

“Impact of Sociocultural and Institutional Belonging on Psychoanalytic Training” IPSO Research*

ANDREA R. Q. DE PEREIRA; MARIA RITA RAGAU; LAURA
BORENSZTEIN; ISABEL RAMALLO; EDUARDO RUSSO¹

What are the implications of belonging to a psychoanalytic training institute, to an organization of candidates, to an association of psychoanalysis, to Fepal (the Latin American Psychoanalytic Federation), or to IPA? We can probably say that we belong to several organizations that operate in different environments but share the same professional activity, that of psychoanalysts.

This paper describes some of the various ways of institutional belonging in three regions: Latin America, North America and Europe. The study is based on research carried out by IPSO entitled “International Perspective in Psychoanalytic Training and Local Institutional Culture”. Its object is to contribute to psychoanalytic training by providing candidate opinion.

Notwithstanding the vast bibliography available on the subject, few articles describe the experience of those to whom training is directed. In our mind, this is the first research on international training done by candidates. We wish to acknowledge their generous and disinterested participation in the study.

We hope that this analysis of the opinions of candidates may prove useful to training institutes in their attempt at improving their teaching activities.

One of the objectives of the study is to find out the ways in which social reality -expressed in terms of local institutional culture- is present in the mindset of candidates.

* Published in *Psicoanálisis. Revista de la Asociación Psicoanalítica de Bs. As. (Psicoanálisis e instituciones. Vol. 3, 2004).*

The paper content only expresses the authors' opinion based on research findings.

¹ **Mentor:** Prof. Peter Fonagy

Supervisors: Dr. Janine Puget
Dr. Adela Leibovich de Duarte

Principal Investigator:
Lic. Andrea R. Q. de Pereira, Apdeba

Co- Investigators :
Lic. María Rita Ragau, Apdeba
Lic. Silvia Jadur, APA
Lic. Ariel Liberman, SAP
Dr., Lee Jaffe, SDPA

Data Analysis Consultant: Dr. Andrés Roussos

Fiscal and Administrative Authority: Asociación Psicoanalítica de Buenos Aires (the Buenos Aires Psychoanalytic Association)

First Phase: funded by Ipsos

Second Phase: funded by Ipsos and by the IPA Research Advisory Board

This paper, aimed at generating thought in connection with the opinion of a group of candidates vis-a-vis training, is structured as follows:

- a- Research development
- b- The Tripartite Model – IPA’s psychoanalytic training model
- c- Modes of institutional belonging
- d- Can unavoidably transmitted training inconsistencies be thought?
- e- The future of psychoanalysis - a joint responsibility

a) Research Development:
IPSO Research: “International Perspective in Psychoanalytic Training and Local Institutional Culture”
(Status of ongoing research)

Questions:

- ❖ What are the differences and similarities in the way candidates from different regions experience psychoanalytic training?
- ❖ Do candidates consider that local culture is reflected in local institutional psychoanalytic culture? How?

Research was carried out in two phases:

❖ **First Phase**²:

252 candidates from Latin America, North America and Europe completed a questionnaire by e-mailⁱ. The questionnaire included 18 questions referred to the organizational nature of the training received and two questions related to the interest of candidates and, in their opinion, the interest of their institute, in 67 authors listed.³

² Questionnaire sent by e-mail.
Technical support provided by CyberPsych.org.
Collaborator: Lic. Noelia Díaz

³ Based on research by Victoria Hamilton (“The Analyst’s Preconscious”, 1996) and by Adela Leibovich de Duarte (“Inferencia clínica y marco referencial teórico”, 2002).

The size and characteristics of the total candidate population are unknown since neither IPA nor IPSO, to date, has a candidate database.⁴ The lack of information was the first obstacle encountered and represented a challenge in our attempt to explore what candidates thought of their training.

While this non-probabilistic sample prevents us from making direct inferences on the candidate population, we have no data inferring that the rest of the population behaves differently. In the way of preliminary results, this paper presents some similarities and differences identified in the 3 regions.

Some of the **similarities** found are related to age and gender of candidates, their possibility of choosing analysts and supervisors, and the monetary value assigned to each part of the tripartite model if given the choice.

Some of the **differences** had to do with the professional degree granted to candidates and their membership to the society to which their institute belonged. Also, the size of the societies to which candidates answering the questionnaire belong, the amount of official supervisions required, the institute's curriculum (open, closed or mixed), the number of patients from a center belonging to the society or the training institute that are referred to the candidate for official supervision. The **proportion of income candidates would be willing to assign to training and the interest in the various authors also differed.**

❖ **Second Phase**⁵:

Out of 94 semi-structured interviews to candidates from the three regions, 7 had to be discarded for technical reasons.

This non-probabilistic sample of 87 interviews included 32 interviews to candidates from Latin America, 29 to candidates from North America and 26 to candidates from Europe.

The interviewer was a candidate of a different region from that of the interviewee.

⁴ Information provided by Dr Lee Jaffe (former President of IPSO) and by Piers Pendred, (IPA General Manager), July 2003.

⁵ SECOND PHASE

Candidate to candidate interviews.

Collaborators: Lic. Laura Borensztein, Dra. Isabel Ramallo, Lic. Eduardo Russo, Lic. M. Adela Laserna, Lic. Isabel Moreno.

Interviews were classified following 160 codes that relate to categories and enable to explore local institutional culture from the point of view of candidates.ⁱⁱ

The data collected was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively

The overall inter-judge reliability for the second phase of the study was determined in three stages to be able to follow the evolution of training directed to judges.ⁱⁱⁱ

b) The Tripartite Model – IPA’s Psychoanalytic Training Model

Many of the questions asked during the interview to candidates focus on psychoanalytic training and, more specifically, on the tripartite model that sustains it.

Following this model, the questions were divided into three sections: Analysis, Supervision and Seminars.

At some other point, it would be interesting to evaluate the ideological implications of the questions prepared by investigators who form part of the population studied. That would give rise to a debate on the very assumptions of the study.

- ❖ The answers regarding the monetary value assigned to each part of the tripartite model if given the choice were similar in the three regions: Analysis, Supervision and Seminars (in that order and with similar percentages). The answers regarding the order in which candidates valued each part of the tripartite model were surprisingly consistent in the three regions.⁶

The 94 interviews to candidates from 9 institutes in the three regions revealed that interviewees and interviewers recognized each other in the language used and the concerns they shared, probably as a result of having been trained at IPA institutes. The interviews were felt to be useful and some candidates considered the interview had contributed to their own training.

On analyzing the results, it appears that candidates question some specific aspects of training, e.g. the criteria used to consider a

⁶ With n=247, candidates assigned 46% to analysis, 30% to supervision and 24 % to seminars. The difference between regions was not significant. (I, First Phase).

supervision as such, the frequency of sessions, and the nature of the seminars among others.

- ❖ However, we must point out that none of the candidates interviewed questioned the actual tripartite model.

Can we consider the tripartite model as a legacy handed down by tradition in training, a mark of identity that unifies and is recognized by all the members of a community, beyond regional or cultural differences?

The tripartite model still is the only model that serves as backbone to psychoanalytic training in the different regions. Leaving virtues and defects aside, this model has never been questioned since its establishment in the 1920's, nor has there been any consideration on the extent to which cultural aspects may produce changes in its configuration.

In a study on psychoanalytic education, Elías Mallet da Rocha Barros (2000) refers to the critical attitude towards training assumed by psychoanalysts today. He relates such nonconformity to the fact that training has remained unchanged since the tripartite model was established in 1920, while the world around us has changed dramatically. There appears to be a complacent acceptance of the differences, a kind of conceptual indifference that does not nurture thought and keeps us in a state of intellectual somnolence. We tend to rest on authors we adopt without examining them critically.

The fact that no candidate has proposed to review or question the tripartite model could suggest that this is a transmitted value that discourages criticism or creative thinking. This, indeed, deserves further study in connection with membership.

Is the tripartite model per se a generator of some form of institutional belonging? Maintaining a structure -which is not questionable in itself- speaks of an institution's mark of identity. Indeed, that which refers to the founding act of institutionalized training and is therefore unquestionable, can become a mark of identity for the group. The mark, not subject to change, enables to determine the subject's institutional belonging, either by inclusion or by exclusion.

Is the tripartite model actually supported by institutional belonging? And if so, what does institutional belonging imply? How is it built? Are there other more complex modes of belonging?

Can we envisage change in IPA's requirements related to training? Will there be new ways of teaching psychoanalysis and training analysts? Is training possible without the tripartite model?

"Acquired psychoanalytic culture often establishes itself as a scheme that ensures permanence and grants unquestionable belonging at the institutional level. It thus becomes one of the unconscious components of belonging that appears as a symptom in stereotypes, fashions, and fanatic use of terms that are void of meaning " (Puget, 2001).

c- Modes of Institutional Belonging

Local institutional culture must be understood as a construct in the interface of two discourses: that of local culture and that employed by the psychoanalytic institute where the candidate is trained (Lewkowicz, I.).

The subjectivity of the future analyst, in our view, builds on the culture of the candidate's institute, country and region.

We have assumed there are different modes of institutional belonging. In order to explore further, we have assigned categories to key institutions and personalities belonging to both local and institutional culture. Such modes of belonging may be studied in connection with adherence to schools of thought, the way differences are handled, and the various forms of acknowledgement.

Sociocultural belonging is defined as the actions and attitudes related to the candidate's religious, socioeconomic, cultural and ethical belonging.

Institutional belonging is defined as the actions that express the candidate's relationship with key figures and institutions. ⁱⁱ

Belonging is imposed on a candidate the moment the candidate accepts to form part of the group of candidates and/or future analysts.

Although forced to belong, the candidate is still responsible for deciding how to make that place his/her own. Training does not seem to assign much importance to the fact that belonging implies working together, doing with others.

Let us take a look at what the study has found in this connection:

- ❖ Out of 64 candidates training in an IPA institute, 25 chose to study there because of the nature and prestige of the training program. 15 chose that type of training because of its ties with key institutional figures, while 10 candidates considered that

was the only institution that trained analysts in their area of residence. 7 candidates chose an IPA institute for the prestige of the association or of the institute and the remaining 7 candidates were ignorant of the fact that the institute belonged to IPA.⁷

Berenstein and Puget (1997) state, "Just like they got in touch with their own unconscious by rendering conscious some of its effects, psychoanalysts should get in touch with their own social belonging and, naturally, with their own ability to make conscious some of the components of that insertion.

39 per cent of candidates said they had chosen an IPA institute for the prestige and nature of its training. The data does not specify what kind of prestige. Candidates refer to certain aspects of training, without describing them.

- ❖ Out of 69 candidates, 54% were IPSO members (34% because they were interested in the organization, 10% through automatic affiliation, and the remaining 10 % for unspecified reasons), 46 % said they were not members of the organization (17 % for lack of interest and 29 % for lack of information).

The lack of interest in the organization and the lack of information not only speak of the candidates themselves but also of what IPSO really means to the various institutes, associations, and to IPA.

The research does not account for the lack of interest in a more specific manner. However, some of the answers provided give some hints as to what the candidates think of the organization.

Let us see what the study has to say with regard to the modes of institutional belonging linked to adherence to authors and schools of thought:

⁷ 2 candidates belong to Latin American institutes, 3 are from North American institutes and the remaining 2 belong to European institutes (I, Second Phase)

❖ **The last two questions of the questionnaire requested candidates to express their interest and, in their opinion, the interest of their institute, in 67 authors listed.**

❖ The interest of candidates in the various authors and their opinion regarding the interest they believed their institute had in them was similar in the three regions.⁸

❖ This congruence does not vary when relating it to the years of training of each candidate⁹, to the size of the training institute¹⁰, or to the curricula.¹¹

The answers provided show the interest of candidates in harmonizing their own expectations and those thought to be imposed on them by the institution.

The yearning for belonging can unconsciously make the candidate prisoner of the knowledge acquired and lead him/her to renounce to the possibility of choosing how to belong for the sake of occupying a place. (Puget, J. 2003)

We thought it important to investigate whether a single theory prevailed in institutes or whether several co-existed; in other words, whether candidates could also explore the differences in comparing other schools of thought.

❖ **Out of 58 candidates who answered the question on the school or schools of thought that prevailed in their institute, 39 candidates (67 %) identified their institute with a single school of thought.^{iv}**

In 1987, Sandler wondered whether the unavoidable indoctrination of training was actually undesirable and, if it was, what could be done about it.

⁸ Results obtained from comparing the 67 authors show a correlation between classes in the range of 0.63 - 0.86. This was statistically significant ($P < 0.01$.)

⁹ A discriminating analysis was carried out to evaluate this question. **(I, First Phase)**

¹⁰ A discriminating analysis was carried out to evaluate this question. **(I, First Phase)**

¹¹ In order to find out how the candidate's readings matched those considered by the candidate as representative of his/her institute, the difference between the values corresponding to each author was calculated to establish a mean. An analysis of variance was done taking into account that distance and the type of curricula. The analysis showed no effect between the institute's curricula and the distance between readings. **(I, First Phase)**

It seems training does not prepare us to practice a critical and at the same time creative mode of belonging.

d- Can unavoidably transmitted training inconsistencies be thought or modified?

Training inconsistencies are transmitted to us during training and have no chance of being questioned or of generating thought because the assumptions on which that training is organized are not to be questioned.

The difficulty of questioning the tripartite model –already alluded to– is a type of inconsistency.

Inconsistencies may be thought both in connection with the content of what is transmitted as with the manner in which such transmission is carried out. We wanted to know whether inconsistencies necessarily became obstacles or if, on the contrary, they could promote curiosity and thus produce knowledge.

Berenstein (2004) states that “anybody who is the object of learning is unaware of the assumptions on which such learning is based.” Further on he says, “The subject is taught to be actively ignorant of inconsistencies of the social environment and the institutions to which he/she belongs”

Here, again, is a link between belonging and inconsistencies. Inconsistencies are transmitted without the subject having any influence over that action. According to Berenstein, education is part of every training project. Wherever there is training –of analysts, in this case–, there is education. “However, the educational component in training that is non explicit and transmitted together with knowledge, has a profound unconscious effect.” (p. 173)

What do we understand by “unconscious effect”? That which the subject cannot account for because he/she is subject to that effect? If so, how can we envisage training psychoanalysts without the “educational component”? Would we refer to “non educated” psychoanalysts?

The solution is probably not in sustaining the dichotomy between training and education by a mere substitution of terms, but rather in envisaging an educational-formative model that gives the subject “the possibility of choosing the mode of belonging”.

In that sense, inconsistencies refer mainly to the mode of transmission, to the actual transmitting action, education being ultimately at stake.

Another way of interpreting inconsistencies refers to content, i.e. to the knowledge produced in psychoanalytic training.

The challenge of teaching, in fact, lies in being able to question its modes of organization so that it (teaching) does not constitute a barrier to the knowledge. (Lévy, P. 1995)

In that sense, if we want to include the teaching of psychoanalysis in the field of transmission, we cannot do without "Denkarbeit" (the work of thinking) on the transmitter's side who, as an analyst, is continuously exposed to the unexpected effects teaching produces in him/her.

Let us take a look at the data provided by the study in relation to institutional belonging linked to schools of thought and to authors:

❖ **During the first phase of the study we were able to group candidates in each region according to their interest in different authors.**

During the second phase, prediction efficiency showed that candidates grouped by school of thought and by authors in each region followed the same pattern described in the first phase. ^{iv v}

❖ Authors mainly have influence in the country where they have developed their work. Exceptionally, there are some European authors who have had more influence in Latin America than in Europe.¹²

❖ In Europe, authors read are largely European and American. No Latin American authors are read there. In North America, mostly American and European authors are read, as opposed to very few Latin American authors.

¹² This information was analyzed using the non-parametric test of Kruskal Wallis and then Fligner Policello's method in order to show the presence of significant differences between groups.

In Latin America, European and Latin American authors are evenly read, while American authors are read significantly less.¹³

Training seems to be influenced by the geographic, historic and cultural context. Can this be thought and, consequently, modified, or can it only be transmitted?

Bernardi (2003) asks, "What kind of change leads analysts to modify their theoretical and technical ideas?" He notes that "the changes in the theoretical and technical positions do not go together with a systematic examination of the different ideas at stake and a specification of the reasons in favor of and against each one of them. As a general rule, in publications and during training, only the positive aspects of the preferred approach are stressed, and criticisms are generally omitted. Training does not include the systematic evaluation of alternatives, exploring the arguments in favor of and against each position".

Another finding of this study relates to the way in which the cultural factors of the regions may impact differently on analytic practice and ideas. Can the preference for certain analytic theories and techniques represent a cultural factor of significance for the treatment of patients in a given region? Once again, the question is whether training programs take these factors into account.

f- The Future of Psychoanalysis -A Joint Responsibility.

One of the challenges before us was to detect in the interviews the correlation between the principal problems prevailing in a social context and their impact on training.

We questioned candidates on the likelihood of a relationship between the scientific production of psychoanalytic institutions and the topics that concern their societies:

- ❖ The analysis of the interviews showed that the main social problems mentioned by the candidates that promote scientific production in the 3 regions are: social violence, sociocultural differences, sexuality, the socioeconomic crisis, current

¹³ This information was analyzed using the non-parametric test of Kruskal Wallis and then Fligner Policello's method in order to show the presence of significant differences between groups.

psychopathologies, interrelation with other sciences, and access to psychoanalysis (Pereira, A. et al, 2004).¹⁴

- ❖ The concern for social and cultural differences is present in all the regions.
- ❖ Psychoanalytic production in Latin America seems to be mainly driven by the concerns of the community for social violence and the socioeconomic crisis.
- ❖ Psychoanalytic production in North America appears to be driven by the concerns of the community for social violence and sociocultural differences.
- ❖ In Europe, psychoanalytic production seems to be driven by concerns of the community for sexuality and psychopathological problems.

Does Psychoanalysis have a future? Does it call for changes? What changes?

- ❖ Out of 71 candidates, 39 believe that the future of psychoanalysis depends on its capability to change, 23 candidates believe in the future of psychoanalysis with or without change, 9 candidates are pessimistic as to the future of psychoanalysis.
- ❖ 30 answers referring to the need for change, focus on the way psychoanalysis relates to society in general.
- ❖ Only 4 answers underscore the need to modify training.¹⁵

The study by Szecsödy (2004) and our study express similar concerns. Although all the subjects interviewed insist on the value of working for the future of psychoanalysis, why is it that they have no serious plans to modify training to match the dramatically changing environment future psychoanalysts will have to face?

Is it possible to expect a change in the relationship between psychoanalysis and society without introducing change to training?

How are we to interpret the answers of 9 candidates who were pessimistic about the psychoanalysis they are being taught?

Can changes introduced to training generate new expectations?

¹⁴ With n= 72, 17 candidates referred to social violence, 15 to sociocultural differences, 12 to sexuality, 10 to the socioeconomic crisis, 9 to current psychopathologies, 5 to interrelation with other sciences, 4 to access to psychoanalysis. **(I., Second Phase)**

¹⁵ Research, Second Phase.

Auchincloss and Michels (2001) propose encouraging trainees to search and ask questions to the authority in class, attitudes that in our daily practice -they remind us- we encourage in our own patients.

Thomä (1993) proposes the learning, analysis and research triad as the basis for reform.

Such concerns lead us to examine **prejudice** vis-a-vis change, in the manner proposed by David Sachs. "...I have worked over 20 years in establishing new psychoanalytic training centers in both the United States as member and then Chair of the Committee on New Training Facilities (CNTF) of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and later as member and Chair of the IPA New Groups Committee (ING). During this period and continuing into the present, every innovative change in educational methods stimulated strong opposition. ...To create a future, in which training builds on the accumulated wisdom of the past, it is necessary not to repeat the limitations of the past during the educational experience....."

By stressing the need for change in psychoanalysis without associating it to training, candidates are probably repeating a mode of belonging already described in this paper. A belonging characterized by acritically assuming established values, not holding themselves responsible for exercising creative criticism.

Must training undergo a crisis before it can change? Referring to the crisis of psychoanalysis, Aslan (2004) argues that psychoanalysis led its time into a crisis because it was ahead of its time, and adds that psychoanalysis enters into a crisis when it falls behind the times.

We thought it important to observe to what extent candidates are able to question certain institutional values or mandates that warrant a sense of belonging if adhered to.

We believe that the future of psychoanalysis, from the point of view of training, largely depends on the way in which the differences are dealt with. If training and belonging are not properly addressed, subjective production will suffer.

The present paper has aroused many questions in connection with the **impact of sociocultural and institutional belonging on psychoanalytic training**. Further research on this topic is necessary. Whatever the final outcome, it is important that we learn from questioning ourselves.

Summary:

This paper presents some preliminary conclusions on the first and second phases of the research carried out by IPSO (International Psychoanalytic Studies Organization) entitled "International Perspective in Psychoanalytic Training and Local Institutional Culture"

The research was sponsored and funded by the IPA Research Advisory Board and by IPSO. APdeBA is the fiscal and administrative authority.

The purpose of this project is to contribute to psychoanalytic training by supplying the point of view of candidates. Notwithstanding the extensive bibliography available on training, very few include the experience of those to whom it is directed.

The research questions are:

- What are the differences and similarities in the way candidates from different regions experience psychoanalytic training?
- Do candidates consider that local culture is reflected in local institutional psychoanalytic culture? How?

After a brief description of the study, the authors provide data and comments on the following:

- The tripartite model – IPA's psychoanalytic training model;
- Modes of institutional belonging
- Can unavoidably transmitted training inconsistencies be thought?
- The future of psychoanalysis – a joint responsibility

Many candidates see the future of psychoanalysis tied to a change in society. However, few relate it to change in training.

They also associate the future of psychoanalysis to the way in which differences are handled, and to the possibility of developing critical and creative belonging.

Kew words: *Psychoanalytic institution, psychoanalytic training, institutional belonging, social belonging, transmission of psychoanalysis, future of psychoanalysis, candidates, research.*

Summary (French version):

L'incidence de l'appartenance socio-culturelle et institutionnelle dans la formation psychanalytique.

Ce travail présente des conclusions préliminaires de la première et la deuxième phase du travail de recherche « Perspective internationale dans la formation psychanalytique et dans la culture locale » réalisé par l'IPSO (Organisation Internationale d'Etudes Psychanalytiques).

La recherche a reçu le support du Research Advisory Board de l'IPA et de l'IPSO. APdeBA est l'autorité fiscale et administrative.

L'objectif de ce travail est d'apporter une contribution à la formation psychanalytique à partir de l'avis des candidats sur leur formation. Malgré l'existence d'une bibliographie étendue sur le sujet "formation", très peu d'articles tiennent compte de l'expérience des candidats.

La recherche porte sur plusieurs questions :

- Quelles sont les différences et les similitudes dans la manière dont les candidats vivent la formation psychanalytique dans les différentes régions ?
- Est-ce que les candidats pensent que la culture locale est présente dans la culture psychanalytique des institutions et de quelle manière?

Après avoir exposé le développement de la recherche, les auteurs ont centré leur analyse sur les aspects suivants:

- le modèle tripartite comme modèle de formation de l'IPA ;
- les modalités de l'appartenance institutionnelle ;
- les inconsistances de la formation, inéluctablement transmises, peuvent-elles être pensées ?
- l'avenir de la psychanalyse, responsabilité et travail à plusieurs.

Un pourcentage élevé de candidats lie l'avenir de la psychanalyse à un changement dans leur rapport avec la société, alors que seuls quelques-uns lient cet avenir à des changements dans la formation.

Mots-clés: Institution psychanalytique. Formation psychanalytique. Appartenance institutionnelle. Appartenance sociale. Transmission de la psychanalyse. Avenir de la psychanalyse. Candidats- recherche.

Final Notes:

ⁱ **1140 e-mails from approximately 4000 candidates**

- ❖ 1140 e-mails sent.
- ❖ 902 e-mails received.
- ❖ 256 questionnaires received.
- ❖ 4 incomplete forms discarded.
- ❖ 252 questionnaires answered.

ⁱⁱ **Interviews were classified following 160 codes related to:**

a) Modes of belonging in terms of institutional culture:

- Theories
- Handling the differences
- Acknowledgement

b) Modes of belonging in terms of local culture:

- Experiences with family and friends
- Experiences related to other training
- Professional experience
- Social experiences
- Previous analytic experience

c) Prospects

d) Others (those arising from the interview material)

e) Key personalities

- Of institutional culture
- Of local culture

f) Institutions

- Of institutional culture
- Of local culture

ⁱⁱⁱ **Inter-judge reliability**

In order to test evaluators in charge of analyzing interview material for skill consistency, an agreement coefficient was used. The Kappa coefficient was used to test nominal measurements in two stages of the research. In the first stage, at the beginning of the evaluation, a preliminary analysis showed reasonable agreement among judges equal to 0.48 (with a range of 0.34-0.65). Following this measurement, the team of judges analyzed the answers once again with the purpose of improving their agreement. A second evaluation six months after the conclusion of the study raised the level of agreement to 0.6 (with a range of 0.52-0.92) showing better inter-judge reliability. A third agreement test will be carried out at the end of the interview evaluation. Finally, the period of lowest agreement will be reviewed.

^{iv} Answers were initially divided according to single or multiple theories, depending on whether the candidate was referring to one or to several theoretical approaches. Answers on the theoretical approach were assigned to categories related to the geographic origin of the authors and of the schools of thought, based on a classification by Marina Altman (2003). We realize this is an arbitrary classification.

When the answer was only “Freud”, it was recorded as such. However, if Freud was mentioned together with another theoretical school, the answer was recorded under that second option, since Freud is considered the father of psychoanalysis. Theoretical schools were basically grouped under the headings “French”, “American”, “English” and “River Plate”.

Schools of Thought – Geographic Origin

Table 7

F-E	Multiple French-English
E-A	Multiple English-American
F-A	Multiple French-American
F-R	Multiple French-River Plate
A-R	Multiple American-River Plate
E-R	Multiple English-River Plate
F	Single French
A	Single American
E	Single English
R	Single River Plate
Fd	Single Freud

^v The answer to the question was positive. A discriminating analysis by region was carried out. 89.5 % of candidates were accurately grouped under the different regions. The separation by region is considered significant.

N= 247

Original Region	Predicted Region			Total
	Europe	North America	Latin America	
Europe	103	4	12	119
%	86.6	3.4	10.1	
USA	1	45	6	52
%	1.9	86.5	11.5	
Latin America	3	0	73	76
%	3.9	0.0	96.1	

- In order to answer this question a Nominal Multilogistic Regression Analysis was done. The prediction efficiency of grouping candidates by region according to theoretical schools and authors is shown on the table.

▪ **Nominal Multilogistic Regression**

Observed	Predicted			Percent Correct
	LA	NA	E	
LA	31	0	0	100.0%
NA (n = 31)	0	28	0	100.0%
E (n = 28)	1	1	24	92.3%
Overall Percent (n = 26)	37.6%	34.1%	28.2%	97.6%

References:

Altman, M. et al. (2003). *Alta y baja frecuencia en nuestra práctica analítica actual*. SAP Scientific Forum.

Aslan, M.(2004). *Freud y la Práctica actual*. Round table. Aslan S. Bleichmar, L Hornstein, C Merea, In *Proyecto Terapéutico*. Paidós.

Auchincloss and Michels (2001). p. 399, quoted by Szecsödy, Imre, op. cit.)

Berenstein, I. (1998). *Education as a Social and Institutional means for Producing Persons*. Inter-Regional Conferences. Vienna.

Berenstein, I. (2004). *El sujeto y el otro*. Buenos Aires. Ed. Paidós. pp.53-55, p.167, p.184.

Berenstein, I. and Puget, J. (1997). *Lo vincular. Clínica y técnica psicoanalítica*. Buenos Aires.

Bernardi, R. (2003). *What kind of evidence makes the analyst change his or her theoretical and technical ideas?* In *Pluralism and unity*. London. The International Psychoanalysis Library.

Leibovich de Duarte, A.; Huerín, V.; Roussos, J; Rutzstein, G.; Torricelli F. (1999) *Qué autores consideran los psicoterapeutas que influyen en su práctica clínica actual*. 6º Seminar on Research in Psychology. School of Psychology, UBA. December. Published in the Proceedings of the Meeting, p.24

Leibovich de Duarte, A. (2002) *Inferencia clínica y marco referencial teórico*. Paper by Leibovich de Duarte, A.; Huerín, V.; Roussos, J;

Rutzstein, G.; Torricelli F. (2002). *Empirical Studies on Clinical Inference: Similarities and Differences in the Clinical Work of Psychotherapists with Different Theoretical Approaches and Levels of Experience*. In IPA *An Open Door Review of Outcome Studies in Psychoanalysis*. Second Revised Edition. International Psychoanalytic Association. London. pp. 201-204. Presented at the Argentine Congress of Psychoanalysis. Rosario.

Leibovich de Duarte, A.; Duhalde, C.; Huerín, V.; Roussos, J; Rutzstein, G.;Torricelli F. (2004). *Theoretical Framework and its Influence on Clinical Practice*. 35th Congress, Society for Psychotherapy Research International Conference. Rome, Italy. June. Abstracts p.168

Lévy, P. (1995) *L'université, une avancée pour la psychanalyse: cliniques Méditerranéennes*. 45-46.

Lewkowicz, I: Private Communication.

Pereira, A.; Ragau, R.; Jadur, S.; Jaffe, L.; Liberman, A. (2003) *Ipsos Research: Perspectiva internacional en la formación psicoanalítica y la cultura institucional local*, paper submitted to the XXV Symposium and Congress of APdeBA.

Pereira, A.; Ragau, R.; Borensztein, L.; Ramallo, I. y Russo, E. (2004). *IPSO Research: ¿Inciden las diferencias culturales en la formación analítica? 94 entrevistas a candidatos de las tres regiones*. Paper submitted to the XXVI Symposium and Congress of APdeBA.

Puget, J. (1997). *El análisis vincular en la formación*. Published in *Devenir*. Buenos Aires, Year 6, no. VII.

Puget, J. (2001). *Nuevas Dificultades. Lo idéntico y lo múltiple*. SAP Magazine, no. 4.

Puget, J. (2003). *Las teorías son obstáculos necesarios*. Published in *Devenir*. Buenos Aires. Year 12, no. XIII.

Puget, J. (2004). *Sentimiento de responsabilidad: un hacer lo común*. AAPPG, Couples Department, Annual Conference. Buenos Aires.

Rocha Barros, E. (2000). *En busca de una cierta crítica o repensando la educación psicoanalítica*. Published in *Revista de Psicoanálisis*, LVII, 3-4, Buenos Aires.

Sachs, D. (2001) .*The Effect of Freud's Case Histories on Psychoanalytic Education*. The 2nd Joseph Sandler Research Conference. London.

Szecsödy, I. (2004). *To become or be made a Psychoanalyst*. Stockholm.

Thomä, H. (1993). *Training Analysis and Psychoanalytic Education: Proposals for reform*. Reprinted from *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*. Vol. XXI/, pp. 3-75.