

Rorschach and Percept a la Gerald Lajole

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com]
On Behalf Of Gérald Lajoie Sent: Monday, January 19, 2009 12:16 To:
Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: Réf. : RE: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a
blend

Hi Rick:

No controversy. I'm just wondering if John Wallace's (Piotrowski's) notion of percept is limited to content.

I'm also thinking about non-scorable verbalizations (CS) or various verbalizations scored DR despite their meaningful differences.

As for Exner's recommendations for inquiry, they leave too many stones unturned to my taste, which in turn may elevate Lambda and let some important data unscored.

Whoever gets a dull ordinary Popular on Card I can ask: "Could you tell me more about this bat?" he is not injecting anything new (except a different un-systematized procedure). This departure from a too often sterile administration often brings incredibly significant material, which, a priori, belongs to the subject's yet-un-verbalized perception.

Verbalization IS NOT identical to perception. Exner's insistence on scoring the verbalizations is not wrong (it prevents undue influence), but it is too strict, even from a diagnostic point of view.

Gérald

-----Message original-----

De : Rick Poll Date : 2009-01-19 14:53:48 A : Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Subject : Réf. : RE: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a blend

I'm not sure I understand the controversy, if any, here.

Exner's system scores aspects of both percept and verbalization. In creating scores it discards a large amount of information, which we clinicians are supposed to address in making our interpretations. This, btw, is one reason why cutting and pasting RIAP or RorScan does not produce a full interpretation.

I occasionally see the raw data from somebody else's Rorschach administration. In a few cases I've seen a normal length protocol (measured by R) written down on a single page. Unless it was an unusually taciturn patient, the likelihood is that the

psychologist was attending to percept more than verbalization (and maybe didn't follow the instruction to record the FA verbatim).

I think that a better approach is to record both FA and inquiry verbatim (Exner does not say to do inquiry verbatim) and also to make notes about speaking style, motor behavior and anything else unusual. None of this interferes with the CS in any way and you acquire more data to interpret.

--- In Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com, Gérald Lajoie <gerald.lajoie@...> wrote:

John:

Rorschach was the first to pay almost exclusive attention to the percept, and this probably remains at the core of the original idea.

Yet, verbalizations must also be taken into consideration very seriously. I would even give them the same diagnostic weight!

Compare:

1- This is a bat, that's all I see.

2- Hum, I don't know, I could say a bat, but I'm not sure. Ok, let's go for a bat, but I must say it's not quite like a real bat...see this / that detail does not look quite like it should...

3- What a weird creature, a bat. It's looks as strange as myself (laughs).. I wonder if it's a male or female bat (laughs)

4- I'm sure most people say this is a bat... that's very ordinary... I'm sure I can find something more "special" if you see what I mean... but I have to say that "bat" does fit the general shape...I know with my personal creativity, I should find something else, but let's not spend the day on this one... a bat.

5- A bat, the type that sucks your blood to death, etc. etc.

All Wo Fo A P.

In a way, we could say that over the year's psychologists meet a wide variety of bats on Card I, even if the score might be identical.

I think that the notion "percept" should include not only what (content) plus the determinants, but also the tone of voice, the non-verbal clues, the choice of words,

the sequence, etc. Whether we see a bat or not does have some meaning, but the HOW is what does differentiate people more clearly and more significantly.

Would you agree with this larger view of "percept"?

Gérald

PS- I just recalled the following: on Card VI "Oh dear, my husband would certainly see a penis here... For me the whole thing is rather an animal skin...".... SHE does not see the penis, so it would not be scorable, and yet :-)

-----Message original-----

Re : John L Wallace Date : 2009-01-19 13:15:12 A : Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Subject : RE: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a blend

Listmates - This is exactly the point Zygmunt A. Piotrowski make years ago in his book Percept Analysis: The Rorschach Method Fundamentally Reworked, Expanded, and Systematized, Fourth Printing 1979. Philadelphia.

It is the percept, not the words that make the difference. Piotrowski's scoring system is based on the precept, not the verbal manner in which the person taking the test uses to communicate what it is they are seeing.

As always,

John

John L. Wallace, Ph.D.

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com]
On Behalf Of hibpsych@... Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2009 18:05 To:
Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a blend

I like the example you give, Bob. It is exactly to the point that I think needs firming up: we need firmer criteria for what counts as a response. In the little paper I hope to deliver this Spring, I try to address this by recasting the "criteria for responses" into "criteria for percepts", because I think that ultimately, the percept is the unit of coding, not the response which is actually a verbal action. I know there is trouble in talking about percepts, but I think there is much more trouble in talking about responses. In the example you give, the stomach is simply a different percept. Coding the derailment can be handled in various ways.