

93

00153

U·M·I

MICROFILMED 1993

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

# **U·M·I**

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

PREVIEW

**Order Number 9300153**

**Psychosomatic potentiality and its relationship to ego  
development and self-representation**

**Curcio, Nancy A., Psy.D.**

**Pace University, 1992**

PREVIEW

**U·M·I**

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**

PREVIEW

**Psychosomatic Potentiality and  
Its Relationship to Ego Development and Self-Representation**

by

Nancy A. Curcio

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of  
the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Psychology  
in the Department of Psychology at Pace University  
New York

1992

(Please type all information)

NAME: Nancy A. Curcio

TITLE OF PROJECT: Psychosomatic Potentiality and  
Its Relationship to Ego Development  
and Self-Representation

**DOCTORAL PROJECT COMMITTEE:**

PROJECT ADVISOR: Beth Hart, Ph.D.  
(Name)  
Professor Pace University  
(Title) (Affiliation)

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Florence Denmark, Ph.D.  
(Name)  
Professor Pace University  
(Title) (Affiliation)

**FINAL APPROVAL OF COMPLETED PROJECT:**

I have read the final version of the doctoral project and certify that it meets the relevant requirements for the Psy.D. degree in School-Community Psychology.

Beth Hart  
(Project Advisor's Signature)

9/10/92  
(Date)

Florence L. Denmark  
(Project Consultant's Signature)

9/10/92  
(Date)

**"...Every human being is capable of creating a neurosis,  
a psychosis, a pathological character pattern,  
a sexual perversion, a work of art, a dream,  
or a psychosomatic malady."**

**Joyce McDougall (1974)**

PREVIEW



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank everyone who along the way has shared an inspiring thought or a moment of pleasure with me. In particular I give special thanks .....

To Beth Hart who, from the very beginning of this process, has been a true mentor, inspiring my professional and personal growth with endless generosity of spirit and never flagging intellectual curiosity. I could not have done it without you. I am grateful for so much....but most of all for your friendship.

To Florence Denmark who has shown steadfast optimism and the utmost faith in my ability to succeed in this process of becoming a true professional. I thank you.

To Steve Salbod who has been exceedingly generous with his time, support and expertise. I thank you for that and, most of all, for your wonderful sense of humor which actually made moments of this process enjoyable.

To my parents, Sylvia and Ralph, and to my family, Kathy, Robert, Gregory, Alexandra, Ralph, Joanne, Ralphie and Billy, who have lovingly supported my desire to finish, and to that end, have accepted my apologies and absences as I've traversed this long and arduous path. Thank you.

To Aviva Rohde and Janis McAdams who have travelled this path with me and have demonstrated an ability to see this process through to the end. I thank you for your generous nature and your friendship. Your presence has enlivened the journey.

To Denise Hien, Robert Mitchell et al. who have provided a sanctuary; levity and love through this oftentimes lonely ordeal. I'm so grateful. And to Denise who has shown me that it is possible to survive and thrive, special thanks.

To Lisa Breslow and to all my Dunewind housemates who have been a source of enjoyment, sanity and sustenance in these final months. I'm already looking forward to our next summer.

To Linda Graham, Jim Ward, Carol Wachs and Dolores Maytrott who know just how difficult this process can be and offered encouragement, understanding and words of wisdom. Your friendship means so much.

To Carole Grand who was able to see my potential when I couldn't, and has imparted that ability to me. For that and much more..... I thank you.

And to the inspiration which enabled me to finish and get on with my life...many thanks.

N.C.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements.....                                    | iv  |
| List of Tables and Figure.....                           | vii |
| Abstract.....  | ix  |
| Chapter I. INTRODUCTION.....                             | 1   |
| Statement of the Problem.....                            | 1   |
| Review of the Literature.....                            | 3   |
| History of Psychosomatic Thought.....                    | 3   |
| Psychoanalytic Theories on Psychosomatics.....           | 6   |
| The Deficit Theory.....                                  | 6   |
| The Regression Theory.....                               | 8   |
| Specificity versus Nonspecificity Theories.....          | 10  |
| Psychosomatic Potentiality - A Heterogeneous Theory..... | 11  |
| Symbol Formation.....                                    | 16  |
| Ego Development.....                                     | 20  |
| Ego Categories.....                                      | 21  |
| Adolescence.....   | 21  |
| Developmental Positions.....                             | 23  |
| Gender Differences.....                                  | 27  |
| Hypotheses.....  | 33  |
| Chapter II. METHOD.....                                  | 35  |
| Participants.....  | 35  |
| Procedure.....   | 35  |
| Instruments.....   | 36  |
| Chapter III. RESULTS.....                                | 42  |
| Ego Development.....                                     | 42  |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Ego Development and Gender.....                                | 43  |
| Ego Development Categories and Somatic Complaints.....         | 44  |
| Ego Development Categories and Self-Representation Positions.. | 47  |
| Gender Differences and Self-Representation Positions.....      | 50  |
| Somatic Complaints and Self-Representation Positions.....      | 52  |
| Somatic Complaints, Self-Representation and Ego Categories.... | 54  |
| Supplementary Analyses with Modified Somatic Complaint Scale.. | 59  |
| Gender Differences and Somatic Complaints.....                 | 62  |
| Somatic Complaints, Self-Representation and Ego Categories.... | 64  |
| Summary of Results.....  | 67  |
| Chapter IV. DISCUSSION.....                                    | 69  |
| Contributions to School/Community Psychology.....              | 86  |
| Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research. | 87  |
| REFERENCES.....  | 89  |
| APPENDICES   |     |
| Appendix A.....  | 96  |
| Instructions   |     |
| Appendix B.....  | 98  |
| Achenbach Youth Self-Report                                    |     |
| Somatic Complaint Scale  |     |
| Modified Somatic Complaint Scale                               |     |
| Appendix C.....  | 103 |
| Loevinger Sentence Completion Test                             |     |
| Appendix D.....  | 105 |
| Pace Profile: Positions in Adolescence                         |     |
| Items in Positions   |     |

## LIST OF TABLES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Ego Development Levels - Total Protocol Rating.....  | 42 |
| 2. Frequencies of Males and Females at Ego Development<br>Categories.....   | 43 |
| 3. Means and Standard Deviations For Boys and Girls on Somatic<br>Complaints Scale (YSR) at Ego Development Categories.....                               | 45 |
| 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Representation<br>Positions at Ego Development Categories.....  | 48 |
| 5. Univariate F Tests of Self-Representation Positions and<br>Categories of Ego Development.....  | 49 |
| 6. Means and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on Self-<br>Representation Positions .....   | 51 |
| 7. Intercorrelations between Somatic Complaints (YSR) and Self-<br>Representation Position (PIA) for Males and Females.....                               | 53 |
| 8. MGAs: Somatic Complaints (YSR), Self-Representation Position<br>and Ego Categories - Males.....  | 55 |
| 9. MGAs: Somatic Complaints (YSR), Self-Representation Position<br>and Ego Categories - Girls.....  | 56 |
| 10. Significant Correlations of Somatic Complaints (YSR) and<br>Self-Representation Positions at Ego Development Categories<br>for Males and Females..... | 58 |
| 11. Means and Standard Deviations for Modified Somatic Complaint<br>Scale and Items at Ego Development Categories.....                                    | 60 |
| 12. Univariate F Tests of Modified Somatic Complaint Scale and<br>Items and Ego Development Categories.....   | 61 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 13. Means and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on the<br>Modified Somatic Complaint Scale and Items..... | 63 |
| 14. MGAs: Modified Somatic Complaint Scale Males and Females..  | 65 |
| 15. MGAs: Modified Somatic Scale - Sex as a Covariate.....  | 66 |

## FIGURES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Ego Development Categories and Somatic Complaints (YSR) for<br>Boys and Girls..... | 46 |
|---|----|

PREVIEW

## ABSTRACT

The present study explored psychosomatic phenomena by examining the relationship of self-reported somatic complaints to ego development and self-representation in a nonclinical adolescent population. The study was conducted with 246 adolescents, 98 males and 148 females, ages 14 through 18 years. The adolescents' scores on somatic items of the Youth Self Report (YSR) (Achenbach, 1982) were examined with categories of ego development (Washington University Sentence Completion Test (SCT) Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) and dimensions of self-representation (Pace Profile: Positions in Adolescence (PIA), Hart 1988).

The central hypotheses predicted relationships among self-reported somatic complaints, ego category, gender and self-representation. Results of analyses confirmed the hypotheses that Ego Development Category explains self-reported somatic complaints. A trend analysis affirmed a significant quadratic component for boys and for girls, demonstrating a curvilinear relationship between ego category and somatic complaints. Somatic complaints were reported with greater frequency by the Preconformist and Postconformist subjects.

The results also supported the hypothesis that the self-representation positions would be related to the frequency of somatic complaints. The overall relationships were such that the positions more reflective of pathology correlated positively with somatic complaints and those which reflect health correlated negatively with somatic complaints. The results supported the

existence of gender differences in the frequency of reported somatic complaints. The findings suggest that females report more somatic complaints than do their male counterparts. Post hoc tests revealed that the items contributing most strongly to the differences were items associated with the menstrual cycle.

The interactive model which proposed that the relationship between somatic complaints and self-representation would vary at different levels of ego development within and between the sexes was not supported by statistical analyses. However, subsequent correlational analyses revealed significant relationships between self-reported somatic complaints and self-representation positions at the various ego categories. The findings were discussed in relation to contemporary psychoanalytic theory. Additionally, practical implications for the identification and referral of psychosomatic adolescents were addressed.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### Statement of the Problem

The relationship between mind and body has fascinated and mystified philosophers and scientists throughout history. In the twentieth century, there has been a growing attempt on the part of psychoanalysts to understand the delicate and permeable boundary which exists between the psyche and the soma.

Psychoanalysts beginning with Freud have pondered the etiology and meaning of psychosomatic illness. Most contemporary analysts attribute etiological significance to the modes of understanding and communication in the mother-infant dyad (Edgecumbe, 1984; Winnicott, 1960; Fain, 1963, cited in McDougall; McDougall, 1974, 1980). The earliest patterns of interaction in the mother-infant dyad serve to organize the infant's somatic and psychic experiences and to determine the infant's ability to manage, contain and express affective states. In somatization, the body expresses emotions whose origins have not been identified, and thus, conflicts and desires are felt as somatic experiences. While body language, or somatization, functions in infancy to alert the mother to the infant's basic needs, that is, her/his tensions, desires, hunger; in adolescence and adulthood, more complex experiences, reactions and needs cannot be adequately communicated (Edgecumbe, 1984).

While incidence and prevalence figures vary, there are strong indications that psychosomatic illness accounts for many



physician appointments and emergency room visits. This holds true for children and adolescents, as well as for adults. Starfield et. al (1980) reported that children and adolescents with psychosomatic illnesses accounted for between 5.7 and 10.8% of all pediatric patients.

Adolescents undergo dramatic physical, developmental and sexual maturation. The somatic complaints which often accompany these changes may reflect the normal stresses of this developmental stage, or may be indicative of either real or perceived threats to the adolescent's sense of self; or, significant feelings of loss, inadequacy, or despair. Their emotional distress often goes unnoticed by parents, school personnel and other professionals. The accurate assessment of, and appropriate referral for these adolescents is critical, particularly in light of the high incidence of maladaptive behaviors, depression, and suicide in the adolescent population.

The author hopes to provide an understanding of psychosomatic symptoms in a non-clinical population of adolescents by exploring the relationship between psychosomatic complaints, ego development and self-representation. Such knowledge will serve to inform parents, school personnel and physicians which might then prompt appropriate referrals and subsequently, adequate treatment. In addition, the exploration will help guide the psychoanalytic treatment of psychosomatic adolescents.

## Review of the Literature

### History of Psychosomatic Thought

The popularity of psychosomatic concepts has been inextricably linked with the cultural climate of the times, flourishing in times of intellectual curiosity and scientific growth, and fading in more conservative and reactionary times. In ancient times, physical illnesses were thought to be punishments by the gods or by malignant spirits. Ceremonies of healing occurred in temples where music, dance and prayer were utilized to drive evil spirits away.

By the fifth century B.C., more rational approaches grew in the intellectual climate of ancient Greece. Hippocrates emphasized the importance of the relationship between the patient and the physician, and the role of the environment and of adaptive factors in health and in illness. Health was regarded as natural homeostatic harmony, and, in contrast, disease was viewed as resulting from an imbalance in the interaction among: the four essential elements that compose the earth; the four humors that control health and illness; the basic character types corresponding to the humors; and cosmology (Schwab, 1985).

When the ancient Greek and Roman civilizations declined, so did the more rational, scientific understanding of the mind-body relationship. All illnesses, particularly mental illnesses, were considered religious concerns. Demonology was viewed as causal in the afflictions of the body and the mind.

This explanatory mode remained prominent throughout the Middle Ages.

The Renaissance once again brought a revival of learning, a weakening of the influence of the Church, and the development of science. Bacon advocated a new experimental method to investigate the relationships of the mind and body, and between the individual and society. He wrote of "...the sympathies and concordances between the mind and the body, which being mixed, cannot be properly assigned the sciences of either" (cited in Schwab, 1985, p. 584.).

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the introduction of quantitative measures in the sciences led to new discoveries and observations. In the Hippocratic tradition, physicians noted the influence of events and emotions on physical health. At the same time, Descartes further developed the concept of Dualism, which appealed to many theologians, philosophers and scientists. This separation of the mind and the body did not threaten the established social order and the authority of the Church. Until the mid-eighteenth century, the concept of dualism thwarted the spread of any theories espousing mind-body unity (Schwab, 1985).

The decline of the authority of the church and feudalism, and the triumph of rationalism in the latter part of the eighteenth century, led to an intellectual climate in which the influence of emotions on physical illness could be legitimate areas of study. In the early nineteenth century, Reil, a

physician and researcher, first used the word psychiatry. He viewed the human experience as a unity of the mind-body experience. And, Heinroth, the first professor of psychology at the University of Leipzig, was the first to use the word psychosomatic. His school of followers, the Psychiker, maintained that an understanding of the mind in health and illness was essential (Schwab, 1985). However, these views were soon rejected as abstract and scientifically invalid and in the latter part of the nineteenth century, psychosomatic concepts were, once again unpopular.

In Paris, Charcot was working with hypnosis to eliminate symptoms without organic basis, demonstrating the power of the mind over the body. Sigmund Freud, then a young neurologist from Vienna, travelled to Paris to learn the technique. He returned to Vienna to apply hypnosis to his patients suffering with conversion symptoms. He soon began a collaboration with Breuer, a more established physician, who was also experimenting with hypnotism. A groundbreaking book, Studies in Hysteria, resulted from this period of collaboration.

These studies laid the foundation of psychoanalytic theory, the concept that all communications; associations, parathesias, conversion symptoms; were expressions of desires and wishes which were unacceptable to one's personal and societal values. Thus, these feelings were repressed, becoming part of the unconscious. They posited that, while outside of one's awareness these feelings continued to impact on the functioning of the individual

(Freud & Breuer, 1893-1895).

In the twentieth century, the mind-body problem has come under the purview of psychoanalysts who have attempted to understand the complexity and richness of this relationship.

### Psychoanalytic Theories on Psychosomatics

"...The unconscious exerts on the somatic processes an influence of far greater plastic power than the conscious act ever can."

Freud (1917)

Two major psychoanalytic hypotheses have been formulated to explain psychosomatic symptom formation. Both emphasized the critical importance of the separation process which occurs in the context of the mother-child relationship. Core representations of self and other arise through the separation process. These internal representations provide the basis of an individual's sense of self-definition and identity (Winnicott, 1960; Klein, 1948). One hypothesis maintained that psychosomatic individuals exhibit global deficits in affect regulation, internalization and symbolization. The other school of thought proposed that psychosomatic illness occurs as a result of weaknesses in representational capacity and regression to earlier modes of coping.

### The Deficit Theory of Psychosomatic Illness: The Paris School

According to proponents of this school of thought, including Winnicott (1966) and McDougall (1974, 1982, 1989), ego weaknesses arise as a consequence of an early impingement of the maternal

shield, that which Winnicott termed 'not good enough mothering'. Individuals who have experienced such impingements demonstrate deficits in the mental representation of the maternal image. The weakness in representational capacity leads to disturbances in affective, symbolic and self-care functions, as well as disturbances in the mental representation of the body. These difficulties are ultimately expressed in psychosomatic symptom formation. The deficit described suggests a relationship between psychosomatic phenomena and lower levels of ego development, ego development being contingent upon self-other differentiation and self-object representations.

Adolescent and adult individuals prone to serious somatization have been described in the literature as demonstrating pseudo-normality (McDougall, 1974) and normotics (Bollas, 1986) which both refer to a mode of operating in the external world with a robot-like adjustment (McDougall, p. 444). In addition, psychosomatic individuals are thought to display: more primitive defenses, unavailability of affect, a lack of imaginative capacity, and difficulties with verbal communication (McDougall, 1974; Edgecumbe, 1984; Neri, 1985; Vassend, 1987; Gustafson & Kallman, 1990).

Gustafson and Kallman (1990) compared adult patients who carried the diagnosis of primary somatic body pain with those who carried the diagnosis of secondary psychosomatic body pain. The diagnoses were made at a pain clinic after extensive clinical somatic evaluations and psychological depth interviews. They

found that the psychosomatic patients utilized more primitive defenses than did the somatic patients. Such results support the model which predicts a linear relationship between ego development and psychosomatic phenomena.

#### The Regression Theory of Psychosomatic Illness

The other major psychoanalytic school of thought, represented by Schur, Sperling and Krystal, postulated that, in most respects, psychosomatic individuals have adaptive ego functions and, the psychosomatic symptoms result as a consequence of a regression to earlier modes where infantile responses to stress and anxiety are reactivated.

Krystal (1978) discussed regression as a possible response to infantile or adult trauma. He proposed the existence of varying degrees of severity of illness and, along that continuum, regression from a position where affects were verbalized, desomatized and differentiated to a position of undifferentiation and resomatization. Thus, the regression results in the development of psychosomatic phenomena. Krystal maintained that the self-representations of psychosomatic individuals prohibit self-care and true ownership of their bodies. The failure to assume the self-care function is inhibited in order to protect the connection to the mother (Krystal, 1978). Mothering activities are reserved for the mothering one who has not been adequately internalized.

Sperling (1968) also attributed psychosomatic phenomena to regressions to earlier coping patterns. She maintained that

psychosomatic individuals have internalized an image, however, the image is of a pathogenic symbiotic relationship. She noted that the psychosomatic relationship, while originating earlier in life, becomes evident in the anal phases of development as the maturational processes allow for a greater degree of separation. Separation at the anal stage is fraught with the toddler's conflicting set of wishes for separation and blissful merger. A secure attachment at this stage enables the process. However, Sperling believed that in some individuals, the internalized image of the mother demands denial of aspects of the child's aggression, sexuality, self-assertion and striving for independence. Thus, any assertion or impulse toward assertion in these individuals results in the fear of object loss. The child feels accepted by the mother when he/she is symptomatic and rejected when he/she is healthy (Sperling, 1968).

The psychosomatic response reflects a compromise formation, a pathological solution to the unresolved separation conflict. The psychosomatic individual achieves immediate discharge of impulses, wishes and fantasies, via a relationship with an internalized object. The impulses are acted out internally in the various symptoms. Sperling elaborated similarities between the psychosomatic patient and the acting out patient. She attributed these similarities to the patient's common intolerance of tension and the urge for immediate discharge. Additionally, she described both types of patients as demonstrating a need for omnipotent control of their objects (Sperling, 1963). Sperling