This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Toivonen, Heidi; Wahlström, Jarl; Kurri, Katja

Title: Discordances in Ascriptions of Agency and Reflectivity in the First Psychotherapy Session

Year: 2019

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © Taylor & Francis, 2019

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en

Please cite the original version:

Toivonen, H., Wahlström, J., & Kurri, K. (2019). Discordances in Ascriptions of Agency and Reflectivity in the First Psychotherapy Session. Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 32(4), 424-443. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2018.1515048

Table 1. The 10DT model

Non-agency tool (NAT)	Short definition
1. Impersonalization (Personalization)	The issue is unrelated to oneself. Any meaningful personal relationship with a supposed problem is denied or mitigated.
2. Other as an Actor (Free to Act)	Some phenomenon/event is functioning as the actor. The client's position is either unverbalized/hidden or that of a victim, object, or stooge.
3. Delocalization (Localization)	Experiences exist as their own entities and are not one's own creation.
4. Not Initiating Action (Initiating Action)	Not being able to initiate action.
5. Not Stopping or Curbing Action (Stopping or Curbing Action)	Not being able to stop what one is doing.
6. Not Modifying Action (Modifying Action)	Not being able to make constructive choices.
7. Non-cognizance (Cognizance)	Not understanding, knowing, noticing etc. something about one's experiences.
8. Reflected Dysfunction (Reflected Function)	Having assumed a problematic way of relating to one's experiences or dealing with problems.
9. Discontinuance (Continuance)	The current actions/experiences are not meaningfully related to the past/future.
10. Unperspectivized Positioning of Others (Perspectivized positioning of others)	Not taking truly into account other person's perspective.

Table 2. Agentic/nonagentic and reflective/nonreflective self-ascriptions

	Nonreflective	Reflective
Nonagentic	Now there have come real binging attacks. NAT2[a]	And then I do actually have that goal that I should always survive with under 2,000 calories per day and it does happen on quite many days but then that is completely ridiculous because one needs at least 2,000 calories per day. NAT7
Agentic	For the past couple of weeks, it has felt good that I'm going to treatment. AT4[b]	Then I realized that social life could be kind of like a medicine for this. AT7

Note: [a]NAT = nonagency tool, [b]AT = agency tool

Table 3. Discordances and discordance sequences on the agency and reflectivity dimensions

The Initial Discordance		Turn 3 (client)	Type of Discordance Sequence	Sum Total of Discordance Sequences
1: client's NAT[a]	2: therapist's AT[b]	3: client's NAT n = 16	Remains Nonagentic	
		3: client's AT n = 11	Becomes Agentic	
	n = 27			
1: client's AT	2: therapist's NAT	3: client's NAT n = 2	Becomes Nonagentic	
		3: client's AT n = 1	Remains Agentic	according to agency n = 30
	n = 3			
1: client's NRT[c]	2: therapist's RT[d]	3: client's NRT n = 14	Remains Nonreflective	
		3: client's RT n = 9	Becomes Reflective	
	n = 23			
1: client's RT	2: therapist's NRT	3: client's NRT n = 19	Becomes Nonreflective	
		3: client's RT n = 2	Remains Reflective	according to reflectivity n = 44
	n = 21			

Note: [a]NAT = nonagentic tool, [b]AT = agentic tool, [c]NRT = nonreflective tool, [d]RT = reflective tool

Table 4. The distribution of the reflectivity discordance sequences among the client–therapist dyads

Dyad	Remains Nonreflective	Becomes Reflective	Becomes Nonreflective	Remains Reflective	Sum
A + Mari	2	1	1	0	4
B + Mari	1	0	0	0	1
C + Anna	2	2	6	1	11
C + Risto	1	1	1	0	3
C + Susanna	0	1	5	0	6
D + Arja	2	1	1	0	4
D + Helena	3	1	0	1	5
E + Tiina	2	1	2	0	5
F + Laura	0	0	1	0	1
F + Eija	1	1	2	0	4
	n = 14	*n = 9*	*n = 19*	*n = 2*	*n = 44*

Note: Therapists are identified by capital letters, clients by pseudonyms.