

Rorschach and Executive Functioning

-----Original Message----- From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of Harvey, Michael Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 15:27 To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: RE: Réf. : [Rorschach_List] ROR and Executive Function

Jane,

Yep ... I'll do a comparison of all the ROR and MMPI variables I have in the database with normative data within the next day or so.

One result which does pop up is the very high correlation (controlling for severity of injury) of a person with ABI having a **vista** response on initial testing with the extent to which they were able to show marked reduction of overall level of disability in response to treatment. No other ROR variable in the database (including the indexes) was associated with overall outcome positive or negative - only the presence of **Vista** as a positive factor.

In considering the cases mentioned for mothers it may be important to keep in mind the extent to which they may have suffered significant negative events during development resulting in lowered M - coping versus individuals who have suffered sudden insult to executive function after having a relatively normal developmental trajectory. A person's development may have far more to do in determining the resources they end up with and are able to employ in adulthood than their level of executive function per se.

Mike

Michael Harvey, Psy.D. Assistant Professor Argosy University - Twin Cities

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com on behalf of Jane Sachs Sent: Sat 1/31/2009 5:48 PM To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: Re: Réf. : [Rorschach_List] ROR and Executive Function

Pam - I find your post very interesting, in part because I notice the same variables coming up repeatedly in the Rorschachs I give to birth moms in CINA cases. But in addition to having low or no M, they also usually have positive CDI, which one would predict would be at least one significant locus of the impairments Michael found in his sample of frontal lobe injured patients.

And Michael - just for comparison's sake, do you have the variables associated with this sample's "brief collapse of psychic function - regression into acute confusional-psychotic or traumatized states - as they encounter complexity - lack of structure in the environment and suffer catastrophic reaction when they become aware of the way their neurocognitive functioning has changed?"

Jane

----- Original Message ----- From: "Pamela Olsen" <theodora@imbris.com> [mailto:theodora%40imbris.com] To: <Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com> [mailto:Rorschach_List%40yahoogroups.com] > Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 3:57 PM

Subject: Re: Réf. : [Rorschach_List] ROR and Executive Function

Rick and others, I have done a number of evaluations of parents for Health and Welfare whose children have been removed for one reason or another. Almost without exception (there has been one exception, and in this case, it was debatable as to whether the kids ever should have been removed)--anyway, otherwise, virtually all of these parents had [only one or two M](#). I also saw this in numerous protocols of teens (even very bright teens) with chemical dependency problems, and currently have a bright adult alcoholic with no M.

What I have seen in these people's behavior and history is that they do indeed have poor logic and problem solving skills. The parents cannot think ahead to provide appropriate structure for their kids (and they admit this). They have trouble with "if-then" thinking. "If I do this, then this will prevent the children from doing this" or "If I don't do this, then...."

With the teen CD kids, these were kids who were not able to think through how to handle stressful situations. And in many cases, they had over-conscientious parents who did their thinking for them.

[The adult alcoholic has no clue how to address stressful situations. He spaces out, avoids, and if that doesn't work, he drinks.](#)

So personally, I think there is something to the idea that M has something to do with logical problem solving skills. Now I don't have all of these protocols in front of me, but I know that many of these people also had low weighted color scores. So they didn't have the intuitive skills, either. In some cases, there were pure C responses.

Of course, there are always other issues, too, e., low self-esteem, too passive, or whatever.

I have seen [high M in people who are highly manipulative](#) (which takes good logic) and also in people who are not adapting very well.

I have one young adult currently in therapy who looked very strong and adaptive on her Rorschach, but with some impulse issues and three S responses.

She made a couple of impulsive suicide attempts, and then regretted it. She manages to get hurt in some way whenever things are going well. She is extremely manipulative can look pretty sick, especially with [emotional meltdowns](#) that manipulate her family into doing her bidding. Recently, however, she's done a huge turnaround, is finding healthier pathways in life, and is no longer being so manipulative. She's using her resources in more positive ways.

(She's also finally medicated for Bi-polar Disorder....but I'm still convinced that many of her meltdowns were learned behaviors because her family always caved in.

This is not to deny the observations of others, but I don't think we can throw out the notion of M responses reflect logical problem solving skills.

Pam

On Jan 31, 2009, at 11:56 AM, Rick Poll wrote:

Speaking entirely subjectively here:

When I look at a protocol (the verbiage, not the scores) there are certain things I'm drawn to. These things include use of color and shading, special scores, various non-CS-scorable aspects of verbiage and behavior, level of complexity (this is an impressionistic combination of DQ, Zf, blends and more) and conventionality (FQ and an impression of how often I've heard similar things before).

I sometimes have to remind myself to look at M. In trying to understand my own process, I think M responses mostly contribute to my sense of the conventionality of the protocol and the level of intellectual control exerted by the subject over the response process. That is, a protocol with a number of reasonably conventional M responses and no evidence of thought or mood disorder (in special scores, shading or verbiage) is comforting -- it usually means the person is in reasonably good shape.

The idea that M is the best indicator of "resources" is not one I have found especially helpful. The notion that a person with a number of badly spoiled [M responses](#) is "resourceful" is troubling. I don't like the usage of the word. Perhaps it would make more sense to think of it as indicating [a capacity for more complex directed thought](#). That makes more sense to me, but it's also usually quite obvious from the verbiage, even before I start thinking about M scores.

What do others think?

Rick