

Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D. [rorscan@SBCGLOBAL.NET] on Red Crabs, the INC coding, and the Implausible or Impossible

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] **On Behalf Of** Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D.
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2009 21:01
To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] crabs

Steve Hibbard wrote:

Love ya, Phil. Couldn't a crab be almost any color? Does it matter if the respondent doesn't know whether there are any? Now, a purple cow, a flying pig, that would be, so to speak, a horse of a different color, right?

Sort of, I guess.

Yes, now that I researched it on the World Wide Web, I find that a crab can indeed be almost any color. The Workbook gives an example of "a red bear" being coded INC1. Then I searched the Internet and found a few photos of real bears with a streak of reddish fur running down their backs. There is so much diversity in the world that if you search hard enough, you'll discover arcane things you never dreamed existed. Fortunately, to code INC, we simply need to determine if the object seen is either "implausible" or "impossible". I assume that judgment should be made by a person who is fairly normal such as your secretary or a checkout person at Wal-Mart and is independent of whether some nerdy examiner can find it on the Internet or once went on a safari to catalog crab and bear colors.

Using that impeccable reasoning, if the respondent admits to not knowing if there are any objects of the kind the respondent saw in the blot and the examiner is equally bewildered, then we should blithely assume that the object's existence is either implausible or is impossible.

If the respondent reports that there are such things, then we may need to do an Internet or library search. If we can't find evidence that they exist, we can assume that the respondent has engaged in faulty thinking and the response qualifies for an INC. Or maybe none of the above is correct. How should I know? Ask Barry. Anyway, giving a couple of INC1 responses just makes you more lovable as Phil Erdberg used to say.

I asked my Wal-Mart checkout girl (who has green hair) if there are purple cows or flying pigs and she just looked at me and said, "What?" I think that means they are either implausible or impossible. I didn't code her green hair.

Phil

Stephen Hibbard, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

University of Windsor, ON, CA

Licensed Psychologist, State of Michigan

Registered Psychologist, Province of Ontario

734 673 5850

Information in this email was sent as confidential. If you believe you received this email in error, please delete it and disregard the information. Thank you.

--- On Fri, 9/18/09, Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D. <rorscan@SBCGLOBAL.NET> wrote:

From: Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D. <rorscan@SBCGLOBAL.NET>

Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] crabs

To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com

My understanding is that if the realistic nature of the response is questionable or you are not sure about the reality, use the client's background and understanding to help determine whether the response is truly unrealistic or simply not in your knowledge base. For example, a response referring to "a drunken cow" may seem unrealistic to an urban-bred examiner who is not aware of what a more rural client may know: that there are, in fact, instances of cows eating fermented food and becoming genuinely drunk. Post-inquiry questioning after the test is completed can help establish the facts, assuming the client's credibility.

So in the case of the red crab, maybe one could ask after the inquiry is over, "Are some crabs really red?" If the answer is "I don't know" or "Not really", then INC1. If it is "After they're cooked." or "Of course there are, don't you know nothin'", then not INC. I don't see any harm in a very brief post-inquiry for this purpose.

Phil

Philip F. Caracena, Ph.D.
Visit the [ROR-SCAN](#) website.