Journal of Education, Humanities, and Social Science Studies
Journal DOI: 10.15580/jehsss
Volume 1(1), pp. 13-22, 2026

https://jehsss.greenfieldjournals.org/

Fragmentation and Its Discontents: Theory, Brain, and the Epistemology of Dissociation

Theodaline Ndifon Feh; Cynthia Ninying

[1] Erudite Scholar, Eagle Scholars Forge, Jos, Nigeria.
Email: fombohtheodoline@gmail.com
[2] Higher Institute of Professional Education and Practice (HIPEP), Bafousssam Cameroon.
Email: wiysenyuycyn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Dissociation remains one of the most conceptually contested phenomena in psychology, situated at the intersection of theory, neurobiology, and measurement. This article critically examines how fragmentation is constructed, explained, and assessed across three domains: Structural Dissociation Theory, contemporary neuroscience, and psychometric instrumentation. First, it evaluates the conceptual status of Apparent Normal Parts (ANPs) and Emotional Parts (EPs), arguing that they are best understood as functional organizational patterns rather than literal structural entities. While the theory offers explanatory coherence, it risks reification if interpreted ontologically. Second, the paper reviews neurobiological findings—including cortico-limbic dysregulation, Default Mode Network alterations, and thalamic gating—demonstrating that neuroscience clarifies regulatory mechanisms but does not fully account for the lived experience of divided selfhood. Neural correlates describe processes; they do not exhaust meaning. Third, the article interrogates the epistemological limitations of assessment tools such as the DES-II, MID, and SDQ-20, highlighting the paradox of measuring phenomena defined by disrupted self-awareness. Across these domains, dissociation emerges as a challenge to reductionism. Neither theory, brain imaging, nor quantitative scales alone can capture the complexity of fragmentation. The article advances an integrative realist position that affirms biological grounding while preserving phenomenological depth and cultural context. Ultimately, the study argues for methodological humility: dissociation exposes the limits of explanation and calls psychology toward integration rather than certainty.

ARTICLE'S INFO

Article No.: *041126052*
Type**:** *Review*
Full Text: *PDF, HTML*
DOI: *10.15580/jehsss.2026.1.041126052*

Received: *11/04/2026*
Accepted: *23/04/2026*
Published: *06/05/2026*

Corresponding Author

Obasi Blessing Chidi

E-mail: *blessed200067@ yahoo.com*

Keywords: *dissociation, structural dissociation theory, neurobiology, epistemology, psychological measurement*

1. Introduction: The Elusive Nature of Dissociation

Dissociation, a complex psychological phenomenon, occupies a contested space within contemporary understanding, bridging theoretical frameworks, neurobiological underpinnings, and the challenges of empirical measurement. This article undertakes a critical examination of how dissociation, particularly in its fragmented manifestations, is conceptualized, investigated, and assessed. We will explore three primary domains: the theoretical constructs of Structural Dissociation Theory (SDT), the insights and limitations of contemporary neuroscience, and the epistemological challenges posed by psychometric assessment tools.

Our analysis begins with an evaluation of the core concepts within SDT, specifically Apparent Normal Parts (ANPs) and Emotional Parts (EPs). We will argue that these constructs are more fruitfully understood as functional organizational patterns within the psyche rather than discrete, literal structural entities. While SDT offers significant explanatory coherence, an uncritical ontological interpretation risks reification.

Subsequently, we will review key neurobiological findings related to dissociation, including cortico-limbic dysregulation, alterations in the Default Mode Network (DMN), and the role of thalamic gating. These findings illuminate the regulatory mechanisms involved but underscore that neural correlates, while informative, do not fully encapsulate the subjective lived experience of a divided self.

Finally, the article will interrogate the epistemological limitations inherent in the measurement of dissociation. We will critically assess prominent assessment tools, such as the Dissociative Experiences Scale II (DES-II), the Multidimensional Inventory of Dissociation (MID), and the Somatoform Dissociation Questionnaire-20 (SDQ-20). This examination will highlight the inherent paradox of attempting to quantify phenomena characterized by disrupted self-awareness.

Across these diverse domains, dissociation emerges as a phenomenon that challenges reductionist approaches. It suggests that no single modality—be it theoretical discourse, neuroimaging, or quantitative scales—can fully capture the multifaceted nature of psychological fragmentation. This article advocates for an integrative realist perspective, one that acknowledges the biological foundations of experience while preserving its phenomenological depth and socio-cultural context. Ultimately, we contend that a stance of methodological humility is essential, recognizing that dissociation reveals the boundaries of current explanatory models and calls for a more integrated approach within psychology.

2. Theoretical Frameworks: Structural Dissociation Theory and Psychic Organization

Theoretical psychology endeavors to make sense of the unseen by constructing models of the mind based on observable behavior, subjective testimony, physiological data, and interpretive analysis. Theories of dissociation represent a particularly clear example of this endeavor. Among the most prominent contemporary frameworks is Structural Dissociation Theory (SDT), proposed by Onno van der Hart, Ellert Nijenhuis, and Kathy Steele (2006). This theory represents a significant attempt to explain how severe trauma can lead to a fragmentation of personality into distinct subsystems, commonly conceptualized as Apparent Normal Parts (ANPs) and Emotional Parts (EPs).

2.1. Apparent Normal Parts (ANPs) and Emotional Parts (EPs): Literal Structures or Clinical Metaphors?

According to SDT, individuals who have endured significant trauma often exhibit an impaired capacity for information integration. This impairment, the theory suggests, results in a division of the personality into ANPs, which manage daily life and avoid traumatic material, and EPs, which are primarily fixated on traumatic memories and associated defensive responses (Van der Hart et al., 2006). ANPs are characterized by their ability to navigate ordinary life, while EPs remain perpetually engaged with past traumatic experiences, often manifesting survival responses such as fight, flight, freeze, or submit. The experience of being "stuck" in these past events, coupled with these responses, can lead to expressions indicative of "structural partitioning"—a divided, rather than merely conflicted, personality.

However, a significant epistemological challenge arises from this structural claim: are ANPs and EPs genuine structural divisions of the personality, or are they more accurately understood as clinically useful metaphors for different functional states? Furthermore, how does this conceptualization align with modern therapeutic approaches, such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), which often presuppose a relatively unified self-capable of reflective self-restructuring? This section will examine SDT not as a dogma, but as a conceptual proposition, evaluating its explanatory power and the philosophical tensions inherent within it.

Critics have raised concerns about the potential for reification (B. T. Williams, 1990), where clinicians might mistake the metaphor of "parts" for an ontological reality. The absence of discernible anatomical structures in the brain directly corresponding to ANPs or EPs challenges the notion of a literal, modular, or structural model of personality.

Nevertheless, dismissing the model as purely metaphorical fails to fully address the clinical phenomenology. Trauma survivors frequently report distinct discontinuities in experience, encompassing memory, affect, and agency, which extend beyond mere mood alterations. They describe difficulties in transitioning between different perspectives, affective states, and even bodily postures. These transitions are often correlated with shifts in physiological arousal

(autonomic activation) and brain functioning (cortical engagement).

The ANP and EP structure may be more accurately understood as functional systems. These systems are conceptualized as arising from trauma's biasing of activation towards "defensive networks" (e.g., hyperactive limbic system, suppressed periaqueductal gray matter) and a down-regulation of the integrative functions of the prefrontal cortex. Consequently, "parts" could be interpreted as recurring and patterned configurations of neuronal networks.

Philosophically, this aligns with process-oriented models of the brain. Thomas Metzinger (2003), in his process model interpretation, describes the self not as a static object but as a dynamic self-image continuously generated through integration. When integration is disrupted, as in trauma, the self-image becomes susceptible to functional disintegration or fragmentation. From this perspective, the "splitting of one's soul-like aspect" might represent not a literal division, but a breakdown of the brain's integrative models.

The core issue is not the "reality" of ANPs and EPs, but the *form* of their reality. Their organizational patterns are phenomenologically robust in observable clinical aspects, yet neurobiologically distributed. Thus, they are "structural" in terms of their function, not in terms of a fixed anatomical structure. This distinction preserves the theory's clinical insights while guarding against overly literal interpretations.

2.2. Trauma-Time Versus Present-Time Functioning

A key differentiator between EPs and ANPs in SDT is their temporal orientation: "trauma-time" versus "present-time" functioning. EPs maintain organized behaviors related to unresolved threats, experiencing past events as immediate and reliving them rather than recalling them from a detached perspective. Conversely, ANPs are oriented towards present functioning and avoid traumatic material.

Neurobiology offers insights into this differentiation. During trauma recall, neuroimaging studies often reveal a hyperactive amygdala (involved in threat detection and emotional salience) and a hypoactive medial prefrontal cortex (responsible for contextualization and executive regulation) (Lanius et al., 2010; van der Kolk, 2010). The hippocampus, crucial for temporal encoding, frequently shows functional compromise under chronic stress. These neurobiological changes correlate with lived experiences such as emotional flooding, flashbacks, and physiological reactions disproportionate to current circumstances. The temporal experience during traumatic events becomes dominant, overriding the present.

Conceptualizing human experience through rigid binary oppositions—integrated versus fragmented, present-time versus trauma-time—presents philosophical and clinical dilemmas. Human consciousness is not neatly divided into discrete domains. Even in individuals without significant trauma histories, objective experience fluctuates between coherent and incoherent states. The multidimensional self is a fluid process of integration (Metzinger, 2003); the ongoing process of identity formation emerges from a dynamic exchange between neural and narrative coordination (Damasio, 2010). Consequently, transitions between unity and disunity occur not merely as aberrations but as integral aspects of human consciousness.

Research on stress further challenges rigid delineations. Acute stress narrows cognitive flexibility, impairs working memory, and shifts regulatory systems towards survival responses (Lanius et al., 2010; Van der Kolk, 2014). Even psychologically healthy individuals may experience temporary fragmentation, such as emotional flooding or altered time perception. Trauma, however, solidifies and extends these changes, transforming transient states under ordinary stress into enduring features under chronic or overwhelming stress. SDT provides a conceptual framework for understanding how these recurring shifts crystallize into stable organizational patterns (ANPs and EPs), though fragmentation is best viewed as existing on a continuum rather than as a discrete rupture.

Judith Herman (1992) highlights that trauma disrupts the natural interplay between remembering and forgetting, leading survivors to alternate between intrusive re-experiencing and constricted avoidance. This oscillation does not necessarily reflect two distinct minds but rather a single system compromised in its ability to integrate traumatic memories, thereby hindering adaptation.

Dissociation can originate early in childhood as adaptive responses to overwhelming relational experiences (Putnam, 1997). These dissociative processes, continuing into adulthood, profoundly impact identity formation and relational patterns.

Limiting fragmentation solely to intrapsychic processes risks reductionism. Culture offers alternative conceptualizations of personhood and ontological categories, enabling a view of fragmentation as relational rather than solely individual. The Ubuntu tradition, for instance, emphasizes that personhood is co-created through relationships—"I am because we are" (Ramose, 1999). This communal basis means that trauma not only ruptures individual narratives but also disrupts collective memory and consciousness.

Collective trauma—through war, displacement, oppression, or genocide—interrupts the transmission of shared meaning across generations, weaving into collective narratives (Sele et al., 2025). The emergence of identity fragmentation from social-historical disruption can thus be understood not only as a psychological symptom but as a breakdown of communal narrative and associated dissociative experiences. Similarly, Sele (2025) highlights how African Christian liturgical traditions, through music and ritual, facilitate communal reintegration by linking past suffering with future hope, restoring temporal continuity. Healing, in this context,

involves not just cognitive restructuring but participation in shared symbolic systems.

The ethical dimensions of fragmentation become apparent when examining rituals related to belonging and inclusion. Conflicts over ritual participation can reflect deeper concerns about communal identity and human dignity, prompting questions of belonging and remembrance within communities grappling with trauma (Selection & Whittaker, 2025). Neurobiology does not negate these relational accounts; rather, it substantiates them by showing how neural adaptations occur within cultural and interpersonal contexts. Neural dysregulation, therefore, cannot be assessed in isolation but must be understood as embodying an individual's history. Trauma-time, consequently, encompasses both altered neural firing and disrupted communal memory.

An integrative approach to SDT offers a valuable heuristic for understanding identity reorganization following trauma. Defensive networks build identity around specific "parts," each functioning as a dynamic system within social and cultural relationships. Fragmentation, in this view, is not a mystical multiplicity or a primary cause of cognitive failure, but an adaptive response to varying layers of meaning encountered during trauma. Trauma-time, therefore, represents a multilevel disruption involving neurobiological dysregulation, narrative discontinuity, and communal disconnection. Healing necessitates multilevel integration, encompassing healthy self-regulation, coherent narrative rebuilding, and supportive social networks. The reconciliation of fragmentation and unity lies not in denying either, but in understanding identity as an emergent, relational, and developmentally plastic process. Culturally, imposing rigid binaries on lived reality is problematic, as human consciousness naturally oscillates between coherence and disunity. Trauma intensifies this oscillation, embedding survival-based responses within identity. Relational and cultural resources—language, ritual, music, communal memory—remain vital for trauma recovery and integration.

2.3. Compatibility or Tension with CBT's Unified-Self Assumption

The contemporary world has, in many ways, contributed to a sense of hopelessness. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), rooted in the work of Aaron T. Beck (1976), posits that individuals can identify, challenge, and modify their beliefs about the world. Implicit in CBT is the assumption of an individual's capacity for critical self-reflection, presupposing a degree of psychological integration.

SDT, however, presents a more complex view. EPs often function without reflective access, meaning that cognitive restructuring targeting ANPs may not influence trauma-bound systems. For instance, if a belief is stored in an implicit protective network rather than an explicit cognitive one, direct challenges to that belief may prove ineffective.

Contemporary CBT has evolved, with trauma-focused CBT, schema therapy, and third-wave approaches incorporating techniques for emotion regulation, mindfulness, and body awareness. These integrations implicitly acknowledge the normalcy of experiencing multiplicity.

The differences between SDT and CBT are not necessarily irreconcilable incompatibilities but rather variations in emphasis. CBT typically starts with a unified self and moves toward cognitive restructuring, while SDT begins with fragmentation and moves toward integration. A responsible clinical integration of both approaches can stabilize daily functioning through cognitive therapy while addressing fragmentation via parts- or trauma-focused therapies. Neither method is sufficient when employed in isolation.

Insisting on a pre-trauma "wholeness of being" can invalidate the lived experience of fragmentation. Conversely, rejecting any notion of wholeness when working with severely traumatized clients can lead to chaos. Therefore, an integration of these approaches must be dialectical.

2.4. Stabilizing Meaning Without Reduction

Theorizing dissociation requires navigating the extremes of reductionism and romanticism. Reductionism seeks to explain dissociation solely through brain malfunction, while romanticism elevates fragmentation to a quasi-mystical state of multiplicity. The Theory of Structural Dissociation (TSD) occupies a middle ground, acknowledging that trauma reorganizes personality in patterned ways that do not preclude the possibility of reintegration. Reintegration remains a viable option even from a highly disorganized state.

The fragmentation of the self must also be considered within a broader psychological context, informed by the circumstances of trauma. Individuals exposed to war, displacement, or systemic oppression may develop dissociative coping skills essential for survival. These functional and purposeful dissociative responses are not indicative of weakness but of survival. However, chronic dissociation can impair relational continuity and agency.

The ethical function of any theory of survival must serve two purposes: validating survival adaptations as legitimate and necessary, and supporting their eventual reintegration. Furthermore, the theory must offer a framework that is both accurate and sensitive to the complexities of lived experience, providing precise yet humane language. TSD, when applied flexibly, assists psychologists in understanding personality organization, the implications of trauma, and the developmental milestones of reintegration.

Concluding Reflection for Section A

SDT does not provide a final answer but rather opens avenues for continued discussion. ANPs and EPs are best conceptualized as functional organizational

elements, not physical compartments. Both narrative time and "real-time" reflect neural firing patterns and relational disconnections. Tensions between CBT and SDT stem from differing assumptions about wholeness and unity, yet a successful integration of both models is achievable.

A central theme is methodological humility. Theoretical frameworks guide our observations but do not fully capture the richness of lived experience. SDT offers a valuable conceptual lens for understanding trauma's impact on personality development, but it cannot fully elucidate the phenomenological experience of dissociation or the socio-cultural factors that promote healing and well-being.

The subsequent section will delve into the neurobiological substrates of dissociation, examining what brain research reveals and, importantly, what it leaves unexplained regarding the subjective experience of a fragmented consciousness.

3. Neurobiology and Explanation: What the Brain Reveals, and What It Cannot

Theory provides a framework for understanding psychological experiences, while neuroscientific evidence seeks to locate these experiences within the brain. Advances in functional neuroimaging over recent decades have yielded increasingly detailed insights into brain activity during states of dissociation, including regional activation and deactivation, network reorganizations, and changes in connectivity. This information, coupled with prior research on trauma, has significantly enhanced our understanding of dissociation from a neurobiological perspective.

However, a critical question remains: Does identifying neural correlates of dissociation explain *what* dissociation is, or does it merely describe its biological manifestations? This section will review three major neurobiological frameworks used to study dissociation—cortico-limbic disconnection, alterations in the Default Mode Network (DMN), and thalamic gating/sensory shutdown—and critically assess what neuroscience illuminates about the experience of dissociation and what remains conceptually ambiguous.

3.1. Cortico-Limbic Disconnection

Trauma research consistently indicates that trauma alters communication between the cortex (e.g., the prefrontal cortex) and the limbic system's threat circuitry (e.g., the amygdala). During trauma recall, the amygdala, crucial for detecting threats and assigning emotional significance to stimuli, often shows hyperactivity, while the medial prefrontal cortex, responsible for contextualization and executive regulation, typically exhibits reduced activation (Lanius et al., 2010; van der Kolk, 2014). This phenomenon is often termed cortico-limbic disconnection.

In typical neurobiological functioning, the cortex modulates amygdala reactivity. When this modulation is reduced, individuals may experience heightened emotional reactivity without adequate contextual framing for their responses. However, for individuals with dissociative subtypes of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), the pattern can be more complex. Research led by Ruth Lanius suggests that some individuals with these subtypes exhibit overmodulation rather than undermodulation. In such cases, rather than amygdala hyperactivity, there is increased prefrontal inhibition, leading to emotional numbing and depersonalization (Lanius et al., 2010).

It is crucial to distinguish this: dissociation is not simply an absence of emotion (i.e., "flat affect") but may result from excessive inhibition or top-down suppression. An individual might appear calm or detached, but this detachment can reflect profound neurobiological overregulation.

Neuroscientific evidence thus indicates that dissociation is not a uniform phenomenon; rather, it represents different dysregulatory (or regulatory) patterns of function. The pattern of fragmentation in individuals who experience dissociation is reflected in altered neural coordination. However, the cortico-limbic models that characterize the various regulatory patterns of the neurobiological and psychological systems associated with trauma, illustrate a lack of regulation.
They do not explain why dissociation is experienced as divided selfhood rather than merely emotional flattening. Neural disconnection alone does not generate the phenomenology of being split.

3.2. Default Mode Network (DMN) Alterations

The Default Mode Network (DMN) comprises areas in the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and angular gyrus, which are active during self-referential thought and autobiographical memory processing. Connectivity changes within the DMN have been observed in populations exposed to trauma or exhibiting dissociative symptoms (Bluhm et al., 2009).

The coherence, or lack thereof, within the DMN can interfere with narrative integration. Autobiographical memory relies on DMN activity; thus, an unstable DMN may contribute to a fractured sense of identity. In presentations of dissociative identity, research suggests potential variations in DMN activation patterns corresponding to different identity states. These activation patterns are frequently interpreted as evidence for the biological basis of structural multiplicity. However, caution is warranted in this interpretation. Neural state changes alone do not confirm ontological separation; they more accurately reflect a reconfiguration of neural networks.

Neuroscience extends the understanding of self-experience to encompass the dynamic nature of network activity, positing that "identity" emerges from multiple processes, aligning with process-oriented philosophical theories of cognition. Antonio Damasio (2010), for example, suggests that the "self" arises from overlapping

representations (including body and memory) as a consequence of neural processing.

Ultimately, significant questions remain regarding the implications of altered DMN connectivity. For instance, diminished coherence detected in the DMN during a scan does not elucidate the patient's subjective experience (e.g., feelings of abandonment, shame) or emotional state.

3.3. Thalamic Gating and Sensory Shutdown

Thalamic gating offers another explanation for the experience of dissociating. The thalamus, a key brain structure involved in processing all incoming sensory information, plays a critical role. During life-threatening situations, the body may narrow its processing of sensory input or shut down entirely.

Animal studies of freezing and tonic immobility reveal defensive circuits at the subcortical level that can inhibit exploratory behaviors. In humans, "dissociative shutdown states" can be viewed as a manifestation of similar subcortical dominance, potentially resulting in derealization or depersonalization. This suggests that experiences of feeling detached from one's body or perceiving oneself as "unreal" may stem from altered sensory integration rather than delusional beliefs. Dissociation, in this context, functions as a neuroprotective response.

However, describing thalamic gating does not fully capture the subjective experience of dissociation. Individuals do not report experiencing "thalamic modulation" but rather an absence of, or distance from, themselves or the world. Therefore, while neurobiology elucidates the mechanisms involved in dissociating, these mechanisms do not equate to the meaning of the experience.

3.4. What Neuroscience Clarifies

Neuroscience offers several stabilizing insights into dissociation:

- **Physical Dimensions:** Dissociation has demonstrable physical correlates. It is not a matter of pretense or fabrication; there are measurable physical changes in the brain.

- **Regulation, Not Lack Thereof:** Dissociation involves a pattern of regulating experience, rather than a complete absence of regulation. The regulation of dissociative experiences arises from an individual's capacity to generate an organized response to overwhelming stress, potentially involving 'low' or 'high' levels of modulation.

- **Integration Through Neural Networks:** The integration of experience is achieved through the coordinated functioning of various neural networks. When these connections are absent or impaired, individuals may experience significant subjective fragmentation.

By providing these clarifications, neuroscience helps to reduce stigma, countering the stereotypical view that individuals who dissociate are weak or attention-seeking.

3.5. What Neuroscience Fails to Explain

Despite these advancements, significant gaps remain in our understanding. The reasons why trauma leads to dissociation in some individuals but not others remain largely a mystery. The interplay of genetic predisposition, attachment history, and socio-cultural context extends far beyond what current brain mapping can fully elucidate.

Neuroscience cannot fully account for experiential reality. The subjective feelings of a divided self, disruptions in time perception, and the profound moral pain associated with memory loss are real experiences that cannot be simply reduced to neurological processes.

Neurobiology can often lead to a reductionist view of reality. If dissociation is solely attributed to brain dysfunction, the relational and cultural dimensions of a person's experience are overlooked. Factors such as collective trauma, colonial history, systemic violence, and ruptures in attachment significantly influence brain development, as the brain is not an isolated structure but is shaped by its social environment.

Furthermore, according to African philosophical traditions, relational ontologies are emphasized. A person's identity is not confined solely to their brain and neural tissue but is co-created through relationships with others. While neuroscience offers valuable explanations, it cannot overshadow these relational aspects of reality.

Finally, neuroscience cannot dictate the resolution of ethical issues. Brain scans can inform legal responsibility, but they cannot replace a clinician's judgment regarding therapeutic approaches.

3.6. Integrative Reflection

Neuroscience enhances our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of psychological phenomena. Cortico-limbic disconnection points to changes in regulatory processes, DMN disruption suggests issues with narrative memory integration, and thalamic gating reveals how the brain processes sensory input. These findings collectively indicate that dissociation has neural underpinnings.

We advocate for Integrative Realism as a responsible framework for understanding dissociation. This perspective affirms the individual's subjective experience as unique, acknowledging that biological and psychological views are different facets of the same reality. We recognize the brain's limitations on the body while emphasizing the depth of phenomenological experience. Psychology is better served by neuroscience

when it acts as an explanatory tool rather than a reductionist one.

This section has focused on understanding dissociation; the following section will address its measurement. Given that dissociation is partly defined by fragmentation and unawareness, how can these experiences be reliably measured? What are the epistemological and ethical limitations of the measurement tools employed?

4. Assessment and Epistemology: Measuring What Hides Itself

Psychology's advancement is intrinsically linked to its capacity for measuring phenomena. Without reliable means of quantifying the individual components of psychological experience, our understanding remains largely hypothetical. Consequently, any method of assessment lacking robust measurement risks becoming arbitrary and ineffective.

Dissociation presents a substantial methodological dilemma. Its existence as a state of consciousness, often lacking a clear anchor in awareness, makes measurement using conventional methods exceptionally challenging. This section critically assesses three instruments commonly used for measuring dissociation: the Dissociative Experiences Scale II (DES-II), the Multidimensional Inventory of Dissociation (MID), and the Somatoform Dissociation Questionnaire-20 (SDQ-20). We will then consider broader epistemological and ethical issues, including the implications of self-reporting, the role of meaning and insight, and the potential for false negatives and misinterpretations.

4.1. The Dissociative Experiences Scale II (DES-II)

The DES-II, developed by Eve Bernstein Carlson and Frank W. Putnam, is a self-report tool designed to assess the frequency of dissociative experiences. It comprises 36 items measuring depersonalization, amnesia, absorption, and derealization. The DES-II has demonstrated adequate internal consistency and is widely used as a first-line screening instrument, proving instrumental in identifying dissociation in both clinical and non-clinical populations.

However, the limitations of the DES-II are significant:

- **Reliance on Self-Report and Memory:** The DES-II depends on individuals recalling and reporting their dissociative experiences. For those with severe dissociation, amnesia is often a core feature, hindering their ability to access and report these experiences accurately. Consequently, individuals may underreport experiences dissociated from their conscious awareness.
- **Inclusion of Non-Pathological Items:** The scale includes items assessing absorption, a phenomenon that is often non-pathological. An elevated DES-II score might reflect high absorption rather than significant trauma-related dissociation, increasing the risk of over-generalization without further investigation.
- **Cultural Interpretation:** Cultural factors significantly influence how individuals interpret and respond to the scale. Individuals from religious backgrounds, for example, might interpret altered states of consciousness as spiritual rather than pathological, leading to responses that do not accurately reflect dissociative experiences. Dissociation assessment tools are predominantly based on Western cultural paradigms and may fail to capture culturally mediated experiences of dissociation.

While the DES-II is a valuable screening tool, it does not provide definitive diagnostic information. It identifies patterns of dissociation but does not offer conclusive evidence regarding the structural organization of the personality.

4.2. The Multidimensional Inventory of Dissociation (MID)

Paul F. Dell's Multidimensional Inventory of Dissociation (MID) addresses the multiple dimensions of dissociation, including amnesia, depersonalization, identity alteration, and internal voices. The MID is considerably more extensive than the DES-II, allowing for a broader measurement of experiences related to complex dissociation.

A key strength of the MID lies in its ability to capture nuanced aspects of complex dissociative experiences, aiding in the differential diagnosis of dissociative identity disorder. Despite its comprehensiveness, the MID remains a self-report measure. Individuals may lack the linguistic ability to articulate their internal states, particularly those experiencing alexithymia or impaired reflective functioning alongside dissociation.

4.3. The Somatoform Dissociation Questionnaire-20 (SDQ-20)

The Somatoform Dissociation Questionnaire-20 (SDQ-20), developed by Nijenhuis and colleagues, measures somatoform dissociation—physical symptoms such as paralysis, sensory loss, or anesthesia that lack a clear physical explanation. The SDQ-20 expands the conceptualization of dissociation to include phenomena beyond cognitive or identity-related experiences, reflecting a growing recognition that trauma can reorganize not only narrative memory but also the body.

The significance of the SDQ-20 lies in its support for the concept of embodiment within dissociative processes. However, similar epistemological challenges arise. Respondents must recognize and report bodily anomalies, and cultural contexts influence the reporting of such symptoms. In many cultures, somatic symptoms may be normalized or attributed to spiritual causes rather

than psychological trauma, indicating that assessment tools are not culturally neutral and are embedded within specific epistemic traditions.

Interpreting high scores accurately requires clinical context, as trauma survivors might perceive intrusive memories or intense emotions as indicative of traumatic experiences without necessarily exhibiting structural dissociation. Numerical results must be interpreted within a relational assessment framework, not in isolation.

4.4. The Paradox of Self-Report in Non-Awareness

A fundamental methodological contradiction shared by these instruments is their reliance on self-report to measure phenomena characterized by disrupted self-awareness. This reliance questions the basic assumption of transparent access to one's internal states, as dissociation inherently creates a lack of such transparency.

This leads to the possibility of false negatives (e.g., low scores due to the absence of co-conscious dissociative systems) and false positives (e.g., misinterpreting normative absorption or culturally influenced experiences as pathological). Language itself acts as a mediator of experience; interpreting terms like "unreal" or "losing time" involves metaphorical understanding, with individuals varying in their correspondence between metaphor and experience. Consequently, measurement becomes an interpretive act, not a neutral one.

4.5. Epistemic Invisibility and Insight

The phenomenon of epistemic invisibility arises because dissociation involves partitioning experience from ordinary consciousness (Van der Hart et al., 2006), making certain experiences difficult to access via self-report. This inherent opacity resists the transparency required for psychological measurement.

This dilemma echoes Pierre Janet's early observations of "fixed ideas" that affected behavior without conscious integration. Contemporary trauma research aligns with this, noting that traumatic memories can be encoded through sensory and bodily means, lacking coherent narrative (Van der Kolk, 2014). Herman (1992) highlights how trauma disrupts the relationship between memory and meaning, creating "zones of silence" that complicate testimony. Consequently, current psychometric instruments can only measure experiences that have been at least partially cognitively accessed (Carlson & Putnam, 1993; Dell, 2006; Nijenhuis).

The ethical implications are profound. Clinicians must avoid the fallacy that absence of evidence equals evidence of absence. Low scores on dissociation inventories do not rule out dissociative organization, especially when co-conscious awareness is limited (Putnam, 1997). False negatives can lead to misdiagnosis, diverting attention from underlying trauma-related fragmentation towards mood, anxiety, or personality disorders (APA, 2022).

Conversely, suggestive questioning or premature interpretive frameworks can inadvertently shape symptom presentation, posing an inverse risk. Historically, dissociation research has seen debates surrounding iatrogenesis and over-interpretation (Lynn et al., 2012). Ethically responsible assessment demands methodological restraint. Clinicians must differentiate between validating lived experience and imposing explanatory structures beyond available evidence (Van der Hart et al., 2006).

Furthermore, language mediates disclosure. Terms like "losing time" or "feeling unreal" are metaphorically laden and culturally inflected. What appears as dissociative symptomatology in one framework may be interpreted spiritually or ritually in another. Relational ontologies, such as Ubuntu, emphasize that personhood is socially constituted, suggesting that altered consciousness may carry communal or sacred meanings rather than solely psychopathological ones. Western assessment paradigms may inadequately capture these distinctions.

Therefore, assessment triangulation—integrating self-report questionnaires, clinical interviews, behavioral observations, developmental history, collateral reports, and neurobiological indicators—is not merely a methodological choice but an ethical obligation. No single instrument holds ultimate epistemic authority; the convergence of multiple data streams enhances interpretive reliability.

However, even with comprehensive data, clinical conclusions remain tentative. Psychology operates on probabilistic knowledge. Given the nature of dissociation, definitive diagnosis is particularly challenging. Clinicians must hold hypotheses tentatively, modifying them as therapeutic trust develops and additional data emerge. Herman (1992) emphasizes that safety and stabilization precede narrative coherence, and insight develops gradually within the therapeutic relationship, indicating that epistemological invisibility is negotiated over time.

In conclusion, dissociation challenges the fundamental assumption underlying most psychological assessments: that individuals possess complete self-knowledge and can provide accurate records of their experiences. It demonstrates that consciousness is layered, subject to historical development, and sometimes discontinuous. Ethical practitioners must approach measurement with humility, recognizing that measures are aids to forming opinions, not determinants of them. The absence of endorsed symptoms does not negate suffering, and practitioners must exercise caution in interpretation to uphold client dignity and professional integrity. The study of dissociation, therefore, is not only a clinical focus but also an epistemological discipline.

5. Ethical Implications: False Negatives and Misinterpretation

False negative assessment results carry the significant risk of denying appropriate treatment. Clients may have underlying dissociative processes that lead to misdiagnosis as mood, personality, or psychotic disorders. Conversely, false positive results risk over-pathologizing individuals who employ normative coping strategies, such as structural dissociation, potentially destabilizing their identity and increasing fragmentation.

Ethically responsible practice necessitates clinical humility. Assessment measures serve as aids in decision-making, not as definitive authorities. They should inform, rather than dictate, clinical judgment.

Global realities underscore the ethical obligation for cultural sensitivity. Survivors of war, systemic violence, or displacement may express distress through culturally unique idioms. Measures standardized for Western populations may lack sufficient information about expressions within diverse cultural communities, requiring interpretation with cultural sensitivity.

Integrative Reflection

Measurement is essential for disciplining intuition and structuring clinical reasoning. However, dissociation also highlights the limitations of measurement. While instruments like the DES-II (screening frequency), MID (dimensional depth), and SDQ-20 (embodiment) provide valuable information, none fully captures the holistic experience of dissociation.

Epistemologically, psychology must navigate between naive objectivism and radical skepticism. Instruments offer partial views of complex behaviors and do not provide a complete account of reality. Dissociation's inherent resistance to full visibility requires clinicians to understand and work within this resistance, rather than denying it.

Closing Integration

A unifying theme across theory, neuroscience, and measurement is dissociation's challenge to reductionism. Structural Dissociation Theory offers a valuable framework, provided it is applied non-literally. Neuroscience yields crucial insights into regulatory mechanisms but does not offer a complete understanding of lived disorientation. Assessment tools generate structured data, yet their nature limits the extraction of comprehensive knowledge.

A complete understanding of dissociation would ideally integrate insights from traditional doctoral training, encompassing brain function, structure, and measurement. However, none of these alone defines personhood. The study of dissociation ultimately serves as a reminder of psychology's purpose: to approach complex issues with humility, recognizing that measurement is estimation, and theory creation risks oversimplification. As a mature discipline, psychology integrates explanation and meaning, biology and relationships, structure and lived narrative. This integration, rather than the pursuit of certainty, defines psychological authority.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.; DSM-5-TR). American Psychiatric Publishing.

Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. International Universities Press.

Carlson, E. B., & Putnam, F. W. (1993). An update on the Dissociative Experiences Scale. *Dissociation: Progress in the Dissociative Disorders*, *6*(1), 16–27.

Damasio, A. (2010). *Self comes to mind: Constructing the conscious brain*. Pantheon Books.

Dell, P. F. (2006). A new model of dissociative identity disorder. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *29*(1), 1–26.

Eagle Scholars Forge (2026), Feh Theodaline Ndifon. https://www.selemedia.org/scholars/hall_of_fame/feh-theodaline-ndifon/

Herman, J. L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery: The aftermath of violence—from domestic abuse to political terror*. Basic Books.

Janet, P. (1973). *L'automatisme psychologique*. Société Pierre Janet. (Original work published 1889)

Lanius, R. A., Bluhm, R. L., & Frewen, P. A. (2010). How understanding the neurobiology of complex post-traumatic stress disorder can inform clinical practice: A social cognitive and affective neuroscience approach. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *122*(2), 103–117.

Lynn, S. J., Lilienfeld, S. O., Merckelbach, H., Giesbrecht, T., & van der Kloet, D. (2012). Dissociation and dissociative disorders: Challenging conventional wisdom. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(1), 48–53.

Metzinger, T. (2003). *Being no one: The self-model theory of subjectivity*. MIT Press.

Nijenhuis, E. R. S., Spinhoven, P., Van Dyck, R., Van der Hart, O., & Vanderlinden, J. (1996). The development and psychometric characteristics of the Somatoform Dissociation Questionnaire. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *184*(11), 688–694.

Putnam, F. W. (1997). *Dissociation in children and adolescents: A developmental perspective*. Guilford Press.

Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.

Sele, J. P. (2025). Sacred music as a catalyst for theological reflection and social development: A critical review of African Christian liturgical traditions. *Journal of Fine and Creative Arts, Music, Media and Communication Studies*, *1*(2).

Sele, J. P., Davou, S. Y., & Zongo, P. K. (2025). The role of the Berom language in fostering cultural

resilience and sustainable development in Jos, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social and Economic Development*, *1*(3), 82–86.

Sele, J. P., & Whittaker, T. J. (2025). Who buries the believer? Church authority, human dignity, and the question of salvation in African and Caribbean Christian death rituals. *African Journal of Stability & Development*, *17*(2), 1542–1572. https://doi.org/10.53982/ajsd.2025.1702.39-j

Van der Hart, O., Nijenhuis, E. R. S., & Steele, K. (2006). *The haunted self: Structural dissociation and the treatment of chronic traumatization*. W. W. Norton.

Van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. Viking.

Cite this Article: Feh, TN; Ninying, C (2026). Fragmentation and Its Discontents: Theory, Brain, and the Epistemology of Dissociation. *Journal of Education, Humanities, and Social Science Studies*, 6(1): 13-22, https://doi.org/10.15580/jehsss.2026.1.041126052.