

wakefulness to sleep, there may be several minutes when the EEG looks like that of wakefulness, but awareness of the environment is lost.

S82. Personality disorders: basic and clinical aspects

Chairmen: A Dahl, C Pull

ATTACHMENT PATTERNS (APs) AND DEFENSE MECHANISMS (DMs) IN PERSONALITY DISORDERS (PDs): A PRELIMINARY STUDY

L. Barone¹, V. Lingiardi², C. Maffei². ¹ Education Department, University of Trieste, via Tigor 22, Trieste, Italy; ² Istituto Scientifico Ospedale San Raffaele, Department of Neuropsychiatric Sciences, University of Milan School of Medicine, via Prinetti 29, 20127, Milano, Italy

One of the most central hypothesis in the field of attachment theory suggests that adults' mental representation of childhood attachment experiences strongly influences the quality of interpersonal relationships. Further information comes from DMs evaluation, which offers a clinical picture of the subject's way of handling conflicts and stressors. This integrated approach can make easier both diagnostic definition and treatment options.

In the clinical domain, a promising line of research is the application of the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, [1]) and the Defense Mechanism Rating Scale (DMRS, [2]).

The Authors present a preliminary study on the evaluation of APs and defense styles in a sample of PDs. The data concerning attachment are collected using AAI. The data concerning defenses are collected using DMRS. The evaluators have been trained by Mary Main for the AAI and by Christopher Perry for the DMRS.

The aim of this study is to analyze the occurrence of different APs and DMs profiles in subjects with PDs. The study is part of a more comprehensive research project on clinical assessment.

The Authors discuss the two evaluation systems (AAI and DMRS) for guiding clinical inference in the identification of specific APs and DMs. The discussion of these two instruments is followed by their application. Five patients have been randomly selected and interviewed. The transcriptions of their clinical interview have been rated following AAI and DMRS criteria. Our preliminary data show a relation between insecure patterns of attachment and specific immature defenses clusters. The comparison among PDs (DSM-IV) diagnoses, attachment categories and DMRS total scores are discussed.

[1] Main M, Kaplan N, Cassidy J (1985), Security in infancy, childhood and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50 (1-2, Serial No. 209).

[2] Perry JC (1991), Defense Mechanisms Rating Scale. Cambridge Hospital-Harvard Medical School, Boston.

PSYCHODYNAMIC CONFLICTS IN DSM-III-R PERSONALITY DISORDERS

C.A. Guldberg, E. Dramsdahl, A.A. Dahl. Institute Group for Psychiatry, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 33, Gaustad, N-0320 Oslo, Norway

Objective: To study the relationship between psychodynamic conflicts and DSM-III-R personality disorders. **Methods:** 171 non-

psychotic subjects between 25 and 45 years of age were interviewed with the Personality Disorder Examination (PDE). Of these, 84 (49%) had a definite DSM-III-R personality disorder. 80 (95%) of these consented to a 50-minute psychodynamic interview, which was audio- and videotaped, and then transcribed in full length. These interviews were then assessed for psychodynamic conflicts with the Psychodynamic Conflict Rating Scales (PCRS). **Results:** Except for Schizoid personality disorder, none of the Cluster A personality disorders correlated with dynamic conflict dimensions. In Cluster B, there was a very strong correlation between Antisocial scores and the Resentment over being thwarted conflict. Borderline, Histrionic and Narcissistic scores correlated with the Object hunger conflict. In Cluster C, Avoidant scores correlated with Counterdependent, Overall gratification inhibition and the Global conflict over expressing emotional needs and anger, as well as negatively with the Object hunger conflict. For Obsessive-compulsive personality disorder scores, there was a trend towards positive correlations with the Dominant goal and Sexual pleasure versus guilt conflicts, as well as a significant correlation with the Object hunger conflict. **Conclusion:** For several of the personality disorders, psychodynamic conflicts seems to play a significant role in the formation of character traits. Our findings may be of importance for targeting psychotherapeutic interventions in personality disorders.

CLINICAL ASSESSMENT OF DEFENSE MECHANISMS USING THE DEFENSE MECHANISM RATING SCALE (DMRS) BY J.C. PERRY

V. Lingiardi, L. Vanzulli, M. Simula, C. Lonati, A. Fossati, C. Maffei. Istituto Scientifico Ospedale San Raffaele, Department of Neuropsychiatric Sciences, University of Milan School of Medicine, via Prinetti 29, 20127, Milan, Italy

This paper touches on the use of the Defense Mechanism Rating Scale (DMRS), an observer-based method, realized by J.C. Perry, which identifies specific defense mechanisms from interview transcripts, video or audio recordings. The DMRS comprehends 28 individual defense mechanisms, hierarchically ordered in 7 clusters from the less mature defenses (Action Defenses) to the most mature ones. A qualitative and quantitative scoring yields a final profile which classes the subject on a scale (range 0 to 7), measuring the Overall Defensive Functioning.

The authors reckon the valuation of the defense style to be very important in the assessment of a Personality Disorder. They present a preliminary study on the interrater reliability (IRR) of a training group learning to use the DMRS from a senior rater directly trained by J.C. Perry. This study is one of the first steps of a multicentric research assessing defenses in patients with Personality Disorders.

Ten patients randomly collected who accepted to participate in the study have been assessed so far by trained clinicians conducting a 50-minute dynamically oriented interview to elicit defenses and conflicts.

Each rater within the training group made independent ratings, based on audio recordings and transcripts, blind to others' ratings. Then five junior raters met in a consensus group conducted by a senior rater, discussing their ratings and forming consensus ratings for each session.

Overall Defensive Functioning	0.85
Total of Defenses	0.79
Mature Defenses	0.81
Obsessional Defenses	0.79
Other Neurotic Defenses	0.88
Minor Image Distortion Defenses	0.94
Disavowal Defenses	0.77
Major Image Distortion Defenses	0.45
Action Defenses	0.79