second sessions and a very important decrease in the third one.

Comparison between the results of the analysis of the wishes in the narrations, the words and the speech acts in each session

In the first and the third sessions we observe important differences between the word's and the speech acts' outcomes in a few analysis of the wishes. In the first session, the very important differences correspond to O1 and in the third one to GPH. Besides, there is a slight difference corresponding to UPH in the first session. However, in the second session we find differences sometimes slight and sometimes very important in 6 of the 7 wishes (slight differences in IL, O2 and A2 and very important differences in O1, A1 and UPH).

The major discordance between the results corresponds to the second session, when the patient seemed to be prisoner of the dependence of an arbitrary and despotic women. It is remarkable that in this second session A1 has a high value in the level of words, different from the value that it exhibits in the level of speech acts. This difference may indicate that the patient is not able to display this wish in the exchange of the session.

The result of the investigation of speech acts also suggested that during the sessions when the patient needed to deal with his feeling of injustice (A1 and failed disavowal), his thought suffered the risk of falling into a chaotic state (O1 and failed foreclosure of reality and the ideal) and he tended to avoid the problem resorting to the embellishment of life (GPH and repression+characterological traits).