

SPR Chile (2009)

Two convergent validity tests of the David Liberman algorithm (DLA)

David Maldavsky (UCES)

I. Goal: to test the convergent validity of the David Liberman algorithm (DLA) in two different investigations.

II. Procedures: 1) “old fashion” way: comparison between outcomes (on drives and defenses) of different researches, appeared in 1994, on the same sample (Ms Smithfield), 2) systematic way: comparison of the analysis (on defenses) of the DMRS and the DLA applied to the same sample (Catullo).

III. The DLA’s clusters

IV. Comparing the outcomes (on drives and defenses) of the DLA application to Ms Smitfield’s interview with the results of other 7 investigations

1. Sample

2. Procedures: No specific analyses of the sample were provided by the 7 papers appeared in 1994. A final comparison among the papers (written by Luborsky, Propp and Barber) stressed mostly certain common and special factors of the different measures. The comparison between the outcomes of these papers and the DLA results has the same qualitative trait. The sequence is: 1) to compare the DLA outcomes with the research with the analysis of the outcomes of the other 7 researches, and 2) to discuss on the prevalence of certain wishes and defenses.

3. Contrast between the DLA results and the analytic outcomes of the 7 studies

3. 1. DLA outcomes

Table II: The patient’s psychic structure according to DLA

Pathogenic Psychic Currents

Non Pathogenic Psychic Currents

Character Neuroses	GPH	Repression + hystrionic and seductive traits
	UPH	Repression + avoiding and ambitious traits
Narcissistic organization	A1	Disavowal
	O2	Disavowal

with which she created the links		
Nuclear Organization	O1 LI	Disavowal Foreclosure of the affect

### 3. 2. Seven 1994 studies' outcomes

The 7 papers appeared in 1994 differed on the concepts, the method, the focus on part or the totality of the sample and on the richness of the conclusions. After “translating” the conclusions of each paper in terms of the DLA, it was possible to reach a comparative overview (Table III and IV).

Table III: Comparison between the analysis of drives in the 7 studies

Authors \ Drives	LUB	M. HOR	CUR	SCHA	ROS	PERR	DAHL
GPH						X	
UPH		X	X	X	X	X	
A2	X		X		X	X	

A1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
O2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
O1		X	X	X	X	X	X
IL		X			X	X	

Table IV: Comparison between the analysis of defenses in the 7 studies

Authors	LUB	M. HOR	CUR	SCHA	ROS	PERR	DAHL
Defenses							
In accordance with the goal						X	
Repression + characterologic traits		X	X	X	X	X	
Disavowal		X		X	X	X	
Foreclosure of the affect					X	X	

#### 4. Discussion: on the intervening components and their dominances

The coincidences are major on the analysis of the patient's psychic organization, but they decrease on the detection of the most relevant components. Two authors (M.

Horowitz and Rosenberg et al) stress the predominance of the most primitive drives, specially IL, while Perry's analysis emphasizes oedipal drives. The combination between Horowitz and Rosenberg et al's studies seems to guarantee the desires investigation with DLA, and even the decision regarding what the dominant is. Perry's study seems to guarantee the description of the conflict between a pathogenic and a functional sector in the patient, and Rosenberg et al's study of the defense seems to guarantee the analysis of the dominant mechanisms according to DLA.

It is possible to detect a conflict between the two main investigations referred to the combinations of drives and defenses. While Rosenberg et al stresses the predominance of IL and foreclosure of the affect combined with O1 and disavowal, Perry gives relevance to IL and foreclosure of the affect combined with O2 and disavowal and GPH and repression, with a predominance of these two last components. Besides, some other researchers partially share the opinions of the previously mentioned authors.

This conflict has strong affinities with a similar conflict that became evident in the DLA analysis, among two alternative ways of stressing the dominant component: the "passionate" nucleus (O2 and A1 and disavowal) or other sector, more regressive (O1 and disavowal and IL and foreclosure of the affect). In this conflict, the outcomes of the DLA research are in tune with Rosenberg et al's position, but not with Perry's. This tune with Rosenberg et al's position is complemented with a tune with Perry in relation to the components (desires and defenses) detected in the analysis of the interview, without paying attention to what the prevalent is.

Besides, the DLA study put in evidence a difference between the analysis of narrated and enacted episodes, regarding the state of the pathogenic defense: this one had failed in the extra-transferential relationships, but the patient tried to reestablish its successful state during the interview.

#### V. Comparing the outcomes (on defenses) of the DMRS and the DLA applications to the sample of Catullo's diagnostic interview

##### 1. Sample

.2. Procedures: While the DLA studies, in a differentiated way, the scenes narrated by the patient and the scenes displayed in front of the therapist, DMRS does not differentiate between these two levels of analysis. Besides, DMRS and DLA do not match in the general criteria for fragmenting the sample. This fact introduces new difficulties for the systematic comparisons of the corresponding outcomes. DMRS and DLA show quantitative and qualitative outcomes. The comparison concerns both

quantitative outcomes. Main steps of the comparison: 1) To compare both global statistical outcomes, 2) To compare both statistical outcomes in the narrations and the enacted levels of analysis proposed by the DLA, 3) To compare the analysis of the defenses in the 74 fragments proposed by the DMRS.

3. The DMRS clusters of defenses

Tabke VI The DMRS`s cluster

4. A comparative general statistic overview

The DMRS and the DLA fragment the clinical interview using different criteria, so the number and the features of the unities of analysis for both methods are not coincident. The DMRS detects 74 fragments, and the DLA, 111. These 111 fragments correspond to 87 narrated and 24 enacted episodes.

Perry proposed the differentiation between two main groups of defenses: the more pathogenic ones (from the narcissistic to action) and the more benign (from the mature mechanisms to the other neurotic). The first group would predict severe resistances during treatment, and the second group leads to anticipate a more collaborative attitude. This differentiation between the two main groups of defenses is a useful first guide for the comparison between the statistical DMRS results (on 74 episodes) and DLA outcomes (on 111 episodes), and it also allows to appreciate some general convergence.

Table IX: A comparison between the DMRS and the DLA`s outcomes

	Type of defense	DMRS defenses	% DMRS	% DLA	DLA defenses	
Common defenses to both methods	More benign defenses	Mature	8	43,21	In accordance with goal	
		Obsessional and other neurotic	40	6,65	Repression	
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>49.86</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
	More pathogenic defenses	Narcissistic, Disavowal and Borderline		20	16,39	Repression+characterologic traits
					12,24	Disavowal
		Action	32	20,03	Foreclosure of the affect	
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48,66</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
					1,48	Foreclosure of reality and the ideal
				<b>50,14</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	

5. A comparative especific overview

The DLA allows to research in a differentiate way the narrated episodes (which reflects the patient`s extra-transference relationships) and the enacted episodes (which evidences the patient`s intra-session relationships).

The DMRS was not designed for the research of these two independent levels of analysis, but it is possible to infer that some of the analysed fragments (like # 5, Acting out) are narrations, and some others (like # 12, Help-rejecting complaining) are enacted scenes. (Incidentally, fragments 5 and 12 were scored as the most severe level of defenses.) The analysis with the DMRS can be distributed in two sectors: narrated and enacted episodes:

Table XIV: Comparison of defenses in DMRS and DLA: narrations

	Type of defense	DMRS defenses	% DMRS	% DLA	DLA defenses
Common defenses to both methods	More benign defenses	Mature	5,13	30,84	In accordance with goal
		Obsessional and other neurotic	41,02	17,59	Repression
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46,15</b>	<b>48,43</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	More pathogenic defenses	Narcissistic, Disavowal and Borderline	20,52	25,93	Repression+characterologic traits Disavowal
		Action	33,33	21,48	Foreclosure of the affect
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53,85</b>	<b>47,41</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
				4,07	Foreclosure of reality and the ideal
		<b>51,48</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>		

Table XV: Comparison of defenses in DMRS and DLA: enacted scenes

	Type of defense	DMRS defenses	% DMRS	% DLA	DLA defenses
Common defenses to both methods	More benign defenses	Mature	11,43	50,25	In accordance with goal
		Obsessional and other neurotic	39,99	0,41	Repression
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51,42</b>	<b>50,66</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	More pathogenic defenses	Narcissistic, Disavowal and Borderline	17,14	30,14	Repression+characterologic traits Disavowal
		Action	31,44	19,20	Foreclosure of the affect
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48,58</b>	<b>49,34</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>

5. 4. Both analysis coincide on the fact that the prevalence of the more benign defenses over the most severe ones is slightly more relevant during the interview than in the extra-transference episodes. Besides, the DLA comparison between narrations and

enacted scenes shows a difference on the state of the defense: it is failed for narrations and successful for the displayed episodes. This fact suggests that the patient increases his resistance during the interview and that, if the therapist cannot change this clinical situation, the treatment is in risk of failure.

6. A comparative study of the 74 fragments

To compare the outcomes of both methods, the 74 fragments proposed and analyzed by the DMRS also were studied with the DLA.

Table XVI: Table of contingency Judge 2-DMRS \* Judge 1-DLA

(Absolute observed frequencies)

Recount

		Judge 1-DLA				Total
		In accordance with the goal	Repression	Disavowal	Foreclosure of Affect	
Judge 2-DMRS	In accordance with the goal	<b>6</b>	0	0	0	6
	Repression	4	<b>19</b>	4	3	30
	Disavowal	0	1	<b>12</b>	1	14
	Foreclosure of Affect	1	0	0	<b>23</b>	24
Total scenes =		11	20	16	27	74

Table XVII: Table of contingency Judge 2-DMRS \* Judge 1-DLA

(By chance awaited frequencies)

Awaited frequency

		Judge 1-DLA				Total
		In accordance with the goal	Repression	Disavowal	Foreclosure of Affect	
Judge 2-DMRS	In accordance with the goal	<b>,9</b>	1,6	1,3	2,2	6,0
	Repression	4,5	<b>8,1</b>	6,5	10,9	30,0
	Disavowal	2,1	3,8	<b>3,0</b>	5,1	14,0
	Foreclosure of Affect	3,6	6,5	5,2	<b>8,8</b>	24,0
Total		11,0	20,0	16,0	27,0	74,0

value  $k = 0,737$

Besides, the high grade of agreement between the judges is confirmed by the result of the *Statistical Significance* of 0,000, which means that the probability of such a high value of a Kappa of 0,737 of agreement appearing between the judges by chance is 0, i. e. that the probability of a highly significant result dueing to random is improbable ( $P = 0,000$ ).

## VI. Discussion

The convergent validity test DMRS/DLA had offer some difficulties based on the differences on the clusters of defenses, on the levels of analysis and on the type and number of fragments to be studied. Three different strategies of comparison were used: 1) the global outcomes (intending to solve the problem of the differences on clusters), 2) the specific outcomes (narrations and enacted scenes) (intending to solve the problem of the differences on levels of analysis). 3) 74 fragments (intending to solve the differences on the type and number of fragment to be studied). In the three strategies, some significative coincidences were observed. In the first and the second strategies, the coincidences concern to the opposition more benign-moreve severe defenses. In the third strategy, the coincidences concerns to kappa .737 (P= 0,000).

## VII. Conclusions

1. The first validity test (III) shows the coincidences between the DLA application and other 7 researches (all them having a qualitative form) on drives and defenses.
  2. The second validity test (IV) demonstrates that the DLA and the DMRS's applications (both having a quantitative form) match on the research of drives. .
-