

Phenomenology and Social Agent Representation in Psychosis: A Welcome Integration

Vaughan Bell^a, Kathryn L. Mills^b, Gemma Modinos^c, Sam Wilkinson^d

^a Division of Psychiatry, University College London; ^b Center for Translational Neuroscience, University of Oregon; ^c Department of Psychosis Studies, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London; ^d School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, University of Edinburgh.

Corresponding author:

Vaughan Bell, Division of Psychiatry, University College London, 6th Floor, Maple House, 149 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 7NF. Email: Vaughan.Bell@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Poletti and colleagues question whether the breadth of subjective and inter-subjective experience in psychosis can be reduced to problems with social agent representation. Their question is important, although we note our aim is not reductive and that we hope that a social agent representation approach is one of many possible phenomenological routes to a better neurocognitive understanding of psychosis. A key question phenomenology raises for us is why the experience of illusory social agents tends to emerge from the alterations in intersubjective experience and attunement that authors like Raballo (2017), Fuchs (2015), and Raballo and Krueger (2011) describe. This may suggest a progressive disturbance of social cognition where intersubjective instability is eventually re-cohered into ‘best fit’ social explanations that appear as illusory social agents. In concordance with Poletti and colleagues, we argue that a phenomenologically-informed cognitive science is essential for our future understanding of psychosis.

Keywords:

Psychosis, delusion, hallucination, Schizophrenia, Social Cognition

Poletti and colleagues (in press) raise the important issue of a careful phenomenological approach in understanding the experience of psychosis in their helpful commentary on our recent article (Bell et al., 2017). To summarise their main concern, they argue that the breadth of subjective and inter-subjective experience in psychosis cannot be reduced to cognitive-perceptual misapprehensions of illusory social agents. This is something with which we wholeheartedly agree.

Our aim was to take a core phenomenological feature of psychosis (the presence of illusory social agents) and show how this is not sufficiently addressed by current approaches to social cognition, and suggest how paradigms in social cognition needs to be rethought to capture the full range of typical and atypical experience in this domain. Consequently, we argue for an additional focus on how social agents are represented and deployed in social cognition, alongside the traditional focus on social information processing.

We are aware that we are not doing phenomenology in the philosophical tradition to which the authors refer (and, indeed, to which they have contributed a great deal themselves) but it is striking to us that the cognitive science of psychosis gives so little consideration to phenomenology that one of the most central features – social experience – is virtually absent from the explanatory focus of our cognitive and neurocognitive theories.

However, we very much welcome a more integrative approach to formal phenomenology. For us, the experiences that Poletti and colleagues highlight are central to this issue. One question their work raises for us is why the experience of illusory social agents tends to emerge from the alterations in intersubjective experience and attunement that Raballo (2017), Fuchs (2015), and Raballo and Krueger (2011) describe. This suggests a progressive

disturbance of social cognition where intersubjective instability is eventually re-cohered into 'best fit' social explanations that appear as illusory social agents.

Perhaps where we differ from Poletti et al. is that we suspect that the appearance of illusory social agents in people with psychosis across a range of background states may be a guide to commonalities at the social cognitive and neurocognitive level, despite considerable differences in other aspects of the experience. However, we consider this a hypothesis, rather than a conclusion.

Finally, to clear up a slight misreading, we are keen not to be reductive nor encourage researchers to move away from the traditional focus on self-other attributions, but hope to complement existing approaches. Indeed, our aim is expansive rather than reductive and we fully agree with the authors that a phenomenologically-informed cognitive science is key to this objective and essential for our future understanding of psychosis.

References

Bell, V., Mills, K.M., Modinos, G. & Wilkinson, S. (2017). Rethinking Social Cognition in Light of Psychosis: Reciprocal Implications for Cognition and Psychopathology. *Clinical Psychological Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702616677079>

Fuchs, T. (2015). The intersubjectivity of delusions. *World Psychiatry*, *14*, 178-179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20209>

Poletti, M., Gebhardt, E., Krueger, J., Raballo, A. (in press). Rethinking the social agent representation in the light of phenomenology. *Clinical Psychological Science*

Raballo, A. (2017). From perception to thought. A phenomenological approach to hallucinatory experience. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *43*, 18-20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw144>

Raballo, A., Krueger J. (2011). Phenomenology of the social self in the prodrome of psychosis: from perceived negative attitude of others to heightened interpersonal sensitivity. *European Psychiatry*, *26*, 532-3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2011.03.003>