| Reference Number | 000213 |
|---|---|
| Article Title | Diamond, D., Blatt, S. J., Stayner, D., & Kaslow, N. (1991). Self-other differentiation of object representations. Unpublished research manual, Yale University. |

#000213

DIFFERENTIATION-RELATEDNESS

OF SELF AND OBJECT REPRESENTATIONS

Diana Diamond, Sidney J. Blatt, David A. Stayner and Nadine Kaslow

Yale University

Differentiation-Relatedness Scale

of Self and Object Representations

Diana Diamond, Sidney J. Blatt, David Stayner

and Nadine Kaslow

Yale University

Clinical theory and research has focused increasingly on the role of early caregiving relationships in the development of representations of self and others (cognitive-affective schema) that organize and guide subsequent interpersonal experience. These relatively enduring representations of self and others are expressions of the development of increasingly mature interpersonal relatedness and the gradual consolidation and emergence of a differentiated, cohesive self-definition or identity (Blatt, 1974, 1990; Blatt, Wild & Ritzler, 1975; Kernberg, 1975; Kohut, 1971; Loewald, 1960, 1978; Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975; Sandler & Rosenblatt, 1962; Stern, 1985). Representations or internal working models (IWM) of early caregiving experiences establish templates or prototypes that are central to the emergence and consolidation of a sense of self and patterns of subsequent interpersonal and subjective experiences (Ainsworth, 1985a, b; Bretherton, 1985; Bowlby, 1988; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985). Research on the mother-infant interaction in the early months of life (e.g., Stern, 1985) demonstrates how patterns of engagement and disengagement in the early relational attunement between caregiver and infant interact with inborn capacities to facilitate the development of representations of caregiving interactions. These formulations from the study of infant-mother interaction in the early months of

2

life and from the study of patterns of attachment and separation in the second year of life are consistent with research and theory in social cognition that has also increasingly focused on the development of cognitive schema of self and others that organize subsequent interpersonal and self perceptions. These cognitive schema function as heuristic prototypes that are the basis for social interaction and behavior (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Horowitz, 1988; Markus, 1977; Westen, 1991).

Blatt and his colleagues, integrating developmental psychoanalytic theory and the cognitive developmental perspective of Piaget and Werner, suggest that representations of self and other develop epigenetically and become increasingly accurate, articulated, conceptually complex cognitive structures of self and others linked to each other by affective valences (Blatt, 1974; Blatt & Blass, 1990; Blatt & Lerner, 1983; Blatt, Wild & Ritzler, 1975; Behrends & Blatt, 1985; Blatt & Behrends, 1987; Kernberg, 1985, 1994). Higher levels of representations evolve from and extend lower levels, thus new representational modes become increasingly comprehensive and effective.

Representations of self and others are integral to the development of the cognitive structures or schema established in interpersonal interactions throughout the life cycle, beginning with the earliest experiences of the infant in the caring relationship with the mother. These cognitive-affective schema unfold and develop as the child matures and experiences various perturbations and demands throughout the life cycle. When these perturbations are not severe, the child alters existing cognitive structures to accommodate the experienced perturbations, leading to the development of new, more mature, levels of cognitive-affective schema. This process usually unfold in a natural, well-defined, developmental sequence; new, more mature, cognitive-affective schema and

3

representational structures more effectively organize, shape, and guide interpersonal and self experiences. When perturbations are severe, persistent, and overwhelm the child's capacities to accommodate, however, the development of these cognitive-affective structures may be compromised (Blatt, 1991, 1995).

The evolution of representations of self and other reflect two independent, but inter-related, developmental lines: a) the development of a consolidated, realistic, essentially positive, increasingly differentiated and integrated self-definition and identity, and b) the development of the capacity to establish increasingly mature, realistically satisfying, empathically attuned, reciprocal interpersonal relationships. The dialectical tension between these two developmental lines of self-definition and relatedness creates a fundamental dynamic that is central to the development of mature personality organization and healthy psychological functioning (Blatt, 1990, 1991; Blatt & Blass, 1990; Blatt & Shichman, 1983). An increasingly differentiated, integrated, and mature sense of self is contingent upon establishing satisfying interpersonal experiences, and, conversely, the establishment of increasingly satisfying interpersonal experiences is contingent upon the development of a more mature self-definition and identity. In normal personality development, these two developmental processes evolve in an interactive, reciprocally balanced, mutually facilitating way throughout the life cycle (Blatt, 1990; Blatt and Blass, 1990; Blatt and Shichman, 1983; Jordan, 1983; Miller, 1984; Surrey, 1983; Stern, 1985). New representational structures coalesce in this mutually facilitating interaction between the development of an increasingly cohesive and essentially positive sense of self and increasingly reciprocal, empathically attuned relatedness to others (Blatt & Blass, 1990, in press; Blatt & Shichman, 1983).

4

A. Clinical assessment of object representation.

1. The Rorschach and other projective techniques

Considerable research has been conducted during the last 15 years on the
clinical assessment of self and object representations. Both Blatt and Mayman,
and their respective colleagues, developed methods to operationalize and
systematically assess the development and impairment of self and object
representation (for reviews see Blatt & Lerner, 1983; Stricker & Healy, 1990;
Westen, 1991). Mayman (1967) examined primarily the thematic content of
representations in projective test data and evaluated the extent to which human
figures are described as differentiated, rich, alive, and involved in
interactions which are benevolent and reciprocal. Mayman and his colleagues
evaluated these dimensions in Rorschach responses (Mayman, 1967; Urist, 1977),
dreams (Khron & Mayman, 1974; Hatcher & Khron, 1980), and early memories (Mayman
& Faris,1969) and found that these ratings correspond to independent clinical
judgments and to independent estimates of clinical progress in the treatment of
psychotic patients (Ryan & Bell, 1984). Their findings support the construct
validity of levels of object representation assessed through thematic content as
a "salient, consistent, researchable personality dimension" (Khron & Mayman,
1974, p. 465).

Blatt and his colleagues, focusing more on structural dimensions of self
and object representations, developed methods for assessing degrees of
differentiation, articulation, integration and affective valence in human and
quasi-human responses on the Rorschach. In a longitudinal assessment of object
representation in Rorschach responses of normal subjects from ages 11-12 to 30,
Blatt, Brenneis, Schimek & Glick (1976) found significant increases with age in
the number of "accurately perceived, well-articulated, full human figures

involved in appropriate, integrated, positive and constructive (benevolent) interaction". Rorschach responses of these normal adolescents at ages 17 to 18 were also compared with those of adolescents in a long-term psychiatric facility and an unexpected but highly significant finding indicated that when patients fail to maintain realistic thinking, their representations are at a higher developmental level than the unrealistic thinking of normals (Blatt et al., 1976). These findings, replicated and extended by Ritzler and his colleagues (1980), clarify the role of restitutional or idyllic fantasies in psychoses and particularly in schizophrenia. This method for assessing the developmental level of realistic and unrealistic human representations on the Rorschach also discriminated among various diagnostic groups (Blatt & Lerner, 1983) including inpatient from outpatient borderlines (Lerner & St. Peter, 1984), narcissistic from borderline pathology (Farris, 1988), schizophrenic from borderline patients, (Spear, 1980; Spear & Sugarman, 1984), psychotic from nonpsychotic patients (Ritzler et al., 1980), neurotic outpatient borderline, inpatient borderline, and schizophrenic patients (Lerner & St. Peter, 1984), and opiate addicted from nonaddicted subjects (Blatt, Berman, Bloom-Feshbach, Sugarman, Wilber, & Kleber, 1984; Blatt, McDonald, Sugarman & Wilbur, 1984).

The methodology developed by Blatt and colleagues to assess object representation in responses to the Rorschach has also been used to investigate changes in object representation over the course of treatment. Independent estimates of clinical improvement correlated with a significant decrease in unrealistic representations of the human figure in inpatients (Blatt & Ford, 1994; Blatt, Ford, Berman, Cook & Meyer, 1988) and a significant increase in realistic representations in the human figure in outpatients (Blatt, 1992; Kavanaugh, 1985) over the course of long-term, intensive therapy. Blatt (1992)

6

found that outpatients whose character structure and psychopathology focused primarily on issues of interpersonal relatedness rather than self-definition (anaclitic patients) had significantly greater improvement in the structural dimensions of their object representations on the Rorschach in long term psychotherapy than in psychoanalysis. And the reverse was found with patients whose character style and pathology focused primarily on issues of self-definition (introjective patients), they had significantly greater improvement in the quality of their object representations if they were in psychoanalysis than in long-term psychotherapy.

Several groups of investigators have begun to operationalize Mahler's stages of separation/individuation to assess representations of early caregivers and of the self (Kwawer, 1979; Ipp, Kohlers & Lerner, 1986) and to evaluate Rorschach responses for themes of separation/individuation (Coonerty, 1986). The Rorschach scale developed by Coonerty (1986) significantly discriminated schizophrenic from borderline patients--schizophrenic patients had more pre-separation/individuation themes, than borderline patients who had significantly more themes at a somewhat higher developmental level expressing primarily issues of narcissism and reapproachment. Diamond, Kaslow, Coonerty, & Blatt (1990) extended Coonerty's original scale for evaluating Rorschach responses by adding higher developmental levels of object constancy and interpersonal relatedness.

2. Spontaneous descriptions of self and others.

Blatt and colleagues (Blatt, Wein, Chevron, & Quinlan, 1979; Blatt, Chevron, Quinlan, Schaffer & Wein, 1988) also developed procedures for evaluating both the content and structure of open-ended descriptions of self and significant others (e.g. parents, significant other, and therapist). Integrating psychoanalytic developmental theory (e.g. Fraiberg, Anna Freud, Jacobson,

7

Mahler), with cognitive developmental theory (e.g. Werner, Piaget), Blatt (1974) postulated five levels in the development of the concept of the object -- sensorimotor, perceptual, external iconic, internal iconic, and conceptual. Blatt and his colleagues (1979, 1992) not only developed procedures for assessing the conceptual level of spontaneous descriptions of significant figures, but they also specified ways of assessing qualitative dimensions of the descriptions (affectionate, ambitious, malevolent-benevolent, cold-warm, constructive involvement, intellectual, judgmental, negative-positive ideal, nuturant, punitive, successful, weak-strong). Factor analysis of these qualitative dimensions yielded three basic factors: benevolence, punitive, and striving (Quinlan, Blatt, Chevron & Wein, 1992). Conceptual level was significantly lower and there were significantly fewer nurturant themes in the representation of parents of depressed as compared to non-depressed young adults (Blatt, et al., 1979) and among psychiatric as compared to nonpsychiatric subjects (Bornstein & O'Neill, 1992). Nonpsychiatric subjects could be distinguished from borderline patients by the degree of differentiation and cognitive complexity (conceptual level) of their object representation (Marziali & Oleniuk, 1990). Independent estimates of therapeutic progress of seriously disturbed adolescent and young adult inpatients in long-term, psychodynamically informed treatment correlated significantly with changes in the conceptual level and the number of qualitative dimensions included in the representation of parents over the course of therapy (Blatt, Wiseman, Prince-Gibson, & Gatt, 1991). Changes in levels of object representation were also found to parallel changes independently reported in aspects of the transference relationship in a clinical comparison of a schizophrenic and a borderline inpatient in long-term, psychoanalytically-oriented, psychotherapy (Gruen & Blatt, 1990). In sum, considerable research

8

supports the construct validity of assessments of descriptions of significant others as an important dimension of personality organization and psychological functioning (Blatt & Lerner, 1983).

This manual presents a procedure for assessing the level of differentiation, integration, and relatedness of open-ended descriptions of self and significant others. The various developmental levels specified in this scale derive primarily from an integration of the developmental psychoanalytic theories of Mahler et al (1975), Jacobson (1976), Fraiberg (1969), and Kernberg (1966, 1976) with the theoretical formulations of Loewald (1960, 1978), Kohut (1971), and Stern (1985), in which psychological developmental is viewed as progressing toward increasing differentiation and integration (Blatt, 1974; Behrends & Blatt, 1985; Coonerty, 1986), and increasingly mature modes of interpersonal relatedness (Stern, 1985; Urist, 1977) based on mutuality and reciprocity.

The scale views psychological development as progressing simultaneously toward the emergence of a consolidated, integrated and individuated sense of self- definition as well as empathically attuned, reciprocal modes of interpersonal relatedness. The development of self-definition and interpersonal relatedness are assessed as two fundamental dimensions of personality development that exist in a creative, mutually facilitative, dialectical, tension (Blatt, 1990; Blatt & Blass, 1990, 1995; Jordan, 1986; Miller, 1984; Mitchell, 1988; Stern, 1985; Surrey, 1983). Differentiation and relatedness are understood as interactive "polarities" (Blatt & Blass, 1990, 1995; Blatt & Shichman, 1983; Sander, 1983) in an unfolding developmental process (see also Kegan, 1982; Mitchell, 1988; Ogden, 1986). The dialectical tension and interaction between these two developmental dimensions facilitates the development of increasingly mature levels of both self definition and reciprocally attuned relatedness. In

9

constructive psychological development, these representations of self and other become increasingly cohesive, differentiated, and integrated, and begin to reflect an increased sense of empathically attuned, reciprocal interpersonal relatedness.[1]

In an investigation (Stayner, 1992) of the interrater reliability of this scale of Differentiation - Relatedness, five judges rated 90 descriptions of mother, father, therapist, and self given by seven inpatients at various times in the course of their long-term treatment at a small, private, psychiatric hospital. Judges differed considerably in their level of clinical experience and their familiarity with the developmental and psychodynamic conceptualizations underlying the scale. The judges included two experienced clinicians, a graduate student in clinical psychology and two psychiatric aides, one of whom had previous related research experience. The scale's reliability was examined by comparing these five judges' ratings across the 90 descriptions and deriving an intraclass correlation coefficient via a target (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). This coefficient was then adjusted statistically so that the resulting intraclass correlation coefficient reflected the degree of agreement which can be expected when the scale is used by a random sample of k judges with similar training and experience as those in the reliability study. An adjusted intraclass correlation coefficient of .83 was derived.

Initial validity studies are encouraging. The level of differentiation-relatedness rated on this scale, especially of the representation of self, correlated significantly with independent assessment of level of clinical

---

[1] Although designed to assess primarily open ended, spontaneous descriptions of self and others, this scale could also be used with data gathered through other procedures including the TAT, speech samples in which the individual describes the self or significant others, and other types of semi-structured interviews.

functioning. In addition, independent assessment of degree of therapeutic change correlated significantly with increases in the differentiation-relatedness scores for representations of mother, father, therapist and self (Blatt, Stayner, Auerbach, & Behrends, in press). These relationships between level of differentiation-relatedness of representations of self and other and levels of clinical functioning, as well as degree of clinical change, are independent of a wide range of sociodemographic (e.g., intelligence, age) and other clinical variables (e.g., length of hospitalization, age of onset) (Stayner, 1994).

Table 1 presents a brief definition of each of the 10 scale points in this procedure that reflect increasing psychological maturity. At the lowest levels, the scale reflects the compromise of boundaries in terms of basic bodily experiences, emotions, or thoughts. Subsequent scale levels reflect a unitary, unmodulated view of self or other as an extension or mirrored image of an other, or as organized around a unitary idealization or denigration of self and other, or around a split of disparate aspects of self and other into polarized extremes. Later scale levels reflect an increasing capacity to integrate disparate aspects of self and other with increasing tolerance for ambivalence and ambiguity (Kernberg, 1966, 1977).

Lower level representations are often rigid and fixed with an all-encompassing affect or point of view in which the individual appears to exercise little sense of control or volition. Higher level representations integrate multiple points of view and feelings in which the individual conveys a sense of control and choice. Higher levels also reflect increasing expressions of mutually reciprocal, empathic attunement, and participation in complex, interpersonal relations. Thus various levels of the scale assess an increasing capacity to simultaneously hold and coordinate disparate view or schemas of self

and another with an increasing toleration for ambiguity and an increase use of affective, temporal, and agenetic dimensions in the representation of self and others.

Lower level representations may consist of a single, all-encompassing affective descriptor; at higher levels representations might include several affects, or contain a creative tension between conflicting affects which, at the highest levels are integrated in the symbolization of self or other. Similarly, lower level representations may be limited to a single, global time frame, such as "always" or "never", whereas somewhat higher level descriptions might reflect a less global, concrete emphasis on the past or the present; while at still higher levels descriptions might reflect an ability to contain past views and present experience, or an ability to integrate past experience in a way that opens up future possibilities. At lower levels, representations may not reflect a sense of agency over one's own experience but a sense of being controlled by external forces, or a sense of being overwhelmed or possessed by another. Higher levels representations may reflect a stronger emphasis on choosing and deciding; while at still higher levels representations may include a sense of choice within the constraints and limits of one's personal or environmental reality. Descriptions at the highest levels may reflect an appreciation of the complex, reciprocal interactions among past and present choices and an awareness of their consequences.

The scale also reflects a trend toward increasingly mutual, empathically-attuned, and reciprocal relatedness. At lower levels, the sense of relatedness in representations may consist of being pushed by or invaded by the other, as seen, for instance, in a description consisting of resisting the onslaught of the other who is experienced as bad and destructive. At higher levels, relatedness

may be expressed primarily in parallel interactions, in expressions of cooperation and mutuality, in increased understanding of the other's perspective, and in increasing expressions of empathically attuned reciprocity. At the highest levels, descriptions also reflect an increasing sense of participation in complex relational matrices that co-determine perceptions, attributions, and the symbolizations of meaning.

In summary, higher ratings of descriptions derive from increasing differentiation and articulation; increasing coordination and integration of varied aspects of experience; and increasingly mutual, empathically-attuned relatedness including a growing awareness of the reciprocal influences and relational matrices that contribute to the creation of symbolization of self and other.

Themes reflecting these developmental trends are rated and the final score given to a description reflects the modal score, the score predominant in the description. One exception to this rule is observed: scores of level 1 are treated as special scores and outweigh others -- two indications of level one require that the description be rated as level one.

Table 1

Scale for rating degree of differentiation -

relatedness in representations of self and others.

The 10 developmental levels of self and other representations are:

1.   Self/other boundary compromise (physical)

     (basic physical cohesion/integrity of representations is compromised).

2.   Self/other boundary confusion (intellectual, affective)

     (affective/intellectual boundaries are confused, fused, or comprised).

3.   Self/other mirroring

     (consolidation and stabilization of representations based on mirroring).

4.   Self/other idealization or denigration

     (consolidation and stabilization of representations based on

     unitary, unmodulated idealization or denigration).

5.   Semi-differentiation

     (tenuous, semi-differentiated consolidation of representations achieved

     through primitive splitting and/or rigid adherence to concrete properties

     to achieve a tenuous cohesion).

6.   Emergent, ambivalent constancy (cohesion) and an emergent sense of

     relatedness.

7.   Consolidated, constant (stable) self and others in unilateral relationship.

8.   Cohesive, individuated, empathically related self and other.

9.   Reciprocally related, integrative unfolding self and other.

10.  Integrative, creative constructions of self and other in empathically

     and reciprocally attuned relationships.

14

Level 1. Self/other boundary compromise (physical)

Basic physical cohesion/integrity of representation of self or
other is compromised.

Descriptions at this level are characterized by severely compromised
physical boundaries in which basic bodily cohesion or physical integrity is
lacking or breached. The body of self or other may be experienced and described
as permeated by or merged with the physical presence or properties of another
person or something in the environment. Thoughts and feelings may seem unbounded
and lack a firm sense of being anchored in a physically defined, intact, cohesive
bodily self, for instance: ". . . my thoughts are go'in out of my head, around
the world." These descriptions tend to reflect a sense of relational barrenness
and may depict infusions or broadcasting of people's thoughts and feelings, as
opposed to interpersonal communication across intact personal boundaries. For
instance, "my upstairs neighbor watches my dreams on her TV at night when I'm
asleep."

Example #1: Paternal description.

"Caring. Wants me to be better. Says he'll be the happiest
person when I come out of the telepathic wind. Nobody knows
what that means. Smart people know. When my thoughts are
go'in out of my head, around the world. He told me he'll be
the happiest person when that stops -- he thinks of me everyday.

Example #2: Self-description.

"A good person-dealing with a lost of stress - like how to cope
with stress - been tested a lot by Jesus Christ - pulled
through a winner - save the world from going to hell early.

Inquiry:

(Early?) "All I have to do is to do one thing wrong and everyone will have to go to hell early - but I won't do that - so by not doing anything wrong I'm saving the world from going to hell early. I'm a good person and God says I'm one of his favorite sons and that's it. (Good Person?) "I care about people more than other people." (Stress?) "Just the stress that's about me every day. About being in the wind." (Wind?) "Being in the telepathic wind - when people say they can hear my voices, and my thoughts and my thinking . . . When I come out of the wind the hospital won't be here anymore. By the time you have read this - you'll have read the newspaper article about what happened to the hospital - just a little sample of what God - of God's power and un - how did I like know this? 'Cuz God told me an um by the time you read this I'll be a live God, a new born God - the power of Robert - . that's it." (God?) "I'm not a God right now - but when I die - then - no, when I land out of the wind - when I land out of the telepathic wind- then I"ll be a real live God and have all the powers of a God."

Level 2.  Self/other boundary confusion (intellectual/affective)

Affective/intellectual boundaries of self or other are confused,
. fused, or compromised.

Self and other appear physically intact but thoughts and feelings are amorphous, undifferentiated or confused rather than defined and distinguishable. For instance, a description may consist of a single, global quality, often an action or imagistic impression (such as "Busy," without any elaboration). The other may also be described by naming internal affective states which lack any reference to interpersonal experience or a sense of interpersonal differentiation (for instance: "Worried. Unhappy."). A description may also consist only of a flood of details which fail to portray a distinguishable person to whom one is related interpersonally. It may also reflect a confusion, vagueness, or loss of mooring related to feeling overwhelmed in the attempt to describe self or other (for instance: "It's too much for me. I don't know. Don't know.)" These descriptions reflect a sense of being lost in unformed, undefined, affective-cognitive experiences, rather than a sense of agency (e.g., refusing to answer) or self reflection.

Example #1: Maternal description, admission

"Good Lord -- that's horrible. I can't without swearing. My mother she grew up in a really bad household where her parents didn't get along very well. Grandfather stayed down all the time and played poker. My grandmother was very upset and neurotic. She had a really hard time at school -- got sick a lot. Had no friends. Went through a long time wearing braids because her mother forced her to wear braids and long hair.

17

Finally cut hair in high school and had friends.  Felt better
about herself.  But also went through a long time being
sick, at home -- in bed -- ate vegetable soup all the time.
Inquiry:  (describe) I'm getting to that.  Back to high school --
went to high school, went to college.  She was going to be a
teacher but decided not to go through last semester of college
to teach -- to marry a man she didn't know very well.  Was a
drunken driver.  She went from home -- back home to a bad marriage.
Now that's down there I can say -- she's not very independent -- has
no hobbies to do with other people.  Depends on other people to do
things for her.  She's a very nervous person.  She drinks a lot of
coffee and tea, has poor eating habits and has a few close friends."

Example #2:  Self description.

"Kind person, care a lot - one of nicest person in whole
world - can feel it inside me - had minibike - trying to get
together - couldn't because sick - sold it for very cheap
price, kid at camp - will come home and see that minibike - I
did that for him.  I care about everybody.  Have girlfriend in
town - will teach her things - she'll turn out really pretty -
have another girl more mature - that's how she'll turn out -
teach each other to be with each other.

Example #3: Maternal description.

"I don't know."

Note:  This kind of vague description with little inquiry poses particular scoring problems.  The vagueness might be seen as an indication that the lack of differentiation of thoughts and feelings reflects an experience of being overwhelmed and flooded (Level 2) (e.g., "I don't know. . ." [Inquiry] . . . "Its like trying to describe the fog - its everywhere"), or as a semi-differentiated response resulting from defensive blocking (e.g., "I won't do it! I don't want to"), or as might occur in a repressive hysteric personality organization and defensive style (Level 5).  Without access to additional clues such as verbal inflection and intonation, observations of non-verbal behavior, or elaborations obtained in inquiry, descriptions consisting of a non-descriptive phrase such as "I don't know," should be considered unscorable.

Level 3.  Self/other mirroring

Representation is as an extension or mirror reflection of self or other.

Descriptions at this level focus almost exclusively on characteristics of self and other that are virtually the same or exactly identical, such as aspects of physical appearance or body shape or size.  These characteristics are described as unequivocally alike and often lack contextual specificity or conditionality.  The other is related to as a mirror, a self-completing object, or an extension of the self, through which a tenuous sense of consolidation and stability of the representation is maintained.

Example #1:  Maternal description.

"Very pretty lady - she's, let's see . . . 5"4:, brownish colored hair, hazel eyes.  She kind'a looks like me.  Our noses are the same, and our beauty marks are in the same spots.  Isn't that weird?  One day I checked, and we had them in the same spot.  She has glasses like me.  She wears contacts.  We both love clothes.  We fit into the same size . . . .

Level 4.    Self/other idealization or denigration

Representation of self or other is described in unitary, un-modulated, idealized or denigrated terms.

Descriptions at this level are characterized by extreme, one-sided idealization or denigration of self or other. This all-encompassing quality lacks any reference to conditionality or any sense of qualification or modulation. Idealization and denigration may at times be included in the same description but will appear as separate static extremes (or part properties) of self or other, but will lack the oscillation between extremes that is seen at the next level (Level 5). (See example #4 below.) The other is related to by idealizing or denigrating, which seems to provide a tenuous sense of consolidation and stability.

Example #1:  Paternal description.

"A dick -- 6"2", heavy, short black hair. Real nasty, a real tyrant, beady black eyes. (Why do you suppose he's like that?) Cause he's an asshole -- sucks dick for a living."

Example #2: Therapist description.

"Sweet, supportive, just really nice.

Example #3:  Therapist description.

"An ass. I don't like him. (Why not?) I don't like his face. I just don't like him. Makes me feel uncomfortable. Talks with an accent."

Example #4:  Self Description.

> "Chris is very confused.  Although not incapacitated by this,
> she is often frustrated.  She is often annoyed and doesn't like
> many people.  She's a bitch.  Chris cries ALOT!  I'm OK.  I try
> hard.  I love everybody.  But I'm usually happy and don't care
> much.  I don't like this hospital but realize we need to be
> here.  I guess it's OK.  I'm very creative and don't like drugs
> or drinking or anything antisocial.  I'm a perfect little girl."

Note:  Most immediately evident in this last description is the split
between idealized aspects (I try hard . . . love everybody . . . usually happy .
. . .") and denigrated aspects (". . . very confused . . . often frustrated . . .
doesn't like many people . . . a bitch.")  There is little or no oscillation
between these polarized representations (as seen in descriptions at Level 5), but
rather a marked isolation of disparate aspects of self experience (for
instance, the denigrated self is called, "Chris").  Because of this, it is scored
level 4 (Idealization or denigration) rather than as a semidifferentiated self at
Level 5.

Level 5. Semi-differentiated, tenuous consolidation of self and other

Representation dominated by primitive splitting of experience of self or other into polarized extremes, or by rigid adherence to concrete properties to stabilize tenuous cohesion of self and other experience.

Descriptions at this level are most often marked by an oscillation between disparate aspects of one's experience of self and other that have been split into dramatically opposed, mutually exclusive polarities with an all-encompassing absolute quality. Extremes of relatedness might include, for instance, an overwhelming closeness versus an unbridgeable gulf or distance; invasive control versus abandonment; or intense rage versus idolizing love. Disparate aspects of self or others are experienced and grappled with but they are not integrated into a multi-dimensional modulated description. They are described in absolute, mutually exclusive terms, with little or no sense of contextual influences or temporal perspective such as placing one aspect in the past and the other in the present.

Example #1: Paternal description.
"He's got mood swings. Sometimes he's nice, sometimes he's real nasty. He can be pretty nice at times. That's about it."
Inquiry (Nice?) "Just a nice guy, nice to me". (Nasty?) "Loses his temper . . . gets angry".

Example #2: Self-description.

"I can't describe myself. . . you describe me. It's

hard . . . no it's easy. Vulnerable. Hurt. Lonely.

Sort of happy. Getting more confident. . . no please write

gaining confidence. Considerate."


Example #3: Self description.

"Depends on how I'm feeling. Sometimes I'm outgoing but

other times I'm withdrawn. I don't know."

Inquiry: (What else?) "I don't want to describe myself.

(Why?) Cause I get upset when I do." (Can you tell me what

upset you?) "I'm either too conceited or too modest to answer

that."

Relatedness in Level 5 descriptions may also oscillate between defensive

distancing and over-identification with the other (for instance, abandonment

versus engulfing closeness). This oscillation may also appear in a preoccupation

with issues of control and autonomy, reflecting the intense struggle to preserve

a fragile, vulnerable, emerging sense of self from the invasive control of the

other (as compared to less threatened, more positive emphasis on self-

directedness and autonomy, as seen in higher levels).

Descriptions at this level can contain an assertive, often abrupt and

complete refusal to describe self or other or an unwillingness to continue the

task of attempting a description. This refusal should not appear to be a'

momentary search for the words to describe one's experience more precisely, but

rather an active, defensive attempt to block the flow of the process to preserve

a rudimentary, fragile sense of differentiation and cohesion (such as, "No! I won't do it. I don't want to!"). This defensive dynamic may also appear as overtly intense conflict over what, or how much, to reveal in a description. This defensive blocking is seen as an assertion of will or agency, rather than an expression of the sense of confusion or loss of mooring, such as seen at Level 2, and therefore is scored as a semidifferentiated attempt to define the self on the object.

> Example #4:  Therapist description.
>
>> "I don't know her.  I won't do it.  I don't like her.
>>
>> Unaware, without knowing it.  Has too much faith in me.
>>
>> (Refused inquiry.)

Descriptions at this level can also include an inordinate emphasis on, or limitation to, concrete, physical properties, bodies or body parts, often depicted in stilted, two-dimensional, sometimes grotesque, terms. This marked focus on physical properties or concrete characteristics is viewed as another expression of an attempt to stabilize tenuous representations of self and other. It should be noted that this type of concrete description might reflect a more basic cognitive or developmental style rather than the defensive blocking suggested here. Thus, this inordinate emphasis on concrete properties can serve both defensive and adaptive purposes, reflecting some combination of both defensive blocking and a more general cognitive style.

> Example #5:  Maternal description.
>
>> "She's got a car.  She's um . . . I don't know how old.
>>
>> . . 36 or something.  She's married to my Dad.  She has
>>
>> green eyes (and?) her ears are pierced.  She has a mouth.

She has two legs (laughing).

Example #6:  Maternal description.

"Her looks or the way I think about her?  (Both if you
like.)  Five feet seven inches.  Blondish hair.  She
wears glasses.  And she works.  And . . . are you ready?
. . . I don't think I like her.  I don't know why."

Inquiry:  (Anything more?)  "No.  Don't know too much about
her. . . I'm losing my voice.  (As a person?)  "I don't know
what kind of a person she is.  I don't know her."

Example #7:  Therapist description.

". . . She's very nice, lets me talk about whatever I
want.  Some of her fingers are different sizes (therapist has a
mild birth defect on one hand) and she smokes.  She has a nice
pictures hanging on the wall in her office.  We meet three
times a week, I think."

Level 6. Emergent, ambivalent constancy, cohesion, and an emergent sense of
relatedness.

Descriptions at this transitional level reflect an emerging consolidation
of disparate aspects of self and other that are expressed in somewhat more
integrated, stable representations. Descriptions are marked by a hesitant,
equivocal, or ambivalent movement toward this integration and stabilization.
Level 6 descriptions may consist simply of a list of appropriate, role
conventional characteristics (but not only concrete properties or characteristics
as in level 5) which do not seem to reflect a sense of the uniqueness of the
individual. Self descriptions are often characterized by trial identifications
or distinctions that also convey a sense of tentative movement toward a more
individuated and cohesive sense of self. Relatedness includes an emergent and
equivocal sense of tolerance for and ability to bring together divergent aspects
of interpersonal experience.

Example #1: Self description.

> "One thing I have now which I didn't have in the past is self-
> confidence. I'm becoming a more social person. I care about
> myself. I worry about the way my room looks. . . if a picture
> is crooked, I have a spaz attack. I don't know if that's good
> or bad. . . I mean I get so caught up in wanting everything to
> be a model. I'm learning ways to control my temper and
> expressing my feelings, and I'm still writing in a journal.
> Most times I enjoy school. . . I used to be petrified and hate
> it when I was in (her hometown). Maybe because it's because I know
> everyone here. I think I want to be like my mother. . . I don't
> know if that's good or bad. . . I told my mother, and she said

it's bad.  She said I have to be my own person. . . that's what
I'm working on.  There were times when the only way I could act
mature was by thinking of myself as my mother. . . the person she
is. . . always dressed nice, clean, caring.  I'm immature.  That's
what I have to learn not to be.  That's what I'm working on.  Staff,
patients, and Mom are helping. . ."

Example #2:  Paternal description.

"My father - um - about 5'10" - Do I have to describe him
physically?  He has a little belly - a big (!) - belly, rather.
Can get very angry.  Can be fun.  Oh yeah, he has brownish-grey
hair and green eyes and wears glasses.  Wouldn't it be easier
to tape this?  Did you write that down?  He's a father of 5
other children also.  That's all to describe him."

Inquiry:  (Angry?)  "He has trouble controlling his anger - sometimes
he takes it out on other people - either verbal or physical."  (Fun?)
"Yeah - I used to have a lot of fun with him - I used to joke about
with him - I mean he has his times when he can be serious but
sometimes he's fun."  (Serious?)  "Like there are times when you
know you can kid with him and other times when you don't fuck with
him at all."

Level 7.   Stable, consolidated, self and others in essentially unilateral relationships.

Descriptions at this level reflect consolidated and stable representations of self and other in which thoughts, feelings, needs, and fantasies are differentiated and more modulated.  At this level, representations, include an increasing tolerance and integration of disparate aspects of experiences of self and other.  Characteristics and qualities are described more conditionally, with some references to temporality and environmental context.  These descriptions are often marked by expressions of sympathetic understanding such as attempts to recognize and take into account specific situational factors that can influence another's, or one's own, behavior or viewpoint.  Cause and effect relationships are depicted in relatively uncomplicated, largely uni-directional terms.  Self descriptions often emphasize a positive self-assertion, in which the subject's own opinions, interests, and qualities are defined and articulated.  Descriptions of others also tend to emphasize specific distinguishing qualities and characteristics.

Example #1:  Self description.

"Lonely, insecure.  Hiding behind a facade.  Has common sense. Abnormal opinions.  One of my abnormal opinions is that people who want to kill themselves should be allowed to kill themselves. . . and I wasn't referring to myself either. Mature. . . can be mature. . .  haven't really acted that during the psych. testing.  I sort of fooled around.  Should have more confidence."

Example #2:  Paternal description.

"Funny.  Caring.  Good-natured.  Generous with me.  Tries to be

29

understanding.  Can't keep a secret very well.  About 5'9", 185

pounds.  A little chubby.  Balding.  A well-meaning person.

Happily married at present."

Example #3:  Self description.

"Describe myself. . . short -ha ha ha!  Um - smart, rebellious,

annoying - that's about it."

Inquiry:  (Rebellious)  "Because I climb walls!  I'm kidding!  <u>You</u>

asked me that?  Be serious!  Don't like doing what I'm told - that's

about it.  Why would <u>you</u> ask me that?  You could probably write a

million reasons down."  (Annoying)  "Yeah, un - let's see - when

people insult me I don't say that was a stupid thing to say - and I

walk out -  they could pull their hair out 'cause I don't say

anything!"


<u>Note</u> (example #3):

Rather than a blocking of the process as seen at Level 5, this

description includes an engagement with the tester and a more self-

assertive, feisty and somewhat humorous (although still defensive in

tone) quality, and thus is scored at level 7.


Example #4:  Self description.

"Fat, but working on it.  Blonde hair - green eyes - 5'7".

Helpful to others sometimes.  Hoping to live life to the

fullest after discharge.  Dependent on others to get through

the bad times."

Inquiry: (Helpful?) "I can talk to people sometimes, when they have problems and help." (Dependent?) "Too dependent on my primaries and ward group administrator."

Example #5: Paternal description.

"My father is 51 this December, he's about 5' 10˚ - he's gained a lot of weight (hah!) Grayish brown hair and blue eyes. He's into always letting his kids know what his life was like, to make us further our education. That's really it."

Level 8. Cohesive, individuated, empathically related self and other.

Descriptions at this level reflect a cohesive, nuanced and related sense of self and other in which varied characteristics and qualities are recognized and increasingly integrated. Aspects of the self and others are emphasized that distinguish and define a unique sense of identity. These descriptions often express an interest in understanding and differentiating feelings and motivations through interpersonal contact and communication, often reflecting references to potential or experienced differences between intentions and actual behavior. These descriptions also include references to using one's own thoughts and feelings to emphatically appreciate and understand the other. Behavior is often depicted in ways that suggest a more complex, context-related, understanding of cause and effect and an appreciation that a given action may have shades of meaning depending on its context. These descriptions also include a positive emphasis on a complex balance of independence and dependence in relationships, on career and work choices, and on future directions and possibilities, that reflect the experience of an increasingly stable and cohesive sense of identity.

Example #1: Therapist description.

"I'm trying to think of a word, Tactful in approaching subjects. . . . that wasn't the word I was thinking of. . . not blunt, can say things in a better fashion. She can put things in a better way that doesn't sound too intimidating or so cruel. She's sweet, generous has high morals. She's a nice person. Has high standards."

Example #2:  Self description.

"I'm weird.  One minute I can be nice and in a good mood, the next in a real bad one.  A lot of times when others think I'm angry, I'm really sad, but it comes out looking like anger.  I like a lot of privacy.  I'm sensitive, I know that.  I'm patient with some people, but with others I'm not at all. . . . I guess I am with those I really care about.  I get scared about things; I have a tough exterior, but inside I'm mush.  I like people, generally guys with long hair - huh!  I like to read and write.  I love animals and little kids.  I like heavy metal and punk."


Example #3:  Self description.

"My name is . . .  you know my name!  19. . . . soon to be 20. Blonde hair, green eyes.  Pretty healthy. . . physically and mentally.  On the emotional aspects, I'm leaving (the hospital) in 26 days!  I'm gonna for the first time be independent, on my own. I'm going to school in the fall - business!  I'm nervous about all of it, of course!  I hope it all comes through.  And I know if I have a hard time, the proper channel to go through.  I think I'm still very sensitive to other people and how they feel about themselves or me.  I don't like to see them locked up or hurting like I was.  That pretty much describes who I am. You can't really. . . you have to meet the person.

Example #4:  Significant other description.

"I'd say M. (boyfriend) right now. . . I don't know why!  Yes, I do. What do you want to know?  He's someone special.  I learned how to have a relationship with somebody, to argue and hate. . . and love. . . and still care.  He taught me. . . we taught each other how to be close and not to be hurt. . . although I still feel it. . . he gives me a different feeling from other people. . . a good one.  And he's standing by me leaving, helping me find a place, just being there for me whenever I need him. That's it."


Example #5:  Paternal description.

"My father is a person who is very confused about what he really wants.  He is a man with an abundance of talent, but never really uses the right one at the right time.  He still has a whole hell of a lot of growing up to do.  He needs companionship, but always hooks up with people who really want nothing from him but money, which leaves him with nothing.  He has nothing to show for what he's tried to accomplish in life. I wish we were closer as I was growing up.  I think things could have been a lot better for the both us.  He needs to practically be kicked in the ass for motivation.  I try but I can't do it all.

Example #6:  Self description.

"Very quiet.  Have a hard time socializing with others.  I
want to be liked by everyone.  I try to be as creative as I can
with my art work and with ideas I have.  I like to be myself
and not try to be someone else.  I try to make a good
appearance, when I'm going somewhere.  Too much of a
perfectionist with everything I do.  I'm not as socially active
as I'd like to be.  That's it!"

Inquiry:  (Quiet?)  I don't initiate conversations, I usually talked
to someone because they've started to talk with me.  (Perfectionist?)
try hard to make things look acceptable to others.

Level 9.  Reciprocally related, integrative, unfolding self and other.

In addition to an integrated, cohesive sense of self and other, descriptions at this level are marked by reciprocal affective and intellectual exchanges between self and other, in which the behavior of one affects the other and each makes a unique contribution to the relationship.  Descriptions at this level include experiences of empathic identification with the other's internal frame of reference and affective experience, while maintaining one's own distinct, intact sense of self.  These experiences of reciprocal, intersubjective relatedness are often experienced as enriching and/or transforming the self.  Descriptions at this level reflect an appreciation that one's sense of self and other is continually unfolding and being articulated in complex, interpersonal matrices.

Example #1:  Paternal description.

"My father.  He's 5'10", grayish brown hair, blue-green eyes, he's a heavyweight. . . big belly!  My father's very overprotective of me. . . he's very insecure himself about letting me make my own moves and my own decisions.  He is very caring but, by the way he shows it, he gets angry rather than say, "I get angry because I care."  But he's trying to be very helpful with me right now, with my leaving.  I've learned a lot about my parents in the last 6 months.

Example #2:  Maternal description.

"My mother - has my name.  Her description is about 5"8", grayish-brownish hair, green eyes, normal weight - little chubby.  She is 49 years old.  I've learned so much about my mother in the past few months I don't know where to begin.

She's very emotional. She doesn't want to let me grow up --
although she has to. She's caring and understanding of me and
tries very hard to help me the best way she thinks is
necessary. That's good enough - that's what I'm trying to
say."

Example #3: Self description.

"um- I'm 19, I'm now on (name of the hospital unit). I think I've
come a long way since I first got here. Sometimes I slip, then I
remember everything I learned and I try to dig myself out of whatever
I'm in. I'm trying to become as independent as possible. Um -
I think I have a better outlook on what my future will be
like - I can see it - which is better than before, when all I
could see was black. Un - there isn't much I could say that
you could write 'cuz people need to talk to me to find out who
I am."

Inquiry: (Independent?) "Well, meaning getting a job in the
community, finding an apartment, just trying to separate my
adolescence from my adulthood as best I can." (Better outlook?) "I
can see what I'm going to be doing - it's not as scary - well, it
still is - it doesn't scare me as much as it used to."

Level 10. Intersubjectively creative, integrative, empathically and reciprocally
attuned self and other.

In addition to an articulated sense of integration and reciprocal
relatedness, descriptions at this level are marked by a recognition that one
participates in and contributes to the construction of systems of meaning that
are interwoven with one's experience of self and other. These constructions are
supported by an understanding of reality as an unfolding interplay of objective
and subjective experience, rather than a series of "facts" existing entirely
apart from one's subjective participation. Self and other are depicted as
creative constructions or narratives that emerge from intrapersonal and
interpersonal experiences, and are understood to shape and organize one's
perspective on and perceptions of self/other experience. Descriptions at this
level reflect an appreciation of a conscious and creative participation in the
intersubjective process of constructing meaning and the relational matrices that
contribute to an evolving sense of self and others.

Example: #1: Maternal description.

"She's . . . kind of neurotic. . . she tries hard with her kids
and her husband. She's basically a very nice person and I'd
say she's wise from experience, from all she's been through.
She doesn't like to hurt people but I think she can be hurt
easily. She's organized and she's very practical but she's got
problems. . . she knows what's going on now, she's smart about
people and things. I understand my mother a lot better now
than I did when I first came to the hospital, and I know that
the way I see her now is a result of my treatment. In six
months I may see her differently. . . "

38

References

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985a). Patterns of infant-mother attachments: antecedents

and effects on development. <u>Bulletin of New York Academy of Medicine</u>, <u>61</u>,

771-791.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1985b). Attachments a cross the life span. <u>Bulletin</u>

<u>of the New York Academy of Medicine</u>, <u>61</u>, 792-812.

Behrends, R.S. & Blatt, S.J. (1985). Internalization and psychological

development throughout the life cycle. <u>Psychoanalytic Study of the Child</u>,

<u>40</u>, 11-39.

Blatt, S. J. (1974). Levels of object representation in anaclitic and

introjective depression. <u>Psychoanalytic Study of the Child</u>, 29, 107-157.

Blatt, S. J. (1990). Interpersonal relatedness and self-definition: Two

Personality configurations and their Implications for Psychopathology and

Psychotherapy. In <u>Repression and Dissociation: Implications for</u>

<u>Personality Theory, Psychopathology and Health</u>, Singer, J.L., (Ed.)

Chicago: University of Chicago Press (pp. 299-335).

Blatt, S. J. (1991). A cognitive morphology of psychopathology. <u>The Journal of</u>

<u>Nervous and Mental Disease</u>, 179, 449-458.

Blatt, S.J. (1992). The differential effect of psychotherapy and

psychoanalysis on anaclitic and introjective patients: The Menninger

Psychotherapy Research Project Revisited. <u>Journal of the American</u>

<u>Psychoanalytic Association</u>, <u>40</u>, 691-724.

Blatt, S.J. (1995). Representational structures in psychopathology.

In D. Cicchetti & S. Toth (Eds.). <u>Rochester Symposium on Developmental</u>

<u>Psychopathology, Volume VI: Emotion, Cognition, and Representation</u>, (pp.

1- 33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Blatt, S.J. & Behrends, R.S. (1987).  Separation-individuation, internalization and the nature of therapeutic action.  International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 68, 279-297.

Blatt, S.J., Berman, W., Bloom-Feshbach, S., Sugarman, A., Wilber, D. & Kleber, H.D. (1984).  Psychological assessment of psychopathology in opiate addicts.  Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 172, 156-165.

Blatt, S.J. & Blass, R.B.(1990).  Attachment and separateness:  A dialectic model of the products and processes of psychological development. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 45, 107-127.

Blatt, S. J., & Blass, R. (1995).  Relatedness and self definition:  A dialectic model of personality development.  In G. G. Noam & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), Development and vulnerability in relationships (pp. 309-338). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Blatt, S.J., Brenneis, C., Schimek, J., & Glick, M. (1976).  Normal and psychopathological impairment of the concept of the object on the Rorschach.  Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85, 394-373.

Blatt, S.J., Chevron, E.S., Quinlan, D., Schaffer, C., & Wein, S. (1988). The assessment of qualitative and structural dimensions of object representations (revised edition).  New Haven:  Yale University. Unpublished research manual.

Blatt, S.J., & Ford, R.Q. (1994).  Therapeutic change: An object relations perspective.  New York: Plenum.

Blatt, S., Ford, R.Q., Berman, W., Cook, B., & Meyer, R. (1988).  The Assessment of Change During the Intensive Treatment of Borderline and Schizophrenic Young Adults.  Psychoanalytic Psychology, 5, 127-158.

Blatt, S.J., & Lerner, H. (1983a). Investigations in the psychoanalytic theory of object relations and object representation. In J. Masling (Ed.), Empirical Studies of Psychoanalytic Theories. New Jersey: The Analytic Press.

Blatt, S.J. & Lerner H. (1983b). The Psychological Assessment of Object Representation. Journal of Personality Assessment, 47, 7-28.

Blatt, S.J., McDonald, C., Sugarman, A., & Wilber, C. (1984). Psychodynamic theory of opiate addiction: New directions for research. Clinical Psychological Review, 4(2), 159-189.

Blatt, S.J. & Shichman, S. (1983). Two primary configurations of psycho-pathology. Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought, 6, 187-254.

Blatt, S.J., Stayner, D. & Auerbach, J. (in press). Change in object and self representations in long-term, intensive, inpatient treatment of seriously disturbed adolescents and young adults. Psychiatry.

Blatt, S.J., Wein, S.J., Chevron, E.S., & Quinlan, D.M. (1979). Parental representations and depression in normal young adults. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88, 388-397.

Blatt, S.J., & Wild, C.M. (1976). Schizophrenia: A developmental analysis. New York: Academic Press.

Blatt, S.J., Wild, C.M., & Ritzler, B.A. (1975). Disturbances of object representations in schizophrenia. Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Science, 4, 235-288.

Blatt, S., Wiseman, H., Prince-Gibson, E., Gatt, C. (1990). Object Representations and Change in Clinical Functioning. Psychotherapy: Research, Theory, & Practice, 28, 273-283.

Bornstein, R., & O'neill, R. (1992). Perceptions of parents and

    psychopathology. <u>Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders</u>, <u>180</u>, 475-483.

Bowlby, J. (1988). <u>A Secure Base</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. In I.

    Bretherton, & E. Waters, (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and

    research. <u>Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development</u>,

    <u>50</u>, 3-35.

Chodorow, N. (1989). <u>Feminism and psychoanalytic theory</u>. New Haven: Yale

    University Press.

Coonerty, S. (1986). An exploration of separation-individuation themes in

    borderline personality disorder. <u>Journal of Personality Assessment</u>, <u>50</u>,

    501-511.

Diamond, D., Kaslow, N., Coonerty, S., & Blatt, S.J. (1990). Changes in

    separation-individuation and intersubjectivity in long-term treatment.

    <u>Psychoanalytic Psychology</u>, 1990, <u>7</u>, 363-397.

Farris, M.A. (1988). Differential diagnosis of borderline and narcissistic

    personality disorders. In H.D. Lerner & P.M. Lerner (Eds.), <u>Primitive</u>

    <u>Mental States and the Rorschach</u> (pp.299-337). Madison, CT: International

    Universities Press.

Fiske, S.T., & Taylor, S.E. (1984). <u>Social cognition</u>. New York: Random House.

Gruen, R.J., & Blatt, S.J. (1990). Change in self and object representation

    during long-term dynamically oriented treatment. <u>Psychoanalytic</u>

    <u>Psychology</u>, <u>7</u>, 399-422.

Hatcher, R., & Krohn. A. (1980). Level of object representation and capacity for

    intensive psychotherapy in neurotics and borderlines. In Kwawer, J.,

Lerner, H., Lerner, P., & Sugarman, A. (Eds.), <u>Borderline phenomena and</u> <u>the Rorschach test</u>, pp. 299-320.

Horowitz, M.J. (1988). <u>Psychodynamics and Cognition.</u> Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ipp, H. R., Kolers, N., & Lerner, P. (1986). <u>Scoring manual for the</u> <u>Rorschach developmental object relations scale</u>. Unpublished manuscript.

Jacobson, E. (1964). <u>The Self and the Object World.</u> New York: International Universities Press.

Jordan, 1986. The Meaning of Mutuality. <u>Work in Progress</u>, <u>No. 16</u>. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Kavanaugh, G.G. (1985). Changes in patient' object representations during psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy. <u>Bulletin of the</u> <u>Menninger Clinic</u>, <u>49</u>, 546-564.

Kernberg, O. F. (1966). Structural derivatives of object relationships. <u>International Journal of Psychoanalysis</u>, <u>47</u>, 236-253.

Kernberg, O. (1967). Structural derivatives of object relationships. <u>International Journal of Psychoanalysis</u>, <u>47</u>, 236-253.

Kernberg, O. (1967). <u>Object Relations Theory and Clinical Psychoanalysis</u>. New York: Aronson.

Kernberg, O. F. (1975). <u>Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism</u>. New York: Aronson.

Kernberg, O. F. (1977). Boundaries and structure in love relations. <u>Journal of</u> <u>the American Psychoanalytic Association</u>, <u>25</u>, 81-114.

Kernberg, O. (1988). Object relations theory in clinical practice. <u>Psychoanalytic Quarterly</u>, <u>LVII</u>, 481-504.

Kernberg, O. (1994). Psychoanalytic object relations theories.

In B.E. Moore and B. Fine (Eds.) Psychoanalysis: The Major Concepts.

Kohut, H. (1971). The analysis of the self. New York: International Universities Press.

Krohn, A., & Mayman, M. (1974). Object representations in dreams and projective tests. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 38, 445-466.

Kwawer, J. (1979). Borderline phenomena, interpersonal relations, and the Rorschach test. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 43, 515-524.

Lerner, H.D., & St. Peter, S. (1984). Patterns of Object relations in neurotic, borderline, and schizophrenic patients. Psychiatry, 47, 77-92.

Loewald, H. (1960). On the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis. In Papers on Psychoanalysis (1980). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Loewald, H. (1978). Instinct theory, object relations, and psychic structure formation. In Papers on Psychoanalysis (1980). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mahler, J., Pine, F. & Bergman, A. (1975). The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant. New York: Basic Books.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50, 67-104.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 63-78.

Marziali, E. & Oleniuk, J. (1990). Object representations in descriptions of significant others: A methodological study. Journal of Personality Assessment, 54, 105-115.

Mayman, M. (1967). Object-representations and object-relationships in Rorschach responses. _Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment_, _31_, 17-24.

Mayman, M., & Faris, M. (1969). Early memories as expressions of relationship paradigms. _American Journal of Orthopsychiatry_, _31_, 507-520.

Miller, J. (1984). The development of women's sense of self. _Work in Progress_, _No. 12_. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Mitchell, S. A. 1988. _Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration_. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ritzler, B. A., Wyatt, D., Harder, D., & Kaskey, M. (1980). Psychotic patterns of the concept of the object on the Rorschach. _Journal of Abnormal Psychology_, _89_, 46-55.

Ryan, E.R., & Bell, M.D. (1984). Changes in object relations from psychosis to recovery. _Journal of Abnormal Psychology_. _93_, 209-215.

Sander, L. (1983). Polarity, paradox, and the organizing process in development. In J. Call, E. Galenson, & R. Tyson (Eds.) _Frontiers of Infant Psychiatry_, (pp.315-327). New York: Basic Books.

Sandler, J. & Rosenblatt, B. (1972). The concept of the representational world. _Psychoanalytic Study of the Child_, _17_, 128-145.

Shrout, P. & Fleiss, J. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. _Psychological Bulletin_. _86_, 420-428.

Spear, W. E. (1980). The psychological assessment of structural and thematic object representations in borderline and schizophrenic patients. In J.S, Kwawer, H.D. Lerner, P.M. Lerner, & A. Sugarman (Eds.), _Borderline phenomena and the Rorschach test_, (pp. 321-340). New York: International Universities Press.

Spear, W.E., & Sugarman, A. (1984). Dimensions of internalized object relations in borderline and schizophrenic patients. Psychoanalytic Psychology, 1, 113-129.

Stayner, D. (1992). Revision and reliability of the differentiation-relatedness scale of self and object representations. Unpublished 2nd year thesis. New York: Columbia University.

Stayner, D. (1994). The relationship between clinical functioning and changes in self and object representations in the treatment of severely impaired inpatients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: Columbia University.

Stern, D. (1985). The Interpersonal World of the Infant. New York: Basic Books.

Stricker, G., & Healy, B.D. (1990). Projective assessment of object relations: A review of the empirical literature. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 219-230.

Surrey, J. (1983). The relational self in women: clinical implications. Work in Progress, No. 81. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Urist, J. (1977). The Rorschach test and the assessment of object relations. Journal of Personality Assessment, 41, 3-9.

Westen, D. (1991). Social cognition and object relations. Psychological Bulletin, 109, 429-455.