

Kächele, H., Schachter, J., & Thomä, H. (Eds.). (2008). *From Psychoanalytic Narrative to Empirical Single Case Research. Implications for Psychoanalytic Practice*. New York: The Analytic Press.

1. PSYCHOANALYTICAL THERAPY PROCESS RESEARCH¹

Introduction

The case for psychoanalytic research is not academic, it is imperative. Psychoanalysis world-wide is under stress, and especially traditional American psychoanalysis is confronted by a simmering crisis reflected in decreased status and prestige. Although the roots of these crises are manifold, unresolved disagreements about fundamental theoretical and clinical tenets have resulted in a fragmentation of psychoanalysis that contributes to this decline (Hauser, 2002). For example, starting around 1960, questions were raised about the reliability and validity of the concept of „psychoanalytic process.“ Numerous attempts to achieve a consensually-agreed definition all failed. Vaughan et al. (1997) concluded from empirical studies that analysts can not judge analytic process reliably and question whether it is a viable construct on its own. Process definitions have to be related to the outcome. Freud implied this when he coined his famous inseparable bond thesis (1912e, p. 114).

Dialogues repeatedly have failed to resolve the lack of consensual agreement regarding theoretical or clinical issues. Wallerstein (2002) concludes: „that we are without warrant ... to claim the greater heuristic usefulness or validity of anyone of our general theories over the others, other than by the indoctrination and allegiances built into us by the happenstance of our individual trainings,, our differing personal dispositions and the explanatory predilections then carried over into our consulting rooms“ (p.1251). It is time, Gabbard and Westen (2003) urge that „we attempt to move from *arguing* about the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis to demonstrating and refining it“ (p. 338). The best possibility for resolving these differences and for developing some consensus about the fundamental tenets of psychoanalysis rests with empirical research generating relevant data that can provide a basis for consensual agreement about fundamental psychoanalytic principles (Schachter, 2005b).

For many years the Ulm Psychoanalytic Process Research Study Group has implemented a program to examine the material bases of psychoanalytic therapy. We were and are convinced that only the careful exploration of the patient's interaction with the analyst can illustrate the central aspects of psychoanalytic treatment and enable an empirically driven theory of the process. In a panel discussion about psychoanalytic process

¹ Horst Kächele, Joseph Schachter and Helmut Thomä

research at an annual meeting of the German Psychoanalytic Association on October 11th, 1968, in Ulm about psychoanalytic process research the senior of this group, H. Thomä, articulated the necessity of systematic examination as follows:

1. The psychoanalytic and the relevant psychosomatic research seems, as one can learn from literature, to move mainly in two directions which can simply be described as “process’ and as “outcome” research. Process research mainly concerns the scientific evaluation of psychoanalytic treatments of single cases. However, in examinations that mainly deal with results of therapies, greater numbers of treated and non-treated cases are compared with on another. The two research directions overlap in many points because Freud’s (1937a, p. 256) „beneficient results“ of the therapy are dependent on the course of the psychoanalysis. The differentiation of process and outcome dates back to the Marienbad Congress 1936 and in particular to a lecture by E. Bibring (1937).

2. However, “one of the famous claims of analytical work is that research and treatment coincide” (Freud 1912e, p. 114); in another place Freud (1927a, pp. 256) speaks about a “precious encounter,” an “inseparable bond between healing and research.” But it should not be concluded eo ipso that treatment and research are identical. There is no assurance that the observation of the analyst and his theoretical conclusions drawn from observation are really reliable.

3. Process research is the most original field in psychoanalysis. The psychoanalytic process is determined by the events in the psychoanalytic situation. The specific technical psychoanalytic means is the interpretation. In the interpretation, technique and theory are combined. Process research serves for the completion of the technique and the validation of the theory (Thomä, 1968).

It has been argued that clinical case reports, especially Freud’s case reports, have had a greater influence on psychoanalytic theory and practice than findings generated by formal research. That influence, however, has had negative as well as positive consequences. A number of case-report-based theories and practices have proven to be erroneous, such as the conception of infantile omnipotence, the conception of female sexuality and the belief that homosexuality was intrinsically psychopathological. Clearly, plausibility of the clinical implications of case reports is not a solid basis upon which conclusions can be drawn (Schachter and Kächele, 2007).

Wallerstein and Sampson (1971) concluded that it was necessary to conduct formalized and systematized examinations of therapeutic process in psychoanalysis: “Our central conviction is that the informal case study, in spite of its forceful power of conviction, has

certain realistic and obvious scientific limitations” (p. 47). Several observers attested the lack of reliability of clinical inferences (Schachter and Kächele, 2007). Pulver (1987a) demonstrated that analysts with different theoretical convictions vary widely in the analytic inferences they derive from case material, and Fosshage (1990) and Streeck (1994) could replicate this finding. Spence (1992) observed that “The clinician ... tends to listen to the clinical material with a favorite set of theoretical predispositions” (p. 562). And he concluded that “Interpretations in a clinical setting have an unfortunate tendency to reflect the therapist’s expectation rather than the underlying facts of the matter” (p. 559). Masling and Cohen (1987), citing several clinical examples, even draw the conclusion that all psychotherapies generate clinical evidence that support their theoretical positions and so can be understood as “instances of therapists systematically rewarding and extinguishing various client behaviors” (p. 65).

In addition to these limitations in the usefulness of clinical case reports, there are analysts who cite the extraordinary difficulties in empirical study of psychoanalytic case material and believe that the result of such study is likely to be of little value to psychoanalysis (Green, 2000), or may well be damaging (Perron, 2006). Many analysts criticize non-clinical analytic research, arguing that formal research destroys the uniqueness of individual patients.

Since in scientific terms there are serious limitations to the value of clinical case reports, progress in psychoanalysis should not rest solely on such reports. Clinical findings need to be tested by empirical research. Those critics fail to recognize that some sacrifice of the uniqueness of phenomena and individuals is necessary in order to conduct empirical studies. Krugman (2007) articulates this in the field of economics, explaining why the abstract conception of “economic man” is useful. It is easy, he notes, to make fun of such abstractions:

You might ask, why not represent people the way they really are? The answer is that abstraction, strategic simplification, is the only way we can impose some intellectual order on the complexity of economic life. And the assumption of rational behavior has been a particularly fruitful simplification. (p. 27)

Comparable abstractions are necessary to impose some intellectual order in the complexity of psychoanalytic treatment.

Ever since Glover’s questionnaire study to British analysts (Glover and Brierley, 1940) interpretation was the first subject of manifold efforts to examine aspects of the treatment process in a formalized and clinical manner. Thomä and Houben (1967) picking up the long

debate on interpretations as a central aspect in the analyst's technique registered the patient's reactions in order to estimate the effects and the ensuing reactions on the former. In the course of these examinations the problems concerning the effectiveness of interpretations and the related problem of truth resurfaced again and again.

In order systematically to evaluate the impact of interpretations Thomä and Houben (1967) followed Isaac's (1939) suggestion and designed a report-schema. This demanded that the analyst write an hourly protocol and localize his interpretations theoretically, and, in addition, to state exactly the patient's reactions (for a precise description see Thomä and Kächele, 1994b, pp. 22-23). In the course of the examinations it became obvious that the appropriate validation can be obtained only by empirical process and outcome research. In agreement with many authors the Ulm study group decided to perform a series of process studies within the intensive model design which is adequate to meet – as Bucci (2007) spelled it out - the characterization of psychoanalysis as the science of inner experience, conscious and unconscious, or one might say the science of psychological representations and processes. Psychoanalysis is not a science of behavior, and not neuroscience. But so is all cognitive psychology. In cognitive psychology as in psychoanalysis, one makes inferences from what is observed to inner experience, including conscious and unconscious experience. Scientifically, one doesn't access inner experience introspectively, i.e., through one's own subjectivity (personal communication).

The positive assessment of the formal single case study in which Wallerstein and Sampson (1971) aimed at the reconciliation between clinical impressions and research, was the deciding methodological suggestion developing their research strategy. If one follows their recommendation, the systematic single case study provides the intersection of clinical and scientific work.

Davison and Lazarus (1994) also commented positively about the possible advantage of an intensive case study:

- A case study can raise doubts about a generally accepted theory.
- A case study can be a valuable heuristic for following better controlled examinations
- A case study allows the examination, even if not really controlled, of a seldom but important phenomenon
- A case study provides the possibility for new principles and ideas to be tested in a new way.
- A case study can in certain circumstances allow enough experimental control of phenomena to provide scientifically acceptable information

- A case study can supply meat for a theoretical skeleton.

In exploring these arguments, the case study methodology was rediscovered also in academic psychology (Bromley, 1986). Furthermore new methodological approaches and the growing appreciation of qualitative research (Frommer and Rennie, 2001) have produced in the meantime a lasting impact on social science in general and on the field of treatment research in particular (Hill and Lambert, 2004, p. 102). Today there is more emphasis on what kind of questions must be examined by which methodological approach in order to find interesting answers that enrich the field (Kächele, 1986). The purpose of these approaches is both “to do justice to the subjective factor in social sciences and to focus research efforts on the individual fate” (Leuzinger-Bohleber, 1995, p. 446).

Research in Contemporary Psychoanalysis

The psychoanalytic culture differentiates between »research in psychoanalysis« vs. »research on psychoanalysis«. Scientific investigations in psychoanalysis originate in the therapeutic situation. In a rather optimistic stance it is assumed that the clinicians apply the psychoanalytic method in a critical vein and thus fulfill the requirement of scientific thinking.

The English language allows a play of WORDS: Wallerstein (2001) distinguishes between <search> and <research>. Analysts are constantly <searching>, but in order to come from search to research a certain degree of formalisation and systematic categorization has to be applied. In the prevailing vignette-culture most psychoanalytic authors limit themselves to the description of transference and countertransference processes thus leading to the rather extreme stance of subjectivism.

The prevailing representation of treatment reports is characterized by reference to essential psychoanalytic concepts. Research-minded analysts are in opposition to clinicians who prefer to remain <on-line>, (an expression introduced by Moser (1991)) that characterizes an analyst's stance in the evenly hovering attention in the clinical situation; it is in contrast to the objectifying <off-line>- position of a clinician outside the consulting room or of a researcher. Both figures of speech grasp the pendulum from subjective experience to objectifying reflection within and outside the session. Already when writing session notes the analyst leaves the <on-line> position; and when case reports are published another basis of collegial and interdisciplinary discussions is reached.

Research in psychoanalysis thus refers to the „mother ground“ (Schlesinger, 1974) of the therapeutic situation and always includes the analyst, his thinking and his actions, which is not only reflected by himself, but also by others, from the outside. Therefore the contrasting of »research in psychoanalysis« and »research on psychoanalysis« separates what

belongs together (Perron, 2003). Both perspectives refer to intraclinical research (in contrast to extra- or non-clinical research!). In order to raise clinical reports to the rank of single case studies detailed and reliable criteria have to be made explicit.

Non-clinical empirical psychoanalytic research has two large realms, independent from each other. The application on all topics of culture knows no boundaries; therefore the interdisciplinary exchange with all humanities covers a wide field, we would be unable to cover it here (see section VI of a recent „Textbook of Psychoanalysis“ (Person et al., 2005)). However we will mention some points with regard to extraclinical, experimental research about psychoanalytic topics.

Although the experimental approach is the most appropriate method for examining hypotheses (Campbell, 1967), manipulation of the examined object is not possible in the clinical situation. Non-clinical studies examining the diverse aspects of basic psychoanalytic theory though often largely unknown to clinicians have attracted many experimental psychologists (Shulman, 1991). Quite extensive compilations and secondary analyses by well meaning critics have been compiled (Hilgard, 1952; Fisher and Greenberg, 1977, 1996; Kline, 1981; Kächele et al., 1991).

There is no reason to view the clinical situation as a deficient version of the experiment; a formerly popular way of saying was that the psychoanalytical treatment situation is a quasi-experimental event. Already Shakow (1960, p. 88) criticised this view and preferred to speak about the psychoanalytical interview as a semi-naturalistic approach. The proper methods of examination are therefore not experimental methods, but methods of the systematic, social science based analyses of material as Allport (1942) already had documented. The single case study can be handled with exactness and procedures that are suitable to the examined materials. Edelson especially emphasized in his book: “Psychoanalysis — a theory in crisis,” the possibilities of the single case research to surpass the heuristic discovery orientated perspective (1988, p. 231ff). Generally speaking it is remarkable how many papers are published about problems of doing research and how few substantial reports about systematic studies performed are available.

Conceptual Research

Recently a new genre has been created for which Dreher (2000, 2005) has coined the expression “conceptual research”. It is fair to say that conceptual clarifications have constituted not a small bulk of analysts’ efforts to come to grip with the ongoing change of terms and their referents (f.e. Compton, 1972; Pine, 2006). A recent overview concluded that “if IJP {International Journal of Psychoanalysis} accurately reflects the international

viewpoint, conceptual research is a central issue in current psychoanalytic research” (Leuzinger-Bohleber and Fischmann, 2006, p. 1361).

Concepts characterize the cosmos of psychoanalytic theory and its change. Therefore the range of concepts and their relationship to clinical experience, their operationalization in the widest sense of the word, has been in the center of the psychoanalytic profession for a century. Written definitions determined what psychoanalysis was and is. One easily can consult using a conceptual dictionary; for example the highly appreciated „Vocabulary of Psychoanalysis“ by the French analysts Laplanche and Pontalis (1967), the APsaA sponsored „Glossary of Psychoanalytic Terms and Concepts“ (Burnes et al., 1968), Klumpner’s (1992) „Guide to the Language of Psychoanalysis“ or „The Dictionary of Kleinian Thought (Hinshelwood, 1989). However what psychoanalysts make out of these definitions in their practical works, remains opaque. In our view pure conceptual research without empirical underpinnings remains sterile and may even hinder progress.

The Contemporary Version of Freud’s Inseparable Bond Thesis

The scientific study of single cases, not the clinical reports, constitutes in our view the *Contemporary Version of Freud’s Inseparable Bond Thesis*. In this sense Freud’s beneficial effect, the therapeutic success, represents a pragmatic criterion of truth. It requires the clinician to spell out his hypotheses on structure and dynamics and to look for *independent* criteria, to refute or confirm these.

Clinical inferences from the material of a case history may be valuable sources of hypothesis development as Blatt (2004, p. 4) beautifully argued recently by pointing out the importance of his two initial psychoanalytic cases for his later thinking about anaclitic and introjective types of depression, but are not of scientific value for hypothesis testing, largely because clinical inferences are diverse and notoriously unreliable. Clinical material from a case history is almost invariably viewed very differently by different analysts. A prominent scientist notes that it is ironic “that psychoanalytic authors attempt to employ clinical data for just about every purpose but the one for which they are most suitable – an evaluation and understanding of therapeutic change” (Eagle, 1984, p. 163). However for the assessment to be scientific it must be based on reliable measurements.

A first striking example was provided by Luborsky who, working together with Cattell, introduced P-Factor-Analysis for intraindividual repetitive measurements in understanding psychotherapeutic change (1953; see also his re-evaluation in 1995). Twenty years later the Penn Study Group (Graff and Luborsky, 1977) reported on the study of four analytic treatments. Each treating analyst filled out a checklist assessing transference (defined as

material overtly or covertly related to the analyst) and resistance (the patient's associations are general, defensive or oppositional). Results indicated that two patients with favorable therapeutic outcomes showed rising transference (as defined here) and diminishing resistance over the course of the treatment. The two patients with poorer therapeutic outcomes showed more parallel curves for transference and resistance; the patient with the poorest outcome showed a high resistance curve.

The work of the research group of Joseph Weiss and Harold Sampson from the Mount Zion Psychotherapy Research Group became well known. Their first study examined two competing theories concerning defense analysis in the case of Mrs C (Sampson et al. 1972). In the following years they applied their newly developed concept of the Control-Mastery Theory to the same case (Weiss and Sampson, 1986) as well as to shorter therapies (Silberschatz et al., 1989). The former examination utilized the completely tape-recorded psychoanalytic treatment created by Hartvig Dahl (New York). A journalist, J. Malcolm (1980), was successful in seducing the analyst-author, to claim the authorship for this first “specimen hour” that Dahl was to published as “Anonymous” (1988).

Meanwhile a good number of psychoanalytic scientists who cooperated with Dahl could use this material of his “specimen case” (Bucci, 1988, 1997; Horowitz, 1977; Spence et al., 1993, 1994; Jones and Windholz, 1990). The most recent use of the collected materials was presented by Ablon and Jones (2005) identifying one notion of ‘psychoanalytic process’ in terms of Jones’ Q-sort methodology (p. 554-558): alas, their definition was a function of selecting a homogeneous group of traditional analyst raters. One might wonder what a psychoanalytic cross-cultural comparison study on the notion of an „ideal psychoanalytic process“ would look like. In any case process research focusing on individual cases are timely as reported by Joseph et al. (2004), Waldron et al. (2004a, b), Lingiardi et al. (2006), Porcerelli et al. (2007) and Bucci and Maskit (2007).

Overviews on the methodology of single case studies have been presented by Kazdin (1982, 2003), Hilliard (1993), Fonagy and Moran (1993). The latter summarized the topic succinctly:

Individual case studies attempt to establish the relationship between intervention and other variables through repeated systematic observation and measurementThe observation of variability across time within a single case combines a clinical interest to respond appropriately to changes within the patient, and a research interest to find support for a causal relationship between intervention and changes in variables of theoretical interest. The attention to repeated observations, more than any other single

factor, permits knowledge to be drawn from the individual case and has the power to eliminate plausible alternative explanations. (Fonagy and Moran, 1993, p. 65)

Comparison of Single Case and Group Studies²

Inappropriate use of statistical methods with single cases led to the view that single case studies were not applicable for clinical research:

In the clinical field the opinion persisted for a long time that comparisons between groups of patients are the sine qua non of the statistical valid scientific clinical research and the single case study is attributed at best to the status of intuition and clinical insight which is not accessible for statistical tests and attempts for validations ... (This opinion) has unfortunately immortalized the by nature superficial methodology as the only scientific prototype in clinical research. (Bellak and Chassan, 1964, p. 23)

Practical reasons led to a rediscovery of the single case methodology, which utilized new theoretical and statistical evaluations (Bortz and Döring, 1995). The single case study, intensively examines individual patients in the psychoanalytical situation:

The long-term commitment for therapy between patient and therapist and the regularity of the scheduled psychotherapeutic sessions, whether they be on a weekly, semi-weekly, or daily basis, provide an ideal opportunity for the collection of relatively large quantities of data for the testing of hypotheses within one or another framework of psychoanalytic theory. (Chassan, 1979, p. 258)

In theoretical terms the single case study can be described as an “intensive model” in comparison to use of large samples which constitute an “extensive model” (Chassan, 1979). A prerequisite for the meaningful examination of the single case is that the examined feature varies over time, within the patient. The variable is observed under various conditions. Marginal conditions such as age, sex, personality and previous experience of the patient remain relatively constant and are therefore better controlled than in a group sample. On the other hand, through intensive scrutiny of the case the marginal conditions are well known to the investigator, who can choose to include them in the examination. Chassan emphasizes that study of the single case can be arranged dynamically; the design of the study can be changed, side effects can be considered and additional questions introduced which in large samples requires considerable expenditure.

When studying group samples, even when a significant result is obtained, nothing can be said about the contribution of the individual patient and nothing about the variation in the examined variable of the individual patients. This limits the implications of any finding for

² We are grateful to Dr. Pokorny for help with this part

enhancing treatment. As claims about whole populations are always based on limited samples, generalization of findings from group studies are limited. Furthermore the information from group studies does not reveal individual differences, which is not the case with the single case study. Group studies, more than individual case studies, are subject to the complication of outliers, individuals whose data points fall far outside the distribution of members of the group. Judgment about how to deal with outliers is arbitrary and can profoundly influence the results for the group.

Chassan (1979) radically argues that if one specifies the variable in the single case study, the results can be generalized to a population with the same variable. The possibility to generalize is better in the single case because the variables are better known. The representativeness of findings derived from a sample depends on the randomness of selection of the examined groups, which in clinical research often is not assessed. Further, often the selection criteria for the sample are included in the examination, so that no population remains for reference. By case comparison and case contrasting the findings from an individual case can be extended to a population; however one has to work step by step in order to avoid over-generalization.

Our purpose is to warrant the utility of empirical single case research, not to assert that studies of population samples are of no value. Although the literature has had proponents of individual studies and proponents of group studies, there is no reason to consider these two approaches to be in conflict. They are complementary. Individual researchers may have a predilection for one or the other, but to assert that one is *better in general* than the other is unnecessary and seems unfounded. There is a clear need for a botanical phase in furthering the field; therefore the call “back to single case research“ by a prominent scholar in the field, Klaus Grawe (1988) was timely. The ultimate test is the demonstration by each approach of the production of findings that enhance psychoanalytic theory and practice. Perhaps one approach may be more effective with certain classes of variables and the other approach more productive with other classes of variables. To paraphrase Chairman Mao’s aphorism, let both approaches bloom. Unlike by Mao, this is a honestly intended proposal.

The centre of several methodological discussions about the problems of single case studies concerns the question of whether it is possible to draw valid conclusions from “one case” or from “N=1” findings for the whole population. One has to note that the aims of a mathematically statistical analysis are considerably more modest and that the term “case” takes on quite a different meaning in the clinical and statistical context. In a psychotherapeutic single case study one often works with a sample of several sessions that

are to be viewed as an observation of *statistical cases*. Through the sequence of the sessions the statistical samples carry the “untoward” dependence of the observed cases. The variable “time”, made operational, for example, by the date or the session number, offers at the same time the chance to control statistically this dependence (Grünzig, 1988). The “population” to which one refers by the help of statistical techniques, is built through the entire amount of all sessions with the examined person (of the *clinical case*), during the therapy or the therapy phase. The significance level of the applied statistical tests informs us of the safety by which the conclusions can be drawn. The total sample is thereby represented through the examined object; that is through the examined patient-therapist-couple.

Even in the case in which all sessions of the therapy are examined, and hence the sample coincides with the “population”, the view of the reached significance level gains a sound meaning, although another from the traditional ones. It connotes rather “relevance” than “significance” of a finding. For a human observer it is generally difficult to differentiate between the lawful and the random and particularly to differentiate between the “true” patterns in the statistical data, and random ones. Such patterns can represent changes in the time or differences between various session settings or circumstances. The human mind is trained to find sense even within the complex – or chaotic – structures. Who did not once recognized humans, animals or plants observing the sky with white clouds? Who can be sure that observed “amazing” patterns in data are really meaningful? Fortunately, statistical procedures can give valuable help in this differentiation. Their technical construction is namely based on the recognizing the non-randomness in the observed structures. In the case “sample = population”, the formally significant result alerts the researcher: This result seems to be *interesting*, it likely did not arise randomly and may be *relevant* to the investigated psychoanalytical process.

Part of the statistical results of a single case study presets the question of whether this is transferable to other clinical cases. This principally possible and desirable generalization is however no longer of mathematical statistical nature. The rumour that Freud’s recordings of his own dreams grew to be the basis of psychoanalysis became a historical example in the well regarded textbook of research methods for social scientists by Bortz and Döring (1995, p. 299).

The scope of the single case study can be characterized as follows:

In a single case study a unit of examination is precisely investigated and described in which observational methods frequently play an important role. The qualitative single case observation helps in answering questions concerning individual processes and

courses. Therefore it is very important in the clinical area to exactly observe the development of a patient during psychotherapy with the purpose of drawing conclusions about the success of the intervention. (Bortz and Döring, 1995, p. 298)

The case-specific and non-transferable part of the results possesses a complementary meaning. The group-orientated research namely focuses on the property that is common to most of the individuals of the examined population. The, for one human unique, phenomena constituting his individuality thereby fall, for example, on a common ground which is termed “the non-explained variance of error.” To investigate this dimension of the unique and the individual and to appreciate this is a task for which the single case study is especially qualified. (Messer and McCann, 2005; Messer 2007)

The Pro and Contra of Tape Recordings

Namely it is an advantage for the clinical discussion if an analyst later on gives detailed information about how he feels and thinks during a session and records this in a written protocol; this also allows other colleagues to develop the possibility of alternative views. However, the systematic weakness of such reports was repeatedly noticed. The most recent statement about this issue puts that matter succinctly:

Disagreements about the meaning of case material are commonplace in clinical work and constitute important grounds for criticism regarding the scientific status of psychoanalytic methods for acquiring knowledge. A particular problem is that clinical observers may vary a great deal in the concepts they use in their descriptive language. Observers of the same case material may not arrive at the same conclusions; indeed, they may not even consider the same dimensions. This issue of handling differences in inference or judgment among clinical experts is particularly important since there are alternative theoretical models in psychoanalysis. (Ablon and Jones 2005, p.543)

The weaknesses in studies that are supported by non-formalized treatment protocols are by now sufficiently known. Spence (1986) shows that analytical narratives are often described on the basis of covert psychodynamic assumptions. In addition it is very often impossible to extract the contribution of the analyst; generally only a few interpretations are communicated selectively. It is not possible to find out what has been omitted or reproduced differently. For scientific examinations it is not sufficient to rely on the memory of the analyst only — a viewpoint which should generate immediate evidence in analysts. Therefore, through the introduction of the tape recording in the psychoanalytical situation a new research paradigm was created. Providing a personal view Merton Gill makes a strong

plea that “process research should be done with some kind of recording of the original exchange. I believe that transcripts of audio recordings will suffice” (Gill, 1994, p. 152)

This device is no longer controversial in the scientific community of research-orientated psychoanalysts (Thomä and Kächele, 2004b, p. 26ff). Certainly one must agree with Colby and Stoller (1988, p. 42) that a transcript is “not a report about what really happened, but only a report of what has been recorded”. Our answer to this warning limitation could only be to find out which picture of the “true” psychoanalytical progress can be reconstructed on the basis of transcripts. The main progress which this tool provides is that it allows independent observers — may they be analysts or scientists of other disciplines — to make independent findings about what happens in the treatment room. From the outset it has been recognized that of the two participants “the therapist is more chronically disturbed by the procedure. Unlike the patient he does not think of the situation as one in which exposure of himself is an intrinsic and necessary evil” (Knapp et al., 1966, p. 404).

The advantage however is that a multitude of social scientific methods for the study of the psychoanalytical process can be applied. It is in this vein that Fonagy (2002b) recommends that

imaginative studies making use of the advances in recording and coding techniques and particularly phonetic and linguistic speech analysis could undoubtedly advance our understanding of the psychoanalytic process (Fónagy and Fonagy 1995). To ban such procedures outright is to tie our hands behind our back in competing with other psychotherapeutic procedures. To me the issue of recording depends strongly on the research question asked. (p. 23)

We certainly agree that one has to keep the perspective that it is one of many windows on the process; again the matter will be which kind of findings materialize from that particular window.

Testing of Process Models

Beyond the basic aim of the Ulm group’s research work to generate a self-sufficient access to the in-vivo material of psychoanalytical treatments, the task was to examine aspects of the clinical psychoanalytical theory. In our view this entails finding out how analysts transform their thinking into the therapeutic situation. We must be able to provide a systematic description of what analysts say and feel and which role the patients play in this dialog. For this the tape-recordings provide a sufficiently good enough basis; more

extravagant recording possibilities are certainly viable, but for such questions not compellingly necessary³.

First of all one has to discuss many theoretical and methodological questions in view of the extra- or intraclinical testing of clinical hypotheses (Chapter 2 in this volume). In spite of many difficulties we have become convinced that many characteristic concepts of clinical psychoanalysis relate to areas that manifest themselves in the verbal mode. Although, unconscious processes can be very well examined in experimental arrangements and have been examined diversely (Shevrin, 2000, 2005), the Ulm group examined natural non-experimental material of psychoanalytical sessions. We basically make the assumption that in the course of treatments the data are produced that support or refute clinical assumptions (Hanly, 1992). Therefore we decided to examine properly recorded psychoanalytical treatments.

Process models of a psychoanalytic treatment are not theoretical, abstract matters; they are factually more or less part of the day by day work of the psychoanalyst. These processual models are handed on from one generation of analysts to the next; they entail, often only in metaphoric expressions, unexpressed theories. Sandler (1983, p. 43) rightfully demands that the private dimension of these concepts should be explored.

In the first volume of the Ulm textbook Thomä and Kächele (1994a) illustrated a few common models of process (Chapter 9.3); they sketched our their model of process which is based on the “focus concept.” By a focus they mean the centrally created interaction topic of therapeutic work that results from the material of the patient and the understanding of the analyst. Since single focus points hypothetically remain connected through a central conflict with one another, this process model can be applied for shorter as well as for longer treatment. Beyond this it is compatible with various theoretical conceptions. They concluded that: “We conceptualize, therefore, psychoanalytic therapy as a continued, timely, not limited focal therapy with changing focus” (1994a, p. 347).

This concept of Ulm’s model of process concerning the course of psychoanalytic treatment was the result of assimilating the findings of the developing field of systematic therapy research (Luborsky and Spence 1971, 1978). More then ever we are convinced that psychoanalytic process research must ignore the subjective position in which all theoretical approaches are regarded as equal in therapeutic potency. We think that this conclusion of Pulver (1987c, p. 289) is premature. Clinical psychoanalysis must be freed from a *narrative*

³ Video recordings as they are extensively used by Krause (1988; 1989) for face-to-face therapy are not yet convincing for couch analyses. The reason lies in the minimal activity in the face of the resting patient (oral rcommunication F Pfäfflin).

self-misunderstanding – to paraphrase Habermas’ verdict regarding Freud’s scientistic self-misunderstanding (Habermas, 1971a; see chapter two) – and become a science that works on therapeutic grounds with empirical methods (Kächele, 1990).

This goal requires descriptive examinations of the therapeutic interaction as well as examinations of the analyst’s (Meyer, 1988) and the patient’s inner thoughts and feelings, including specifically the process of internalizing the therapeutic experience as it is recorded in the Intersession-Questionnaire (Orlinsky and Geller 1993; Arnold et al. 2004). Fundamental for this are studies of how unconscious fantasies are expressed both verbally and non-verbally (Krause and Lütolf, 1988; Krause et al. 1992). We see the necessity of thorough and reliable description as a basis of theoretical generalization and as a precondition of etiological reconstruction.

Examining the interactive foundation of the course of treatment involves not only our reacting differently to the same material, but also includes analysts being personally touched by the patient’s material. Expressed in clinical terms, we often find that the countertransference precedes the transference. In the language of research, one would say that the cognitive-affective conception of the analyst provides the semantic and pragmatic domain which the patient can use. The actual degree of an analyst’s involvement can first be identified through tape recordings (Bouchard et al., 1995). If an analyst hands over a transcript of a session to a colleague, it is amazing how many of the analyst’s own problems became evident because the transcript exposes easily how much had evaded his/her self-evaluation. Schachter & Kächele (2007) concur with Renik’s (1998, 2004) assertion that many elements of the analyst’s subjectivity are unconscious at the moment of interaction and therefore can only be understood retrospectively. Further, this retrospective understanding becomes accessible only through the analyst’s limited and restricted self-analysis or through consultation. (Renik, 1998, 2004). For the analyst there is a significant discrepancy between his/her own professional ideal and his/her daily, routine performance. Kubie (1958) was the first to point out this; more recently Fonagy (2005) spoke in the same vein.

Dahl et al. (1978) demonstrated that analysts were selective in their perceptions of patient material, and that attempts at free floating attention provide only limited protection from the effect of the analyst’s expectation structures. Moreover, it can even promote unconscious effects concerning role expectations (Sandler, 1976). These various references on the problems of the development of the analyst’s judgment and the creation of evidence substantiate the bi-personal foundation of the psychoanalytic situation in which valid

descriptions versus fantasized descriptions are difficult to distinguish; they must be understood as constructions in a social realm (Gergen, 1985; Gill, 1994).

Inner psychic conflicts are expressed at least in part in the patient-analyst interaction, and they are, therefore, a function of the dyadic process. Its form is unique for every therapeutic dyad; each psychoanalytic treatment constitutes a singular history. However, many process models do not do justice to this historic uniqueness. Tolstoy (1868) characterized this uniqueness in literary style:

They could not know the disease Natasha was suffering from, as no disease suffered by a live man can be known, for every living person has his own peculiarities and always has his own peculiar, personal, novel, complicated disease, unknown to medicine ... This simple thought could not occur to the doctors ... because the business of their lives was to cure, and they received money for it and spent the best years of their lives on that business. But, above all, that thought was kept out of their minds by the fact that they saw they were really useful, as in fact they were to the whole Rostov family. ... The doctors were of use to Natasha because they kissed and rubbed her bump [like a child's soreness], assuring her that it would soon pass if only the coachman went to the chemists in the Arbaty and got a powder and some pills in a pretty box for a ruble and seventy kopecs, and if she took those powders in boiled water at intervals of precisely two hours, neither more nor less (1996, pp. 582,583).

Luyten et al. (2006) disagree about the importance of uniqueness, maintaining that „psychoanalysis is not (or at least is not only) a science of purely individual, idiosyncratic thought, affect and behavior, but rather studies regularities that can be observed across human beings ... Although every patient has his or her own „idiosyncratic narrative“, any clinician will recognize regularities or „master narratives“ in the particular story and dynamics of a patient. To deny this, and to act as if we approach each new patient as a tabula rasa, would be naive“ (p. 581).

They conceive that these regularities or „master narratives“ arise intrinsically and independently from the patient's mind, not shaped by or influenced by the analyst, an immaculate creation. They fail to consider how the analyst's expectations of these „master narratives“ may influence their presentation in the clinical context. This influence may explain why analysts are so rarely surprised by the shape and content of these „master narratives“. As we quoted earlier, Masling and Cohen conclude that all psychotherapies generate clinical evidence that support their theoretical position by „systematically“ rewarding and extinguishing various client behaviors (p. 65). This is confirmed by Luyten et

al. , however, citing the Ablon and Jones (2005) Psychotherapy Process Q-Set study which „revealed unique treatment processes in each [of two] case (p. 592).

We acknowledge that diagnostic characteristics, one form of regularity across individuals, are associated with treatment responses (Blatt, 1992; Blatt and Sharar, 2004). However, we are a long way from being able to parcel out the variance in treatment behavior between individual and group characteristics of the patient. It seems premature to dismiss the importance of the patient's uniqueness as „naive“.

The range of conceptualizations can be illustrated by Freud's model of the treatment process. His comparison with the chess game (Freud, 1913c, p. 123), clarifies that rules of a game gives rise to an infinite variety of moves which influence the potential paths of the interactions which exist independently of each dyad's special circumstances. Chess is, after all, played all over the world by the same rules. Furthermore, there are strategies and tactics that can be useful in different phases of the game, such as the opening or end phase. This varies according to the individual technique of each player and influences the dyadic interactions in which the players gauge the expected strengths and weaknesses of each other. Freud wanted the rules of treatment to be the same for all patients so that psychoanalytic treatment would be regarded as a scientific enterprise (Schachter and Kächele, 2007). But chess is an inappropriate metaphor for psychoanalytic treatment. The goal of chess is defined, and is simple and unitary; the goals of psychoanalytic treatment are not defined, should be mutually developed by patient and analyst, and are complex and multiple. Given the uniqueness of each analytic dyad it is to be expected that optimal methods – rules – would be unique. In addition, although it is controversial, some psychoanalytic groups are essaying modifications in the fundamental rules of the game (Schachter and Kächele, 2007).

In psychoanalysis is there something like a fixed set of rules independent from the unique dyad? In chess it is easy to determine which moves conform to the rules and which break the rules; in psychoanalysis such differentiations are difficult (Thomä and Kächele, 1994a, p. 215). Many psychoanalysts still believe that the rules in the psychoanalytic situation can be determined regardless of the interactions in a particular dyad. Freud's conception of psychoanalytic treatment describes how the transference neurosis develops independently of the analyst's behavior:

He introduces a process of the disintegration of the existing repression; he can supervise, promote, remove obstacles and certainly also ruin much about it. In all, however, the process, once introduced, goes along its own way and neither lets itself be told the direction nor the sequence of the points it affects. (1913c, p. 130)

We find much ambiguity in Freud's assertion. Freud hoped to formulate technical rules that were as close as possible to an experimental ideal. Many analysts tried to maintain Freud's ideal, but that has not been possible (Swaan, 1980). It was not ever and is not possible for the analyst to be a non-human, neutral entity who has no impact on the patient-analyst interactions, although, for a long time this was the central utopian fantasy of psychoanalysts. We don't find useful the assumption that every analytic treatment runs in linear (developmental) phases from early to late as some process model imply. Instead of simple linearity, we conceive of a sequence of foci resulting from a bargaining process between the needs and wishes of the patients and the analyst's choice of interventions: this real issue is "what works at what time with what analyst" (Schachter, 2005a).

Our Methodological Approach

The goal of the studies presented in this volume was to establish ways to systematically describe long-term psychoanalytic processes in various dimensions and to use the descriptive data obtained to examine process hypotheses. This entails the generation of general process hypotheses as well as the specification of single case process assumptions. It should go beyond general clinical ideas as to how a psychoanalytic process should unfold and specify for each patient what kind of material has to be worked on in order to achieve change in various dimensions of specified theoretical relevance in each particular case — be it structural properties or symptomatic (verbal) behavior.

Our approach did not include the recording of external measures in order to limit the intrusions on the clinical process (Kächele, 1988).

Our methodological conception – inspired by Sargent's (1961) conception - consists of a four level-approach; on each level different material involving different levels of conceptualization are worked on:

- A-level: clinical case study
- B-level: systematic clinical descriptions
- C-level guided clinical judgment procedures
- D-level: computer-assisted text analysis

This multi-level approach reflects our understanding that the tension between clinical meaningfulness and objectification cannot be creatively solved by using one approach only. A fairly similar approach has recently been detailed by Freedman et al. (2003) mapping "two pathways toward knowing psychoanalytic process". which concatenates essentially clinical procedures with methods generating external validity.

For the A-level we have provided typical examples on the patient Amalia X in the second volume of our textbook (Thomä and Kächele, 1994b).

For the B-level we have exemplified our understanding of what constitutes a systematic clinical description in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5.1 the treating analyst contributes to this level by adding his advice on how to advance “comparative psychoanalysis” illustrating this by excerpts from two significant sessions.

The C-level:

Clinical descriptions performed by two or more observers maintain the nature of the data on a qualitative level. In psychoanalysis the step from transforming the rich qualitative though unsystematic knowledge into quantitative assertions has barely begun. The tool to perform this transformation consists in a simple representation of a dimensional aspect of the concept under study on a scale. A scale is an elaborate version of the primordial “yes” or “no” distinction that marks the beginning of any measurement operation (Knapp et al., 1975). Luborsky (1984) aptly calls these operations “guided clinical judgment procedures,” which catch the process of narrowing down the clinicians’ capacity of recording complex data and thereby enabling reliability of observations. On this level of our research approach various studies were performed.

The D-level Text Analysis

The fourth level in our research model introduces the methodology of computer-based text analysis as tool. The use of the computer has developed from content analysis to text analysis, a process which has been described in detail elsewhere (Kächele and Mergenthaler, 1983, 1984; Mergenthaler and Kächele, 1988, 1993). Other linguistic methods also are placed on this level.

Conclusion

Psychoanalytical therapy research is still a stepchild of our profession; the number of those who seriously occupy themselves with this is not great. It is bound to scientific institutions since only there is the infrastructure that makes its implementation possible. Today its emphasis lies in the comprehensive comparative evaluation of various forms of psychoanalytical therapy as well as in the microprocess analysis of psychoanalytical action. A stringent empirical demarcation of “proper psychoanalysis” from other psychoanalytical treatments has not been demonstrated. Besides the existing variance within what is internationally designated as psychoanalysis, there exists great variability of the person-bound psychoanalytical technique which are implemented in bi-personal interaction structures (Czogalik and Russell, 1995; Ablon and Jones, 2005, 564ff). The number of

potential interaction structures is huge; the various combinations of patients and analysts provide for a psychoanalytic variability which only artificially can be divided into neat categories (Fonagy, 2002a). It may be more helpful to identify essential dimensions of psychoanalytical therapeutic action and to find out, at each time for and with the patient, what mixture and which doses are good for him.

The individual psychoanalyst is called upon to determine through careful, methodological and sophisticated case studies whether his intervention can be portrayed as well-founded. Critical clinicians are then on their way to provide their contribution to making psychoanalytic therapy objective. Clinically based process-outcome research of single cases does not destroy the science, as Freud feared, - on the contrary.

- Ablon, J. S., & Jones, E. E. (2005). On analytic process. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 53, 541-568.
- Allport, G. W. (1942). The use of personal documents in psychological science. *New York Social Science Research Council Bulletin*, 49.
- Arnold, E. G., Farber, B. A., & Geller, J. D. (2004). Termination, posttermination, and internalization of therapy and the therapist: Internal representation and psychotherapy outcome. In D. P. Charman (Eds.), *Core processes in brief psychodynamic psychotherapy*. Mahwah/NJ: Erlbaum. pp 289-308
- Bellak, L., & Chassan, J. B. (1964). An approach to the evaluation of drug effects during psychotherapy. *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.*, 139, 20-30.
- Bibring, E. (1937). Versuch einer allgemeinen Theorie der Heilung (Approaching a general theory of healing). *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 23, 18-42.
- Blatt, D. S., & Auerbach, J. S. (2003). Psychodynamic measures of change. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 23, 268-307.
- Blatt, S. J. (2004). *Experiences of depression. Theoretical, clinical and research perspectives*. Washington, D C: American Psychological Association.
- Bortz, J., & Döring, N. (1995). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation für Sozialwissenschaftler (Methods of research and evaluation for social scientists)*: 2. Ed. Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer.
- Bouchard, M. A., Normandin, L., & Seguin, M. H. (1995). Countertransference as instrument and obstacle: a comprehensive and descriptive framework. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 64, 717-745.
- Bromley, D. B. (1986). *The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines*. New York: Wiley.
- Bucci, W. (1988). Converging evidence for emotional structures: Theory and method. In H. Dahl, H. Kächele, & H. Thomä (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic process research strategies*. Berlin Heidelberg New York Tokyo: Springer. pp 29-49
- Bucci, W. (1997). Pattern of discourse in good and troubled hours. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 45, 155-188.
- Bucci, W., & Freedman, N. (Eds.). (2007). *From impression to inquiry: A tribute to the work of Robert Wallerstein*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association.
- Burnes, E., Moore, M. D., & Fine, B. D. (1968). *A glossary of psychoanalytic terms and concepts*. Washington: (APsA) Library of Congress.
- Campbell, D. T. (1967). From description to experimentation: interpreting trends as quasi-experiments. In C. W. Harris (Eds.), *Problems in measuring change*. Madison, Milwaukee

- and London: Univ Wisconsin Press. pp 212-242
- Chassan, J. B. (1979). *Research design in clinical psychology and psychiatry*: 2. Ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Colby, K. M., & Stoller, R. J. (1988). *Cognitive science and psychoanalysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Compton, A. (1972). The study of the psychoanalytic theory of anxiety. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 20, 3 - 44, 341 - 394.
- Compton, A. (1990). Psychoanalytic process. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 59, 585-598.
- Czogalik, D., & Russell, R. L. (1995). Interactional structures of therapist and client participation in adult psychotherapy: P-technique and chronography. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 28-36.
- Dahl, H., Rubinstein, B., & Teller, V. (1978). A study of psychoanalytical clinical inference as interpretive competence and performance. Proposal to the Fund for Psychoanalytic Research. *unpublished manuscript*.
- Davison, G. C., & Lazarus, A. A. (1994). Clinical innovation and evaluation. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 1, 157-167.
- Dreher, A. U. (2000). *Foundations for conceptual research in psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Dreher, A. U. (2005). Conceptual research. In E. S. Person, A. M. Cooper, & G. O. Gabbard (Eds.), *Textbook of Psychoanalysis*. Washington, DC - London: American Psychiatric Press. pp 361-372
- Eagle, M. (1984). *Recent developments in psychoanalysis. A critical evaluation*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Edelson, M. (1988). *Psychoanalysis. A theory in crisis*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Edwards, A. L., & Cronbach, L. J. (1952). Experimental design for research in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 8, 51-59.
- Fisher, C., & Greenberg, R. P. (1977). *The scientific credibility of Freud's theories and therapies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fónagy, I., & Fonagy, P. (1995). Communications with pretend actions in language, literature and psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 18, 363-418.
- Fonagy, P. (2002b). Epistemological and methodological background: Reflections on psychoanalytic research problems - an Anglo-Saxon view. In P. Fonagy (Eds.), *An open door review of outcome studies in psychoanalysis*. London: International Psychoanalytic Association. pp 10-29
- Fonagy, P. (2005). In praise of simplicity: Commentary on Ablon and Jones. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 53, 579-589.
- Fonagy, P., & Moran, G. (1993). Selecting single case research designs for clinicians. In N. Miller, L. Luborsky, J. Barber, & J. Docherty (Eds.), *Handbook of psychodynamic treatment research*. New York: Basic Books. pp 62-95
- Fosshage, J. L. (1990). Clinical protocol: How theory shapes technique: Perspectives on a self-psychological clinical presentation. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10, 461-477.
- Freud, S. (1913c). *On beginning the treatment (Further recommendations on the technique of psychoanalysis)*. In Standard Edition XII: 123-144:
- Frommer, J., & Rennie, D. L. (Eds.). (2001). *Qualitative psychotherapy research. Methods and methodology*. Lengerich: Pabst.
- Gabbard, G. O. (1995). Countertransference: The emerging common ground. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 76, 475-485.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 266-275.
- Gill, M. M. (1994). *Psychoanalysis in transition: A personal view*. Hillsdale - London: The

- Analytic Press.
- Glover, E., & Brierley, M. (Eds.). (1940). *An investigation of the technique of psychoanalysis*. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox.
- Graff, H., & Luborsky, L. (1977). Long-term trends in transference and resistance: A quantitative analytic method applied to four psychoanalyses. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 25, 471-490.
- Green, A. (2000). Science and science fiction in infant research. In J. Sandler, A.-M. Sandler, & R. Davies (Eds.), *Clinical and observational research: Roots of a controversy*. London: Karnacs Books. pp 41-72
- Habermas, J. (1971a). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hanly, C. (1992). Inductive reasoning in clinical psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 73, 293-301.
- Hilgard, E. R. (1952). Experimental approaches to psychoanalysis. In E. Pumpian-Mindlin (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis as science*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. pp 2-45
- Hill, R. D., & Lambert, M. J. (2003). Methodological issues in studying psychotherapy processes and outcomes. In M. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Bergin and Garfield's Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. New York: Wiley. pp 84-135
- Hilliard, R. B. (1993). Single case methodology in psychotherapy process and outcome research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 373-380.
- Hinshelwood, R. D. (1989). *A dictionary of Kleinian thought*. London: Free Association Books.
- Horowitz, L. (1977). Two classes of concomitant change in psychotherapy. In N. Freedman, & S. Grand (Eds.), *Communicative structures and psychic structures*. New York: Plenum Press. pp 419-440
- Huber, D., & Klug, G. (2007). Scales of psychological capacities: the Munich contribution to their psychometric qualities. In W. Bucci, & N. Freedman (Eds.), *From impression to inquiry: A tribute to the work of Robert Wallerstein*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association. pp 97-134
- Isaacs, S. (1939). Criteria for interpretation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 20, 853-880.
- Jones, E. E., & Windholz, M. (1990). The psychoanalytic case study: Toward a method for systematic inquiry. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 38, 985-1016.
- Kächele, H. (1986). Validating psychoanalysis: what methods for which task? *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 9, 2-44.
- Kächele, H. (1988). Clinical and scientific aspects of the Ulm process model of psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 69, 65-73.
- Kächele, H. (1990). Welche Methoden für welche Fragen? (What methods for which question?). In H. Argelander (Eds.), *Empirische Forschung in der Psychoanalyse* (Vol. 10. Frankfurt/Main: Sigmund Freud Institut. pp 73-89
- Kächele, H., Ehlers, W., & Hölzer, M. (1991). Experiment und Empirie in der Psychoanalyse (Experiment and empirical studies in psychoanalysis). In F. Schneider, M. Bartels, K. Foerster, & H. J. Gaertner (Eds.), *Perspektiven der Psychiatrie. Forschung - Diagnostik - Therapie*. Stuttgart Jena New York: Gustav Fischer. pp 129-142
- Kächele, H., & Mergenthaler, E. (1983). Computer-aided analysis of psychotherapeutic discourse - a workshop. In W.-R. Minsal, & W. Herff (Eds.), *Methodology in Psychotherapy Research. Proceedings of the 1st European Conference on Psychotherapy Research*. Frankfurt: Lang. pp 116-161
- Kächele, H., & Mergenthaler, E. (1984). Auf dem Wege zur computerunterstützten Textanalyse in der psychotherapeutischen Prozessforschung (On the way to computer-assisted psychotherapeutic process research). In U. Baumann (Eds.), *Psychotherapie: Makro/Mikroperspektive*. Göttingen: Verlag für Psychologie Dr. Hogrefe, C J. pp 223-239

- Kazdin, A. E. (1982). *Single case research designs: Methods for clinical and applied settings*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kazdin, A. E. (1994). Methodology, design, and evaluation in psychotherapy research. In A. E. Bergin, & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*, 4. Ed. New York: Wiley & Sons. pp 19-71
- Kline, P. (1981). *Fact and fantasy in Freudian theory*: 2nd. Ed. London: Methuen. 2nd ed.
- Klumpner, G. H. (2007). The Open Access project: origins and new directions. In W. Bucci, & N. Freedman (Eds.), *From impression to inquiry: A tribute to the work of Robert Wallerstein*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association. pp 137-151
- Knapp, P. H., Greenberg, R. P., Pearlman, C. H., Cohen, M., Kantrowitz, J., & Sashin, J. (1975). Clinical measurement in psychoanalysis: an approach. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 44, 404-430.
- Knapp, P. H., Mushatt, C., & Nemetz, S. J. (1966). Collection and utilization of data in a psychoanalytic psychosomatic study. In L. A. Gottschalk, & A. H. Auerbach (Eds.), *Methods of research in psychotherapy*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. pp 401-422
- Krause, R., & Lütolf, P. (1988). Facial indicators of transference processes within psychoanalytic treatment. In H. Dahl, H. Kächele, & H. Thomä (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic process research strategies*. Berlin: Springer. pp 241-256
- Krause, R., Steimer-Krause, E., & Ulrich, B. (1992). Use of affect research in dynamic psychotherapy. In M. Leuzinger-Bohleber, H. Schneider, & R. Pfeifer (Eds.), *"Two Butterflies on my Head..."*. *Psychoanalysis in the interdisziplinäre dialogue*. Berlin: Springer. pp 277-291
- Krugmann, P. (2007). Who was Milton Friedman? *The New York Review of Books*, 54 (Feb. 15), 27-30.
- Kubie, L. S. (1958). Research into the process of supervision in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 27, 226-236.
- Laplanche, J., & Pontalis, J. B. (1967). *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Leuzinger - Bohleber, M., & Fischmann, T. (2006). What is conceptual research in psychoanalysis? *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 87, 1355-1386.
- Leuzinger-Bohleber, M. (1995). Die Einzelfallstudie als psychoanalytisches Forschungsinstrument (The single case study as psychoanalytic research instrument). *Psyche - Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 49, 434-480.
- Luborsky, L. (1953). Intraindividual repetitive measurements (P-technique) in understanding psychotherapeutic change. In O. H. Mowrer (Eds.), *Psychotherapy - Theory and research*. New York: Ronald Press. pp 389-413
- Luborsky, L. (1984). *Principles of psychoanalytic psychotherapy. A manual for supportive-expressive treatment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Luborsky, L. (1995). The first trial of P-technique in psychotherapy research. A still-lively legacy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 6-14.
- Luborsky, L., & Spence, D. P. (1971). Quantitative research on psychoanalytic therapy. In A. Bergin, & S. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. 1st ed., 1. Ed. New York: Wiley. pp 408-438
- Luborsky, L., & Spence, D. P. (1978). Quantitative research on psychoanalytic therapy. In S. L. Garfield, & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change*. 2nd ed., 2. Ed. New York: Wiley. pp 331-368
- Luyten, P., Blatt, S. J., & Corveleyn, J. (2006). Minding the gap between positivism and hermeneutics in psychoanalytic research. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54, 571-610.
- Luyten, P., Blatt, S. J., & Corveleyn, J. (2006). Minding the gap between positivism and hermeneutics in psychoanalytic research. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic*

- Association*, 54, 571-610.
- Masling, J., & Cohen, J. (1987). Psychotherapy, clinical evidence and the self-fulfilling prophecy. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 4, 65-79.
- Meissner, W. W. (1983). Values in the psychoanalytic situation. *Psychoanal Inquiry*, 3, 577-598.
- Mergenthaler, E., & Kächele, H. (1988). The Ulm Textbank management system: A tool for psychotherapy research. In H. Dahl, H. Kächele, & H. Thomä (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic process research strategies*. Berlin: Springer. pp 195-212
- Mergenthaler, E., & Kächele, H. (1993). Locating text archives for psychotherapy research. In N. Miller, L. Luborsky, J. Barber, & J. Docherty (Eds.), *Psychodynamic treatment research - A guide for clinical practice*. New York: Basic Books. pp 54-62
- Meyer, A. E. (1988). What makes psychoanalysts tick? In H. Dahl, H. Kächele, & H. Thomä (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic process research strategies*. Berlin: Springer. pp 273-290
- Moser, U. (1991). On-Line und Off-Line, Praxis und Forschung, eine Bilanz (On-Line and Off-Line, Practice and Research, drawing a balance). *Psyche - Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 45, 315-334.
- Orlinsky, D. E., & Geller, J. D. (1993). Patients' representations of their therapists and therapy: A new research focus. In N. Miller, L. L., J. Barber, & J. Docherty (Eds.), *Psychodynamic treatment research. A handbook for clinical practice*. New York: Basic Books. pp 423-466
- Perron, R. (2003). What are we looking for? How? In M. Leuzinger-Bohleber, U. Dreher, & J. Canestri (Eds.), *Pluralism and unity? Methods of research in psychoanalysis*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association. pp 97-108
- Perron, R. (2006). How to do research? Reply to Otto Kernberg. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 87, 927-932.
- Person, E. S., Cooper, A. M., & Gabbard, G. O. (Eds.). (2005). *Textbook of Psychoanalysis*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychiatric Press.
- Pine, F. (2006). The psychoanalytic dictionary: a position paper on diversity and its unifiers. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 54, 463-491.
- Porcerelli, J. H., Dauphin, V. B., Ablon, J. S., & Leitman, S. (2007). Psychoanalysis with avoidant personality disorder: a systematic case study. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 44, 1-13.
- Pulver, S. E. (1987). Epilogue to "How theory shapes technique: perspectives on a clinical study". *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 7, 289-299.
- Pulver, S. E. (1987). How theory shapes technique: perspectives on a clinical study. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 7, 141 - 299.
- Renik, O. (1998). The analyst's subjectivity and the analyst's objectivity. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 79, 487-497.
- Renik, O. (2004). Intersubjectivity in psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85, 1053-1056.
- Sampson, H., Weiss, J., Mlodnosky, L., & Hause, E. (1972). Defense analysis and the emergence of warded off mental contents. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 26, 524-532.
- Sandler, J. (1976). Countertransference and role-responsiveness. *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, 3, 43-47.
- Sandler, J. (1983). Reflections on some relations between psychoanalytic concepts and psychoanalytic practice. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 64, 35-45.
- Sargent, H. D. (1961). Intrapsychic change: Methodological problems in psychotherapy research. *Psychiatry*, 24, 93-108.
- Schachter, J. (2005). Contemporary American psychoanalysis: A profession? Increasing the role of research in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 22, 473-492.
- Schachter, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Transforming lives. Analyst and patient view the power of*

- psychoanalytic treatment*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Schlesinger, H. J. (1974). Problems of doing research on the therapeutic process. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 22, 3-13.
- Shakow, D. (1960). The recorded psychoanalytic interview as an objective approach to research in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 29, 82-97.
- Shevrin, H. (2000). The experimental investigation of unconscious conflict, unconscious signal anxiety. In M. Velmans (Eds.), *Investigating phenomenal consciousness. New methodologies and maps*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp 33-65
- Shevrin, H. (2005). Toward a theory on consciousness based on recent developments in subliminal research. In P. Giampieri-Deutsch (Eds.), *Psychoanalysis as an empirical, interdisciplinary science. Collected papers on contemporary psychoanalytic research*. Wien: pp 54-74
- Shulman, D. G. (1990). The investigation of psychoanalytic theory by means of the experimental method. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 71, 487-498.
- Silberschatz, G., Curtis, J. T., & Nathans, S. (1989). Using the patient's plan to assess progress in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 26, 40-46.
- Silberschatz, G., Sampson, H., & Weiss, J. (1986). Testing pathogenic beliefs versus seeking transference gratifications. In J. Weiss, H. Sampson, & the Mount Zion Psychotherapy Research Group (Eds.), *The psychoanalytic process: theory, clinical observation, and empirical research*. New York: Guilford Press. pp 267-276
- Spence, D. P. (1986). When interpretation masquerades as explanation. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 34, 3-22.
- Spence, D. P. (1992). The virtual case report. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 71, 679-698.
- Spence, D. P. (1994). *The rhetorical voice of psychoanalysis: Displacement of evidence by theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Spence, D. P., Dahl, H., & Jones, E. E. (1993). Impact of interpretation on associative freedom. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 395-402.
- Spence, D. P., Mayes, L. C., & Dahl, H. (1994). Monitoring the analytic surface. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 42, 43-64.
- Streeck, U. (1994). Psychoanalytiker interpretieren "das Gespräch, in dem die psychoanalytische Behandlung besteht" (Psychoanalysts interpret "the talk which makes up the psychoanalytic treatment"). In M. B. Buchholz, & U. Streeck (Eds.), *Heilen, Forschen, Interaktion. Psychotherapie und qualitative Sozialforschung*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. pp 29-47
- de Swaan, A. (1980). On the sociogenesis of the psychoanalytic situation. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 3, 381-413.
- Teller, V., & Dahl, H. (1995). What psychoanalysis needs is more empirical research. In T. Shapiro, & R. Emde (Eds.), *Research in psychoanalysis: Process, development, outcome*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press. pp 31-49
- Thomä, H., & Houben, A. (1967). Über die Validierung psychoanalytischer Theorien durch die Untersuchung von Deutungsaktionen (On the validation of psychoanalytic theories by the investigation of interpretative actions). *Psyche - Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 21, 664-692.
- Thomä, H., & Kächele, H. (1994). *Psychoanalytic practice. vol 1 Principles*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Thomä, H., & Kächele, H. (1994). *Psychoanalytic practice. vol. 2: Clinical studies*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Vaughan, S. C., Spitzer, R., Davies, M., & Roose, S. (1997). The definition and assessment of analytic process. Can analysts agree? *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 78, 959-973.
- Waldron, S., Scharf, R. D., Crouse, J., Firestein, S. K., Burton, A., & Hurst, D. (2004). Saying

- the right thing at the right time: A view through the lens of the analytic process scales (APS). *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 73, 1079-1125.
- Waldron, S., Scharf, R. D., Hurst, D., Crouse, J., Firestein, S. K., & Burton, A. (2004). What happens in a psychoanalysis? A view through the lens of the Analytic Process Scales. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85, 443-466.
- Wallerstein, R. S. (2007). The vision of CAMP and the future of psychoanalytic therapy research. In W. Bucci, & N. Freedman (Eds.), *From impression to inquiry: A tribute to the work of Robert Wallerstein*. London: International Psychoanalytical Association. pp 207-224
- Weiss, J., Sampson, H., & The Mount Zion Psychotherapy Research Group (Eds.). (1986). *The psychoanalytic process: Theory, clinical observation, and empirical research*. New York: Guilford Press.