

Rorschach - Communication Deviance, Slippage, Psychotic Perception Scoring

Date: Fri, 7 Apr 2006 11:00:35 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Scoring questions
Reply-To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com

Rorschach - Communication Deviance, Slippage, Psychotic Perception Scoring

I used to be involved in research on thought and language disorders in schizophrenia (with Nancy Docherty at Kent State). We measured language slips in a few ways, but not using the Rorschach (though some of the lit we cited did).

I think if INCOM is meant to get at conceptual slippage broadly, it makes sense for it to capture statements of the sort we have discussed (that seem to be mostly linguistic).

What makes me say that is that Docherty has focused to a large extent on ***communication* deviance**, which does not presume thought disorder. If the communication is distorted, there is a problem whether it is linguistic or cognitive, since **the listener will be confused**. What Docherty found is that not only do schizophrenic patients do this more frequently than controls, but also the 1st-degree relatives are prone to communication slippage that seems to reflect subtle cognitive slippage that is not at a psychotic level.

I think the reason I balked at scoring INCOM in these cases is that I had conceptualized INCOM as really a measure of **psychotic perceptions**, ones that feature fusing of incongruous percepts. I do think this is the case with INCOM level 2. But it seems that many INCOM level 1 scorings reflect rather a looseness of language in which not only is the word wrong (such as in a DV), but the **meaning** that is communicated reflects a fusing of concepts in an incongruous manner -- such as a bat with hands, or a bat with antennas, or an insect with tentacles. Whether or not it's really a percept is perhaps beside the point. What has been communicated to the listener is incongruous.

--- "Dana A. Max, Psy.D." <dmax@danamax.com> wrote:

Interesting. Still not sure I agree, but I certainly see the logic. Although I guess tentacle does not seem too strange to me, IF he was meaning antenna. If he was meaning tentacle, yes, it's strange and I see how one could score INCOM. I guess there are two issues in this particular case. First, is it more a DV or INCOM, which is the point you discuss. The other is if the clinician needs to take into account the educational and verbal skills level of the client in scoring, which I think the workbook suggests one should.

Dana A. Max, Psy.D., P.C.
Licensed Clinical Psychologist

5808 S. Rapp Street, Suite 200
Littleton, CO 80120
(303) 347-8498
(303) 347-2011 (FAX)
<<http://www.danamax.com>> www.danamax.com
<<mailto:dmax@danamax.com>> dmax@danamax.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com]
On Behalf Of Joseph Rhinewine Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 11:27 AM
To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Scoring questions

Three times when describing butterflies or insects he used the term "tentacle" instead of antenna. I know that technically this would be a DV1, but with his grade level and background, would you still score that as a neologism. The workbook states, "involving the tentacle...", Tim Catlow and I have had endless discussions regarding this issue.

Tim scores these as INCOM, because butterflies don't have tentacles. I have conformed to this after much debate.

My point was that conceptually, it seems like loose language (DV), not loose perception (INCOM), although my point seems weaker in the context of 'tentacle' which is really kind of strange. There have been other instances in which the deviation was less dramatic.

I think a good example of what I'm asking would be the use of the word "foot" where "paw" would be more appropriate. We have been scoring "foot" for animals as INCOM (I think--right, Tim?) I have always thought that DV would be better as it seems like a linguistic rather than conceptual slip. However Tim has won me over by pointing out that an INCOM level 1 doesn't really make a lot of difference in the structural summary versus a DV.

Now on the other hand, "hand" instead of paw, while still essentially a language error in my view, is stranger than "foot", and I'm more amenable to an INCOM rating for this.

This contrasted with "tentacle" instead of antenna. Various levels of weirdness, it seems to me.

Any thoughts are welcome.

From: "Robert Erard" <rerard2000@ameritech.net>
Sender: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Date: 07Apr2006
Joe

Here's Viglione (7-21):

'Tentacles' are slender, flexible organs originating from the heads of some invertebrates (Webster's). The most common 'tentacle' response in the review for this reference guide is 'crab with tentacles...'

He goes on to state that "tentacles" instead of jointed legs should be scored INCOM1. OTOH, in cases of word finding problems, Viglione says DV1 may be more appropriate than INCOM1. "For example, tentacles on various insects and crustaceans or "spiders" and "squids" are not INCOM."

For comparison, Viglione scores DV1 for "antlers" on insects (a misuse of the word "antennae") but INCOM for "antlers" on bats and birds (no such feature). "Feet" on butterflies or insects are INCOM (no feet on invertebrates), "arms" for weight-bearing forelegs in mammals in most cases, and "hands" on mostly anything but primates and humans (and clocks) are INCOM.

Robert E. Erard, Ph.D. Psychological Institutes of Michigan, P.C. Franklin, MI
rerard2000@ameritech.net

N.B. This e-mail message is not encrypted and may be subject to interception by people for whom it was not intended. Privacy of e-mail communications with me cannot be fully assured.

-----Original Message----- From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
[mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of Timothy Catlow Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 3:18 PM To: 'Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com' Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Scoring questions

Not quite. It is true that in the case of deciding whether to give a DV1 for "pointy," the difference to the WSum6 is negligible, so I don't worry too much about it. But I do not apply the same logic to the situation of a butterfly having tentacles and whether to code DV or INCOM. A butterfly with tentacles is an INCOM based on the definitions of DV and INCOM. A DV is either a neologism or it is a redundancy. A tentacle is neither; rather, it is a body part that is incongruous to a butterfly, i.e., an INCOM. The example in the workbook of a "bacteria under a telescope" (which is coded as a DV) is potentially misleading. It is not the same situation as the butterfly with tentacles. There is no microscope in the actual percept. The subject is really saying that it is as if the bacteria were being seen under a microscope. As a result, it would be impossible to code a FABCOM or INCOM for the inappropriate use of the word "telescope". In the case of the butterfly, the body part is actually in the percept.

Tim

From: Joseph Rhinewine [mailto:jpenr@yahoo.com] Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 10:27 AM To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Scoring questions

Three times when describing butterflies or insects he used the term "tentacle" instead of antenna. I know that technically this would be a DV1, but with his grade level and background, would you still score that as a neologism. The workbook states, "involving the

Tim Catlow and I have had endless discussions regarding this issue.

Tim scores these as INCOM, because butterflies don't have tentacles. I have conformed to this after much debate.

My point was that conceptually, it seems like loose language (DV), not loose perception (INCOM), although my point seems weaker in the context of 'tentacle', which is really kind of strange. There have been other instances in which the deviation was less dramatic.

I think a good example of what I'm asking would be the use of the word "foot" where "paw" would be more appropriate. We have been scoring "foot" for animals as INCOM (I think--right, Tim?) I have always thought that DV would be better as it seems like a linguistic rather than conceptual slip. However Tim has won me over by pointing out that an INCOM level 1 doesn't really make a lot of difference in the structural summary versus a DV.

Now on the other hand, "hand" instead of paw, while still essentially a language error in my view, is stranger than "foot", and I'm more amenable to an INCOM rating for this.

This contrasted with "tentacle" instead of antenna. Various levels of weirdness, it seems to me.

Any thoughts are welcome.

Joe

