

## M Scoring in Cards III and IV

List@yahoogroups.com] **On Behalf Of** Gérald Lajoie  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2010 13:28  
**To:** Rorschach\_List@yahoogroups.com  
**Subject:** [Rorschach\_List] Movement coding tradition

Renata:

I was waiting for Alberto Peralta to answer your question, but he seems to be off-line.

Here is my take on this issue.

H. Rorschach stated in the first pages of his Psychodiagnostik that seeing a full Human on card III (usual P) IMPLIED some movement whether verbalized or not. He believed that some kinaesthesia was needed to see the full figure, due to the little space between the torso and the legs.

This was followed, I think, both by the Swiss and French schools. Either or both also advocate scoring kinaesthesia on Card IV for a full H or (H) whether or not movement is verbalized.

I see 3 reasons why this may not be a good idea, perceptually and diagnostically speaking.

1- I think this has to do with CLOSURE rather than Pregnanz. One can draw a clearly identifiable human body with just a few lines without any movement being involved. The face on Card X is a good example of closure, and no movement is needed. If this can be done for a face, why not for a full body?

2- Stretching the rule to Card IV is quite debatable... where CLOSURE is not involved and why not consider the frequent Human pairs on Card I or Card II also?

3- The difference between a purely formal and a clearly kinaesthetic determinant is meaningful, is it not? NOT verbalizing movement on the Popular responses on Card III and IV does have a diagnostic value. Therefore, I think several systems are right in not following H. Rorschach's suggestion.

My 2 cents

Gérald Lajoie

Montréal, CANADA