

EBPer Ambitence and More

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com]
On Behalf Of Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D. Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 21:41 To:
Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] Re: EBPer

Rick, My trouble with the EB style issue is that I can take a detailed history and then administer extensive cognitive testing and still not be able to predict which way the EB style will come out.

The posts supporting its use make logical sense to me, but I remain reluctant to use it. Exner once told me that his experience was that things that make sense in the Rorschach don't always work out the way you expect.

To be clear -- I think that M and C responses are very important elements. **I'm just not convinced that the numerical balance has the meaning - in daily life - it has been purported to have.**

The approach you describe for predicting the EB style uses external criteria, namely the history and cognitive test results. It's logical and sensible to expect to see the coping style demonstrated in those areas and it's an approach you heard Exner say doesn't always pan out the way you expect. I want to mention that sometimes it's worth looking at variables from the inside out, so to speak. By that I mean after you've done the Rorschach and have the EB data, have a client feedback session in which you ask the client to help you understand what some of the test findings "seem to be saying". Then describe the EB style shown on the Rorschach in a very general way, without giving concrete examples, and using simple layman terms. Then ask the client whether "any of that" seems to describe him or her in any way at all and fully explore how the client thinks it does or does not. It's akin to what often happens in therapeutic assessment, but I'm using it here only to promote inclusion of the client's own perceptions when considering the usefulness and validity of variables.

I'm sure that approach is nothing new to you and you still find the EB of questionable use. I mention it just because I've so often been struck by how much more there is to learn about how our CS variables play out in real life apart from being demonstrated in the formal history and other test results. The client is uniquely positioned to help us understand particular findings and in what sorts of situations and ways they do and do not apply. Clients might report the EB style describes how they are "only at work", or in particular relationships, or in specific situations, or even how hard they try not to be like that, etc. Often I've been surprised with fresh new ways of understanding how and when variables operate and apply in unique life circumstances. Some who report that the findings don't describe them at all go on to disclose aspects of their

functioning that reconcile the apparent contradiction with the test finding. And, of course, some clients will prove how totally wrong and worthless the variable is. That's where "clinical judgment" comes in.

Phil Caracena