**The Connected Central Relationship Pattern:
A Structural Version of the CCRT**[1]

R. W. Dahlbender, C. Albani, D. Pokorny, H. Kächele

Abteilung Psychotherapie, Universität Ulm, Am Hochsträß 8, W-7900 Ulm
(Ärztlicher Direktor: Prof. Dr. med. Horst Kächele)

Key-words

psychotherapy research, methodology, psychodiagnostic, interpersonal problems, central relationship pattern, core conflictual relationship theme, transference, brief psychodynamic psychotherapy, contingency tables, exact tests

Abstract

The *Core Conflictual Relationship Theme* (CCRT) developed by Luborsky is a content-analytic method for the measurement of repetitive relationship patterns. Narratives about relationship episodes with the self and significant others serve as data base. The most frequent of each of the three rated components (wish, response from others, response of the self) constitute the CCRT.

In this paper we present a further developement of the CCRT-method, a structural version we have called *Central Relationship Patterns* (CRP). It is a method to identify "macro-molecular" relationship structures. We describe the approach, the specific features of the data aquisition, the statistical analysis based on methods for contingency tables and some applicabilities using as an example a completely rated brief psychodynamic psychotherapy with nearly 300 relationship episodes.

---

[1] First drafts have been presented at the annual meeting of the SPR at Lyon 1991 and at Berkeley 1992

Introduction

As a serendipitous byproduct of his work on the therapeutic alliance Luborsky (1977) presented a method to identify the *Core Conflictual Relationship Theme - CCRT -* of patients in individual psychotherapy (1990a). It represents one of the first generation procedures for the judgement of narrated interactive relationship events[2]

The method focusses on three aspects of patients presenting relatinship descriptions: 1. what does the patient want fromn others? 2. How do they react to it and 3. How does the patient react to those ? Luborsky underscores the closeness of this procedure to usual clinical reasoning; experienced clinicians tend to identify in this way the stable transference patterns. His notion of transference is operationally defined ("The CCRT looks much like Freud´s (1912) transference template"(Luborsky. & Crits-Christoph 1990)).

The Method of the Core Conflictual Relationship Theme

As the method has been described in detail by the authors (Luborsky & Crits-Christoph 1990) we may restrict our comments to features that seem of importance to us. It is a content-analytic, categorical and connestionistic conceptualized method; basically the logic of evaluation is framed within the individual case.

It works on naturalistic data that are derived from therapy session transcripts or from Relationship Anecdotes Paradigm Interviews (Luborsky 1990b; Dahlbender et al.1992). These RAP interviews focus on the production of narrative epiodes on important relationship experiences. The method is based on narrations of real interactions and in contrast to the fictitious interactions as they are stimulated by the cards of the TAT (Morgan & Murray 1938)[3] .

In contrast to other methods (e.g. SASB, Benjamin 1974 the verbal material is not segmented in small, simple structured investigative units but is kept in more comprehensive narratives (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Quasthoff 1980). These larger units formally are relatively complex organized structures: they consists of an orientation section which informs the listener /reader on the behavioral situation, a part with a complicating action, another part with an evaluative function, a part with a resolution and sometimes a coda that organizes the reference of the narrative to the presence.

---

[2]In Ulm Luborsky prresented a first versions of the manual in 1981; it has been formally introduced by the publication of the German manual (Luborsky & Kächele 1988).

[3] The use of dream accounts as data for the CCRT has been studied by Popp &Luborsky & Crits-Christoph (1990); they found some concordance but also significant differences to the results fromn therapy sessions.

Narrative interviews are especially apt to convey affective, subjecvtively important material (Schütze (1977)

The CCRT-method focuses on the contents of those relationship experiences that are presented by the narrative episodes. As a narrator selects more or less consciously what he tells his thus transmitted experiences may claim to be adaequate samples of specific interactions with specific partners in specific contexts. How far these experiences are of special significance resp of representative significance to the narrator a priori cannot be decided. Depending on once theoretical stance it will oscillate between situational constraints and reptitive patterns of experience.

The CCRT-method relies on the meanwhile by linguists well established basic assumption that specific interactional experiences are presented in narrations. (Flader & Giesecke 1980; Bruner 1986). The reptitions represent the structure of important subject-object action relations like a template, which transcends the subjectiv reconstructive Perspective of the indivudal narration The CCRT-method intentiously neglects the context of narration and the probable influence of the clinical investigative situation (why does this patient tell this story just now to me?) in order to accentuate the structural properties. With this position it is in conformity with the classic psychoanalytic position that the object is the most variable part of a drive. In modern language we would say that a subject insists on his (unconscious) wish in different situations with different objects.

The narratives focus on interactions with significant others that are of importance for the narrating subject. These are called "relationship episodes "(REs). The REs are analyzed according the the rules of a manual which the most recent German version contains some further technical specifica-tions.(Luborsky u. Mitarb. v. Albani & Eckert 1991). For the standard detailed explication of the method see Luborsky & Crits-Christoph (1990).

 Procedure
 1. Identification of a relationship episode by rater A[4]
 2. Evaluation of the RE by rater B for three components :
  Wish = W
  Reaction of Object = RO
  Reaction of Self/ Subject = RS,
  the formulation should be "tailor-made"
 3. Identifying the most frequent component and putting them together
  results in the preliminary CCRT

---

[4] In the identification of the "unit of observation" our group is more strictly guided by the space-time structure of the narrative than the original manual points out.

4. Rechecking the components in the light of the CCRT
5. final formulation of the CCRT

At least 10 REs are necessary to formulate a stable CCRT. It represents a hypothetical scheme of interaction among the three components, it does not claim real interactions between them though for statistical reasons they might be more likely (see later)

To allow interpersonal comparison a list of standard components has been created (Crits-Christoph & Demorest 1988) 34 Wishes and each of 30 reactions of the object and the self are available as *Standard Categories* (SC) and 8 empirically derived *Cluster Standard Categories* (CL-SC) (Barber, Crits-Christoph & Luborsky 1990; Table 2).A theoretical underpinning of grouping has not been presented yet. The recently demonstrated QUAINT-Methode (Crits-Christoph & Baranackie 1992) tries to combine CCRT-logic with the SASB category system.

However the consistency of CCRT formulations across relationship episodes containing different objects in different contexts has yet been rarely investigated; a first study at least compared the consistency of the standard CCRT formulation across a series of sessions of a psychodynamic short term therapy and found some degree of variability of the CCRT within the 10 (out of 29) sessions that have been utilized within this study (Schnekenburger 1990)

This result demonstrated to us that the CCRTs may be looked at as representation of the repertoires of relations of a patient. It is obvious that the more relationship episodes are available the more precise this representation will be. However within a single session, even within an session induced to produce relationship episodes called RAP interview it is not possible to really tap the large amount of potential episodes with all significant objects in all significant contexts. If one wants to control for situational variability psychometric diagnostic procedures are more apt to satisfy this need; then one has to live with the clinically important disadvantage not to work on naturalistic material.

Critique of the method
There are diverse directions of critique on the method. The theoretical-conceptual aspect, the implicit concept of transference or the discourse linguistic assumptions. We shall take up only those points that are of importance to our own development.

The method constructs/composes the core relationship theme out of three *independent components*; it does not control whether this connectionistically generated wish-reaction pattern actually occurs in any given subject-object action episode be it in a psychological meaningful way or in a stochastic-probabilistic way.

The notion of centrality ist not theoretically anchored; instead it is purely empirically defined by the largest frequency of singular components. One has to realize that the robust variable *frequency* is largely dependent on the category formation.

> Example: After a visit in the zoo a child is asked "what were the most frequent animals in the zoo?" The answer will be: "fishes". . Asking for the most frequent kinds of animal results in the answer: "Elephants" .

Well know is the critique on the quantitative position in content analysis that frequency is not identical with relevance and rare events may be espeially relevant because they are so rare. Rare events indeed may be of extreme importance which is obvious to any clinician. So subjective relevance of frequent events and of rare events merits further discussion.

Another point of critique refers to the merely pragmatic combination of the most frequent components which has no theoretical basis what so ever. Putting together a complex pattern out of three very frequent, but independent tallied components does not necessarily lead to the most frequent combination nor to the most meaningful.

The inherent paradoxon is easily demonstrated by accompanying the child to the zoo again.

> Example: The child observes the feeling of the animals. The most frequent fed animals that it sees again are fishes. When the child asks:what are the most f requentlyx used foods: The Answer wll be "bananas" Factually the most frequent animal-food combination is "birds and insects".

If one records the real dependencies of the components this problem is avoided Though Luborsky understands the relation of subject and object in a sequential action and asks explicitly for the evaluation of the reaction of the object and self in the context of the wish, he then gives up the operationalization of these connections He only records independent *individual components* Strictly speaking he is not in a position to make inferences with regard to the connections among the components.

The practical advantage of Luborsky´s procedure consisting in the limitation on at least ten REs is bought at the same time by a methodological disadavantage

Though clinicians are very versatile in formulating core patterns based on a minimum of clinical material; for a research method this parsimony could turn out to be detrimental. If one considers that a patient in one session may talk only about certain events with certain significant others the likelihood for the ten epiodes to be only a non-representative sample is very big. At least Luborsky and Crits-Christoph have not yet presented data that rule out this possibility. It is open how many REs constitute the population of an individual´s repertoire and how many would constitute a fair sample.

Objekt-REs and Self-REs
Luborsky does not differentiate *Objekt-REs and Self-REs* when formulating the CCRT. We think that Object-REs and Self-REs psychologically are very distinct events. A Self-RE does not represent an interpersonal-interactional event; it is more likely understood it as a moment of self-communication in the context of self-regulation (Moser & Zeppelin 1991). This makes the systematic lack of reactions of the object in Self-REs understandable.

Therapist Type B-REs
Another point of critique refers to the Therapist Type B REs that represent a real interaction with the therapist, they are not a narration about a past event We have decided to exclude this type of episode from our rating as the material does not allow a clear differentiation of subject and object in the interaction as in all real interaction there is often a simultaneity of being subject and object.

The Method of Central Relationship Pattern (CRP)

The aim of our study group after having studied one case in the usual CCRT-method (Schnekenburger 1990; Kächele et al 1991) was directed to develop an approach that would be able to identify connected relationship structures.
This would be a structural version of the CCRT because we would claim that the connections are empirically demonstrable. Because these structures do not by themnselves represent a conflict (which also is true of Luborsky´s CCRT) we decided to speak of "central relationship patterns" We are in agreement with Luborsky that some patterns are more conflictual than others - in terms of tension they might cause to the individual, but it is clear that the method does not identify conflict.

Taking into account our critical arguments we have made the following improvements on the manualized procedure:

1. For each relationship episode the rater has to identify a combination of a wish of the subject (W), a reaction of an object (RO) and a reaction of the self (RS) to the RO , which represents from the narrators perspective a psychological most likely connection in the context of this one episode. This coding - the central message of each episode - is called *A-level-*coding (s. Tab. 1).

2. Besides the one A-level-combination other wish and reaction components may occur in each relationship episode. As these do not show

6

any regular relations they are only recorded as elements which is called B-level coding There are no fixed B-level codings for which a psychological meaningful connection is asked for.

3. The temporal sequences within the REs at present are not taken into account the assumption being that the surface level of speech is under constraints which do not alter decisively the deep structure.

4. Therapist Typ b-REs are not included.

5. Objekt-REs and Self REs are kept and analyzed separately

6. Though the coding has to take into account the psychological context in the episode the "level of inference" has to be kept very low, i,.e. we restrict ourselves to the manifest level of meaning..

As a result of the above described procedure we obtained two sample of codings: one sample of self relationship episodes with only two nominal scaled variables: A-level-wish (W_A) and A-level-reaction of the self (RS_A). Analogously we obtain a sample of object relationship episodes with three nominal scaled variables: A-level-wish (W_A), A-level-reaction of the other (RO_A) and A-level-reaction of the self (RS_A).

The structure of co-occurence .

The null hypothesis of our approach (H_0) assumes the total independence of W_A, RO_A and RS_A (see *fig. 1*). The model of total independence corresponds to the following situation: the probabilities of individual A-level-components are fixed. In relationship episodes these three elements are independently combined. The joint probability of such a three-event-combination is obtained as a product of the probabilities of the three single events.

On the contrary, if the alternative hypothesis (H_1) holds some A-level-combinations must appear more frequently and some A-level-combinations must appear less frequently than statistically expected under the null hypothesis.

Actually the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis would not be a very big surprise. We expect that certain psychologically and semantically meaningful combinations will appear more preferably than others. We are interested to identify such more frequent combinations occuring very frequently compared to

the statistical expectations. We call a combination that meets this and some other reasonable criteria a *relationship pattern*.

The CCRT method as it is described by Luborsky seems to be implicitely based rather on the null than on the alternative hypothesis. The combination of the most frequent wish and the most frequent reaction components is exactly the combination that has the greatest *expected* frequency. No attention is paid to actually *observed* frequencies and to *differences* between observed and expected frequencies. On the other hand the CCRT approach has the advantage that only a few relationship episodes are necessary to formulate the CCRT, which has led to impressive results and may be retained for studies that work with an expectancy model.

The Specimen Case: "The Student"

The investigation of a completely recorded psychoanalytic short term therapy provided the necessary databasis for the statistical procedures. The verbatim protocols of "The Student" were provided by the Ulm Textbank. A systematic clinical evaluation of the 29 sessions and the achieved results in terms of CCRT formulations have been reported elsewhere (Kächele, Heldmaier & Scheytt 1990; Kächele, Dengler, Eckert & Schnekenburger 1990).

The patient was a 23 year old student suffering from minor obsessional symptoms and working problems in the context of a typical late adolescent separation problem. He was treated by an experienced psychoanalyst who focussed the treatment around the negativ-oedipal issue of an unconscious identification with the mother´s disappointment for the father[5].

Albani (1992)[6] analyzed all 29 sessions and identified a total of 300 relationship episodes Beziehungsepisoden and found 363 "wishes", 362 ROs und 566 RSs in narrated interactions with 42 different objects. Under the described criteria of the A-level analysis this material contained 224 Object-REs 224 with A-level-combinations.

These figures represent the largest data set on a single case in the field of the CCRT-research up to now. Luborsky´s group analyzed a treatment of comparable length ("Mr. B") which produced a sample of half of our size (Luborsky et al. 1991; Crits-Christoph & Demorest 1991).

The Generation of Data and their Analysis

We have developed a recording sheet (*Table 1*) which is tied to a databank device so that all information about REs is centrally stored[7]. All components are coded on three ways: 1. by tailor-made formulations; 2. by using the standard category lists; 3. by using the cluster-standard categories.

Standardized categorizations are a requirement for a computer-assisted analysis of the codings. While the standardcategories (SC) allow for 30 600 possible combinations of the three comnponents (W, RO, RS), the cluster standard categories (CL-SK) ((*Tab*. *2*; Barber, Luborsky & Crits-Christoph 1990) provide a useful system of categorization, which allows the intra- and

---

[5]The case "The Student" has been one of the two cases on which the PEP-project is fosuing on (Grawe 1988; Kächele 1992)

[6] This medical dissertation was supported by the Breuninger Stiftung, Stuttgart..

[7]a system that became necessary as we CCRT study group in Germany is expanding rapidly

interpersonal comparison of REs: they allow for 8x8x8=512 possible W-RO-RS-combinations. They are the basis for computations.
The aim of data analysis is to identify salient relationship patterns. What counts as salient, as central, or as core has to be defined by the researcher and may be dependent on the specific question.

In this study the identification of patterns is mainly based on methods for two- and three-way contingency tables. First we look - analogously to Luborsky - at the observed one-way frequencies of the A-level-components. The most frequent A-level components are (see fig 3):

$$W_A 5, RO_A 5 \text{ and } RS_A 7.$$

Wish$_A$ 5 (to be close to others and accept them) occurs 47times, the RO$_A$ 5 (others reject and are against me) occurs 99 times and the RS$_A$ 7 (I am disappointed and depressed) occurs 62 times If we compare these A-level based results with the results of conventional CCRT approach (Kächele et al 1990), which uses all occuring components, we find that for this case both methods yield the same results.

The following step computes the co-occurences between A-level wishes, reactions of others and reactions of self. As an appropriate global test chi-square test or likelihood ratio chi-square test, applied to the model of total independence, are commonly used here. Unfortunately, it is obvious that even in the case of 224 object relationship episodes some of the 512 cells in this three-way contingency table must have very low expected frequencies. This is a well-known contraindication for chi-square methods. A combinatorial exact test would be more appropriate here. And unfortunately again computational complexity of such global exact tests grows rapidly with the problem size (Mehta 1991).

We proceded with an exploratory search for central relationship patterns. The frequency that is expected under the hypothesis of total independence is computed as a product of the three marginal observed probabilities multiplied by the sample size. For the combination $W_A5\text{-}RO_A5\text{-}RS_A7$ shown above we have:

$$E = (47 / 224) * (99 / 224) * (62 / 224) * 224 = 5.75$$

The actually observed frequency for this combination O = 14 was considerably (2.4 times) higher than the expected one, the difference between them was

shown to be statistically significant. Additionally, in two-way marginal tables we have found significant association between components W_A5-RO_A5, between components RO_A5-RS_A7, but not between W_A5-RS_A7.

Intuitively we have the following criterion for the pattern search: The combination has to occur with a considerable frequency in the data and all three components have to play their role in the pattern. Our (current version) of the criterion is the following:

(i) There is a three-way association for the cell, i.e. the total independence for the cell is rejected.

(ii) Moreover: at least two marginal associations are significant *or* the model of "all second interactions" is rejected for the cell[8].

As our design choice, we adopted a one.sided approach and we searched only for combination occuring *more* frequently than expected. Hence, we did not search for supressed "anti-patterns". Experimenting in this direction led to too many of low level results.

The difference between observed and expected frequencies can be statistically investigated using one of the following two method classes:

1. *adjusted standardresiduals*, based on the theory of classical chi-square methods (Bishop et al. 1984, Agresti 1990);

2. *exact tests* (Mehta 1991, Agresti 1990), which are fortunately for the case of $2*2$ and $2*2*2$ tables computationaly feasible.

The disadvantage of (adjusted) standard residuals as chi-square based methods is their tendency to *false* positive results, if expected frequencies are too small. It was exactly our experience that using residuals we have found beside more "nice" patterns, also quite a lot of peculiar combinations, which were observed just once in the data. We had then to eliminate such peculiar combination from our solutions, using additional formal and intuitiv criteria[9] On the other hand the investigation of table cells using exact methods leads to a small number of "reasonable" patterns, correponding fairly good with our previous intuition. So

---

[8]Testing of the "all-second-model" would be theoretically approprite for the search of "trully" three-dimensional patterns. In our analysis this criterion seemed to be much too conservative.
[9]One referee proposed the very interesting idea to use r-effect sizes, as described e.g. in Rosenthal, 1991. However this measure is based on chi-square theory und will lead stucturally to the same results, and consequently to the the same problems

we were strongly encouraged to use exact methods for the sake of pattern search, and to write a computer procedure for this purpose (Pokorny 1991).

Up to now, we have discussed the possibility to test the association in one cell of the table. However, this inference is simultanously applied to all 512 cells of the table. Consequently the probability of occurence of false positive finding anywhere in the table can be considerably greater than usually accepted 5 %. As one possible solution of this problem, Bonferonis procedure of simultaneous inference (or some of its improvements) can be used. Bonferoni recommends to divide the desired significance level by the number of simultaneously used tests, in our case 5% / 512 = 0.0098 %. This approach guarantees that we make - despite the 5% risk - almost no false positive decision. The procedure is very secure and - consequently - very conservative.

Just one pattern has survived the application of Bonferonis procedure to our data:

$$W_A6 - RO_A8 - RS_A3$$

This most significat pattern consist of W_A6 (to be loved and understood), RO_A8 (understanding and accepting) and RS_A3 (respected and accepted). This wish was significantly associated with the both reactions, and the reaction were not significantly associated. The pattern occured just 4 times in the data, but it was 36 times more than under the null hypothesis expected frequency E=0.11. The expected frequency had such a small value mainly because of low frequency (16) of RS3. The computed expected frequencies of all possible 512 W_A-RO_A-RS_A combinations für the "Student" (null hypothesis) are presented in fig 1. Comparing the expected frequencíes of both already identified patterns with the observed frequencies of these combinations *(Alternativhypothesis)* demonstrates that pattern W_A6-RO_A8-RS_A3 is more cathected than pattern W_A5-RO_A5-RS_A7 (fig. 2).

The reader may be confused by the comparabely small observed pattern frequency. Nevertheless, exact methods and Bonferoni principle justify the conclusion that the communality of W_A5, RO_A5 and RS_A3 in the investigated material was not a result of random combination play.

The just demonstrated example has shown, that the Bonferoni principle is in the current context rather a *very* conservative approach, analysing as many as 224 object relationship episodes we have found just one pattern. We can find more patterns if we leave leave this conservative principle. We do not claim then that

all patterns we have found are simultanously significant ones, and we can arrange ourselves to the fact that some part of our results, whose size can be estimated, contain false positive findings. By such an exploratory approach we use some conventional significance niveau (for instance p=1 %) and handle results very carefuly. In this way we have found the following 7 pattern *proposals* ordered by the significance reached:

$$W_A6 - RO_A8 - RS_A3$$

$$W_A5 - RO_A7 - RS_A3$$

$$W_A5 - RO_A5 - RS_A7$$

$$W_A3 - RO_A5 - RS_A7$$

$$W_A1 - RO_A4 - RS_A4$$

$$W_A1 - RO_A3 - RS_A6$$

$$W_A6 - RO_A5 - RS_A7$$

These patterns are shown as triangles in Fig. 3. In the middle of the triangle we give the reached significance of the three-way (or two-way) association. Hence, we express graphically the security degree of our findings, applying three conventional significance niveaus (5%, 1% and 0.1%) here.

Compared to the conventional CCRT-procedure we have obtained a multiple solution of seven possible patterns. Interestingly the original "central theme" W5, RO5 and RS7 found by the CCRT-procedure is among them, on the third place.
We refrain from reporting those patterns that occur less than expected as we are still unclear about the psychological meaning of such findings.

Applications
The domain of the CCRT-method and its structural CRP version is the identification of repetitive intrapsychic relationship structures as provided by narrative material. It should be suitable to investigate self and object representations. From the psychoanalytic perspective objects are human beings that are invested with subjective meaning; therefore it should be interesting to search for relationship patterns with regard to different objects or thematically grouped objects (mother and father figures, erotic relationships etc). Grouping of REs with regard to different life episodes or phases in treatment may help to reconstruct aspects of development or to portray aspects of the therapeutic process.
To move from the triangular molecular combinations to more complex patterns would lead to graphical representations of all wishes and reactions as illustrated in fig. 4 and 5. These imaging process could help to map the regulation of internalized relationships
The strength of the co-occurence of the components is represented by the strength of the lines. The size of the W, RO and RS boxes refers to the frequencies

Some components do not exist in combinations; still they might be useful to characterize the differences among objects as it is demonstrated in fig. 6
This method also is useful to analyze nosological groups for their prevailing patterns of wishes, ROs and RSs (Eckert et al 1990).

Last not least the identified patterns lead back to the verbatim protocol and may initiate more differentiated approaches to the study of interventions.

Reliability and Validity of the CCRT

Meanwhile quite a few studies demonstrate reliability and validity of the CCRT method (Luborsky & Crits-Christoph 1990). As both methods follow the same principles of operationalisation the reliability issues are alike. The difference lies in the method of data analysis.

With regard to the content validity of the list of standard categories it has not yet conclusively bewen demonstrated that the possible broad spectrum of wishes and reactions is adaequately represented. However the tailor made approach makes abundantly clear that there are infinite variations of singular wishes which can reliably subsumed into one or another category system. So it may be that using Benjamin´s SASB dimensions as basis conception will link the CCRT approach to a more theoretically defined categroy structure (Crist-Christoph & Baranackie 1992).

Investigation of discriminant and convergent validity have not been presented yet. Interrater-reliability has been demonstrated by Crits-Christoph et al (1990): they report kappa values of .61 für W and RS and .70 for RO which were highly significant (p<0,1%). Bond, Hansell & Shevrin (1987) demonstrated a high reliability for identification of objects as did Luborsky, Barber & Dinguer (1990). In our own ongoing reliability study we can show (Dahlbender et al., in prep.) on a sample of 48 relationship episodes a highly accurate judgment of episodes borders (in 87%, retest. 84%), in 98% we could identify the same object.. For wish and RO, RS components we achieved in a paired comparison kappa values in the realm of "moderate to substantial" (Landis und Koch 1977). The same amount of reliability was achieved for the. A-level-combinations that had to be identified by each CRP rater.

CCRT and CRP in contrast

Luborsky´s CCRT method is an instrument that dissects the complex experienced relationship world into single components and reconstructs it by creating one condensed formulation, the CCRT.

The CRRP method identifies the same elements as the CCRT with the same coding device; it then uses a statistical method to identify empirical co-occurances of three components that have a beyond chance frequency of co-occurence as triadic, molecular compounds.

It may be that the CCRT is replicated in one of the CRP as we have shown in the case we analyzed; therefore it may be that Luborsky´s approach though methodologically problematic in its reliance on frequency of individual components has a stabile footing especially in small samples of REs. In a larger sample of REs we demonstrated that the CCRT is but a special case of a series of highly statistical significant patterns of Ws, ROs and RSs which as in a metaphorical way may be approached to be the atoms of social bargaining. CRP then are the first molecules that entertain a stabile relationship within the context of personality.

Both methods catch subjective realities as transmitted through narration which function in an ongoing dialogue as determinants of ongoing exchange. We suppose that they are due to slow change though change of the wish structure is less likely to occur than change in the reaction components.

Viewed as operational definitions of the concept of transference both methods are able to catch the repetitive aspect of transference where the CRP is more able to identify triadic structures and the CCRT places more emphasis on the probability of components and their repetitions.

The pragmatic advantage of the CCRT is impressive - already ten REs are able to produce a formulation that has stood up many tests - the scientific advance of the CRP consists in its emphasis on complexity which is loaded with an enormous increase in sample size necessary to meet the statistical requirements. Taking into account the degree of differentiation with which both methods approach the internalized relationship world of individuals there is one fundamental difference. The CCRT identifies one major overriding pattern, the CRP finds more than one pattern which together form the transference potential of an individuum. The CCRT may be called a macro structure, the CRP a meso structure and the SASB sequence analyses would represent the micro structures (Benjamin 1986) in the verbalized articulation of personality. Below theses are many more micro structures as has been shown by the facial indicators of transference (Krause & Lütolf 1988).

References

Agresti, A. (1990). *Categorial data analysis*. New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore: J. Willey & sons.

Albani, C. (1992). Vom ZBKT zum ZBM: Eine methodenkritische Einzelfallstudie zur Erfassung von repetitiven Mustern und Übertragung mit der ZBKT-Methode. Med. Dissertation, *Universität Leipzig*.

Albani, C., Dahlbender, R.W., Pokorny, D., & Kächele, H. (1991). Mißt die ZBKT-Methode repetitive Beziehungsmuster?, *14. Werkstatt Empirische Forschung in der Psychoanalyse*, Ulm, 30.Mai 1991.

Albani, C., Dahlbender, R.W., Pokorny, D., & Kächele, H. (1991a). Central Relationship Patterns (CRP): First results on a structural version of the CCRT. *22. Annual Meeting of theSociety for Psychotherapy Research*, Lyon, Juni 1991.

Barber, J.P., Crits-Christoph, P., & Luborsky, L. (1990). A guide to the CCRT standard categories and their classifikation. In L. Luborsky & P. Crits-Christoph (Eds.), *Understanding Transference: The CCRT method*, New York: Basic Books.

Beckmann, D. (1974). *Der Analytiker und sein Patient. Untersuchung zur Übertragung und Gegenübertragung*, Bern: Huber.

Beckmann, D., Brähler, E., & Richter, H.-E. (1983). *Der Giessen-Test (GT). Ein Test für Individual- und Gruppendiagnostik*, 3. überarb. Aufl., Bern: Huber.

Benjamin, L.S. (1974). Structural analysis of social behavior. *Psychol Rev 81,* 392-425.

Benjamin, L.S. (1986). Operational definition and measurement of dynamics shown in the stream of free associations. *Psychiatry 49,* 104-129.

Bishop, Y., Fienberg, S., & Holland, P. (1984). *Discrete Multivariate Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge/London: The MIT Press.

Bond, J.A., Hansell, J., & Shevrin, H. (1987). Locating transference paradigms in psychotherapy transcripts: Reliability of relationship episode location in the core conflictual relationship theme (CCRT) method. *Psychotherapy, 24,* 736-749.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, London: Harvard Univ Press.

Crits-Christoph, P., & Baranackie, K. (1992). The quantitative assessment of relationship themes method: A merger of SASB and the CCRT. Vortrag: Annual Meeting, Society of Psychotherapy Research, University of California Berkeley, CA.

Crits-Christoph, P., & Demorest, A. (1988). List of standard categories (Edition 2). unpublished manusricpt, *University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine*.

Crits-Christoph, P., & Demorest, A. (1991). Quantiative assement of relationship theme components. In M J. Horowitz (Ed.), *Person schemas and maladaptive interpersonal behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crits-Christoph, P., & Luborsky, L. (1990). The measurement of self-understanding. In L. Luborsky & P. Crits-Christoph (Eds.). *Understanding transference*. New York: Basic Books.

Crits-Christoph, P., Barber, J.P., & Kurcias, J.S., (in press). The accuracy of therapists' interpretations and the development of the therapeutic alliance, *Psychotherapy Research* .

Crits-Christoph, P., Cooper, A., & Luborsky, L. (1988). The accuracy of therapists' interpretations and the outcome of dynamic psychotherapy, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 56, 490-495.

Dahlbender, R.W., Albani, C., Pokorny, D., & Frevert, G. (1992). Forschungsorientierte Dokumentation von Beziehungsepisoden nach der ZBKT/ZBM-Methode. *PPmP Disk-Journal (submitted)*.

Dahlbender, R.W., Torres, L., Reichert, S., Stübner, S., Frevert, G., & Kächele, H. (1992). Die Praxis des Beziehungsepisoden-Interviews. *Zeitschrift für Psychosomatik und Psychoanalyse*, (in print).

Dahlbender, R.W., Frevert, G., Reichert, S., Pokorny, D., Volkert, M., & Torres, L. (in prep.) Reliability of transcribed relationship episode ratings.

Dixon, W.J., Brown, B., Engelman, L., & Jennrich, R.I.(Eds.) (1990). *BMDP Statistical Software Manual (Volume 1)*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.

Eckert, R., Luborsky, L., Barber, J., Crits-Christoph, P. (1990). The narratives and CCRTs of patients with major depression. In L. Luborsky & P. Crist-Christoph (Eds.). *Understanding Transference*. New York: Basic Books.

Ehlich, K. (1980). Der Alltag des Erzählens. In K. Ehlich (Ed.), *Erzählen im Alltag*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Flader, D., & Giesecke, M. (1980). Erzählen im psychoanalytischen Erstinterview. In K. Ehlich (Ed.), *Erzählen im Alltag*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper & Row.

Grawe, K. (1988b). Zurück zur psychotherapeutischen Einzelfallforschung. *Z Klin Psychol, 17, 4-5*.

Kächele, H. (1990). Une nouvelle perspective de recherche en psychotherapie - le projet PEP. *PPmP-Diskjournal, 1(1),*

Kächele, H., Dengler, D., Eckert, R., & Schnekenburger, S. (1990). Veränderung des zentralen Beziehungskonfliktes durch eine Kurztherapie. *Psychother med Psychol 40*, 178-185

Kächele, H., Heldmaier, H., & Scheytt, N. (1990). Fokusformulierungen als katamanestische Leitlinien. *Psychother med Psychol 35*, 205-216.

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 Heidelberg, New York: Springer.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle, London.

Landis, J.R., & Koch, G.G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorial data. *Biometrics, 33*, 159-174.

Luborsky, L. (1977). Measuring a pervasive psychic structure in psychotherapy: The core conflictual relationship theme. In N. Freedman & S. Grand (Eds.), *Communicative structures and psychic structures*, New York: Plenum Press.

Luborsky, L. (1990a). A guide to the CCRT method. In L. Luborsky & P. Crits-Christoph (Eds.), *Understanding Transference: The CCRT method*, New York: Basic Books.

Luborsky, L. (1990b). The relationship anecdotes Paradigm (RAP) interview as a versatile source of narratives. In L. Luborsky & P. Crits-Christoph (Eds.), *Understanding Transference: The CCRT method*, New York: Basic Books.

Luborsky, L. & Crits-Christoph, P. (Hrsg.) (1990). *Understanding transference: The CCRT method*, New York: Basic Books.

Luborsky, L. & Crits-Christoph, P. (1991). Freud's transference template compared with the Core Conflictual Relationship Theme (CCRT): Illustrations by two specimen cases. In M. Horowitz (Ed.), *Person schemas and maladaptive interpersonal patterns*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Luborsky, L. u. Mitarb. v. Albani, C., & Eckert, R. (1992). Manual zur ZBKT-Methode (deutsche Übersetzung mit Ergänzungen der Ulmer ZBKT-Arbeitsgruppe) , *PPmP DiskJournal 3:2*

Luborsky, L., & Kächele, H. (1988). (Hrg) *Der Zentrale Beziehungskonflikt: Ein Arbeitsbuch,* Ulm: PSZ Verlag.

Luborsky, L., Crits-Christoph, P., Friedman, S.H., Mark, D., & Schaffler, P. (1991). Freud´s transference template compared with the Core Conflictual Relationship Theme (CCRT): Illustrations by the two specimen cases. In M.J. Horowitz (Ed.), *Person schemas and maladaptive interpersonal behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Luborsky, L., Barber, J.P., & Dinguer, L. (im Druck) The meanings of the narratives told during psychotherapy. The fruits of a new observatinal unit. *Psychotherapy Research*.

Mehta, C. (1991). *StatXact. (User manual)* , Cambridge: Cytel Software Corporation.

Morgan, C.D., & Murray, H.A. (1938). Thematic apperception test. In H.A. Murray (Ed.), *Explorations in personality: A clinical and experimental study of fifty men of college age*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moser, U., & Zeppelin, I. v. (1991). *Kognitive-Affektive Prozesse* . Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer.

Pokorny D (1991) Multi-dimensional chi-square statistics. *unpublished programm, Department of Psychotherapy University of Ulm*

Quasthoff, U. (1980). Gemeinsames Erzählen als Form und Mittel im sozialen Konflikt oder Ein Ehepaar erzählt eine Geschichte. In K. Ehlich (Ed.), *Erzählen im Alltag*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Schnekenburger, S. (1990). *Die kontinuierliche Erhebung des zentralen Beziehungskonfliktes über den gesamten Verlauf einer Kurztherapie*. Med. Diss. Universität Ulm.

Schütze, F. (1977). Die Technik des narrativen Interviews in Interaktionsfeldstudien. Unveröffentlichtes Manuskript. *Universität Bielefeld*.

Tab. 1: Data recording

The first column on the left side records von top to bottom: Number of RE, The codenumber of the Ulm Textbank protocol, the objec t of the RE, the rating of completeness of the RE, the time in which the RE takes place The second, third and fourth column contain the codings for the three CCRT components: W, RO, RS: a first coding should be a textual version,tailor-made, the second a coding in the codes of the stand categories, a third a code of thre Cluster standard categrories. In brackets we give the most suitable and the second most suitable category. (s. Tab. 1) The most fitting vcombination is defined by A-level reasoning is marked..

	Wish (W)	Reaction of Objcct (RO)	Reactions of Self (RS)
Session: 03 RE-Nr.: 09 Text: 257-265 Objekt: Completeness: 4 Time	**(W) (11;5 / 33;6)** **[free textual formulation]** (W) (10;4) .	**NRO (16;3 / 4;5)** **[free textual formulation]** PRO (1;8 / 13;6) . NRO (19;3)	**PRS (1;1 / 14;5)** **[free textual formulation]** NRS (13;6 / 17;6) (PRS) 12;5 / 11;4) . NRS (19;6 / 17;6) .

Tab. 2:   CCRT Cluster-Standardcategories

WISHES (W)

1. to assert self and be independent
2. to oppose, hurt, and control others
3. to be controlled, hurt, and not responsible
4. to be distant and avoid conflicts
5. to be close and accepting
6. to be loved and understood
7. to feel good and comfortable
8. to achieve and help others

RESPONSES FROM OTHERS (RO)

1. strong
2. controlling
3. upset
4. bad
5. rejecting and opposing
6. helpful
7. likes me
8. understanding

RESPONSES OF SELF (RS)

1. helpful
2. unreceptive
3. respected and accepted
4. oppose and hurt others
5. self-controlled and self-confident
6. helpless
7. disappointed and depressed
8. anxious and ashamed

Fig. 1: A model for the expected frequencies (H_0)

Fig. 2: Comparison H_0 - H_1 for W_A5-RO_A5-RS_A7
                      and W_A6-RO_A8-RS_A3

Fig. 3: The 7 Central Relationship Patterns

Fig. 4: "How the Patient ticks" - Objekt-REs

Fig. 5: "How the Patient ticks" - Girlfriend REs

Fig.. 6: "Contrast-Images" of different objects