Rorschach Form with a Blend Scoring MQnone

Steve

I agree. Of the 600 non-patients adults, apparently 4 gave any MQnone responses, and the max = 1, so each of these gave only one such. And in the interpretive part of the manual, JE provides plenty of incentive to interpret these embellished M responses, although he does not call out MQnone itself as a special class, most likely because they are rare. The responses you list of course have an air of erudition about them, and for sure suggest abstractness. I am reminded here, oddly enough, of Alex Caldwell's caricatured interpretations of the K scale, as suggesting a type of "upper crust, aristocratic nobility" that avoids showing anxiety under any circumstances. Also shades over into a type of narcissism, i.e., could be a manifestation of such, certainly as much as a manifestation of the self image.

However, as for coding MQnone, I think I know how it's supposed to be coded, i.e., I think I understand the coding criteria. I don't understand the coding criteria for F.xx, pure F in a blend, and for me; at least, it's difficult to find where the coding criteria sufficient to render such a code are to be found in any CS or Exner books. But that is an extended conversation, and as you point out, a) MQnone is sufficiently established that it is listed on the structural summary (F.xx is not), and b) MQnone has clear and obvious interpretability. In contrast, those responses that I have seen as candidates for F.xx all seem to me to be treatable as cases of FABCOMs, or as two responses. For example, occasionally we have the bow tie in card III stated as "a butterfly" immediately after reference to the two human objects, and they are all supposed to be a single "response" or "percept", i.e., all get coded on one line. I would argue that in such cases, either the b.f. is actually part of the same percept as the two figures, and hence its form determination is captured by the form determination of the other entities, and the oddness of its size or context can be captured by a special score; or its actually a separate percept. It either has a "meaningful relationship" to the two human figures, even if only a spatial relationship, such as being between them, or, if it does not, then it's a separate percept, deserving a separate coding line.   But that's already to say too much.

I'd really like to hear what Barry has to say about F.xx.

Steve

--- On Sun, 1/18/09, drmigalski@aol.com <drmigalski@aol.com> wrote: From: drmigalski@aol.com <drmigalski@aol.com> Subject: [Rorschach_List] Another low base rate occurrence - MQnone To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Date: Sunday, January 18, 2009, 10:03 AM

In addition to Pure F blends, MQnone is also a very low base-rate score and with very poor scoring reliability, but it is an example of a low-base rate score in the CS that, despite little published scholarship on it, seems to have considerably more clinical meaning than a pure F blend does.

If someone goes out of their way to ignore the contours of the blot completely, to project associations of personal human emotions in the guise of purely formless emotional responses as in "It looks like compete an utter whimsy" or "It looks like human hopelessness, " two MQnone responses I've gotten over the years, then they seem to be ignoring the instructions of telling the examiner what the perceptual stimuli in their immediate environment actually "might be or look like." Remember these ARE the instructions of the Rorschach task. These seem to be folks whose immediate emotional associations "break through" into their cognitive processes or folks who are very committed to verbalizing their emotional associations in the face of being asked to stick closely to physical data in their immediate environment.

I'd love to hear how you all make sense of FQnone responses.

Steve

Dr. Steven Migalski Core Faculty, Adler School of Professional Psychology br> Associate Director of Training, Adler Community Health Services

65 E. Wacker Place, Suite 2100 Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 201- 3151

-----Original Message----- From: hibpsych@sbcglobal. net To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups. com Sent: Sun, 18 Jan 2009 8:38 am Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a blend

Hi Rick

I also like to have valid indicators of low base rate events. It would be great to have decent predictors of suicide, for example.   I am ignorant, though, as to what a pure F Blend is correlated with? Is there a study on it? Is it listed in the interpretive

manuals? If you could help me out on this, I'd appreciate it.

Steve

--- On Sun, 1/18/09, Rick_Poll <richardipollack@ yahoo.com> wrote: From: Rick_Poll <richardipollack@ yahoo.com> Subject: [Rorschach_List] Re: Pure F in a blend To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com Date: Sunday, January 18, 2009, 1:53 AM

I would love to have a list of response-types, each of which correlated highly with something specific (as does F blend) -- no matter how rare.

To me, the issue isn't how rare the response is. It's 1) whether it can be coded reliably and 2) whether it means something (validity).

The problem with pure F blends seems to be that novices sometimes code it where it doesn't apply. That problem has the same remedy as many other coding problems -- a searchable archive of gold standard scorings -- so that coders could see what an F blend really looks like. All 26 of them.

Rick

--- In Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com, "Michelle S. Berliss" <msberliss@. ..> wrote:

"But aside from that argument, simply on the basis of statistics, you will not suffer any loss whatsoever in a career of Rorschach interpretation, if you simply adapt the habit of never coding F in a blend".

Indeed!

From Exner, Vol. 1 p.142: Pure F in a blend is extremely rare: Exner mentions 26 responses in 15,000 protocols. Almost all come from neurologically impaired or intellectually limited subjects.

Michelle

From: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of hibpsych@... Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2009 9:01 PM To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups. com Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Coding "The soul going up"

Evyatar

I merely want to "second" what Robert says here. The coding system developed by Exner has had success because the rules can be applied consistently. I myself have misgiving similar to your own about coding a corpse H, and yet coding the central

principle of human life, the soul, the psyche (Greek), 'die Seele' (German), or whatever it is in Hebrew, with (H). The most "human" thing, to me, is the principle of life, the identity of the person, which in the various religions, is the soul. And yet, this particular percept is very rare, usual, in its demands on the coding system. Often, we code a response according to the system, but we reserve the right to modify interpretation because we realize that no coding system can accurately capture everything. As an aside, let me say that Robert and I live in the same state, Michigan, and we are each within 45 km of the largest Arabic speaking group in our nation. I do not yet have a student bilingual in Arabic and English, but it would be great to have a resource who Rorschach in Arabic and English. It seems like you're getting there.

As to the business about coding pure F in a blend (F.FM), I teach my students to simply never do this. Somewhere Exner mentions the frequency of these blends, and they are so very rare that anyone who is influenced reasonably by base rate considerations would not have any such score in their system. In a paper I hope to give this spring, I will argue that there is no tenable way that such a code can be given. But aside from that argument, simply on the basis of statistics, you will not suffer any loss whatsoever in a career of Rorschach interpretation, if you simply adapt the habit of never coding F in a blend.

Ciao Steve

0A> --- On Sat, 1/17/09, Robert Erard <rerard2000@ ...> wrote:

From: Robert Erard <rerard2000@ ...> Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Coding "The soul going up" To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com Date: Saturday, January 17, 2009, 3:00 PM

Evyatar:

The M is not for the dead body but for the soul--the soul being the animate force of the person; it has its own motive power. As a conscious, human-like force it merits an M (and an (H)), not an m. It is an abstract idea, but not a symbolic representation- -it is a 'ding an sich'. Thus, no AB. The body gets an H because it is a whole human form. Dead, alive, or drawn, it is H if it is a whole, non-fictional human form.

Re: the second one, I'm in no position to opine on the translation issues, but I'm not following what exactly it is that the chickens are doing with respect to the water and the pail. If it is something that poultry do, then FM; if not, then M. In any event, it is extremely rare and almost always incorrect to score F with another determinant with another response. Here, if you are scoring FM for even one part of the response, that becomes the determinant for the entire response, superseding the F for the pail.

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

HI Aimee and Robert

The answer translated from Arabic (I work in Um-El Phahem Psychiatric clinic for
Children and youth). I asked the same question and my participants (3 in the group)
translated it to "Neshamma" and not to "Nefesh" (What do think is the best word in
English "Soul or may be Spirit?).

The inquiry is partly enough we have to deduce that the "Black body body, had and
red eyes" is a human being.

In the Arabic Islamic culture the soul (Neshama) going up just from dead human being.
The boy says nothing about death. So we deducted that that the body is of dead
human (His father is very sick - he has a Cancer).

He pointed out that the soul (D2) is separated from the body (D1).

For my opinion it's not logically to give M for dead body because the soul of it is "going
up", and not very logically to give H for the body and (H) for the soul in the same
response.

I thought about AB for "soul" because it's an abstract idea, is not like "Spiritus
Sanctus" (Ruhach Hakodesh), but I'm not sure about it.

For the second response - "...poultry head filing water in pail" - He didn't say anything
about running water and not pointed out, so we deduced that he see the water in the
pail but have not perception of "streaming water. That is the reason for coding
separate F for the pail after FMa.

What do you think?

Thanks for your answers

Evyatar

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

From: Robert Erard <mailto:rerard2000@

To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com <mailto:Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 4:47 PM

Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Coding "The soul going up"

I agree with Aimee, and would simply add that we commonly code ghosts as (H) and soul, spirit, etc. should be in the same class of phenomena (as in the phrase, "He gave up the ghost" or "Into your hands, I commend my spirit").

Robert E. Erard, Ph.D. Psychological Institutes of Michigan, P.C. Franklin, MI rerard2000@ameritec <mailto:rerard2000@ ...> h.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.

From: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups. com [mailto:Rorschach_ List@yahoogroups .com] On Behalf Of Aimee Yermish Sent: Friday, January 16, 2009 7:07 AM To: Rorschach_List@ yahoogroups.com Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] Coding "The soul going up"

On 16 Jan 2009, at 12:14 AM, Evyatar Michaelis wrote:

1. Card II "It's a soul that go up (D2)" InQ: "Here (D1) is the black body and here (Dd26) is the head with red eyes and the soul (D@) going up from here (D4). No more details in the Inquiry. My coding questions: - "Soul going up" - M or m, Passive or active - The content coding of soul - Hx, AB, Id - MOR or not.

Wow, that's an interesting philosophical and religious question. Do you think it matters if he used the word nefesh or neshama or some other word? (I have some Hebrew, not a huge amount.) What does *he* think of the soul as, an essentially human thing or a sort of object? Personally, I'd say that because of the content coding involving human content, I think I'd vote for M over m.

"Going up" as passive or active... I think passive -- it sounds like the soul is floating up from the body, not actively fleeing.

Content code for soul... I don't think you can code Id if you code other things, right? Instead of Hx, though, my first reaction was

(H). Again, another deeply philosophical question, and one that may hinge on the kid's understanding of the idea rather than ours. I don't agree with AB -- it's not a representation of a soul, it *is* a soul. Do you also need to code the body?

MOR... it's a pity we don't know for sure whether he thinks the body is dead or merely meditating or dissociating. I'm inclined to guess that he meant dead, so yes on MOR.

2. Card III "It's two head of poultry" Inq: "Here (Dd 32) is 2 heads of poultry because the beak and they filing water the pail (D7)"

(Have no any word about the water) I code it: D+ FMa (for filling water). F (for pail) Ad, Hh, FAB1 What do you think?

Ma -- chickens don't fill water pails, humans do. The rest seems reasonable. (I'm assuming the apparent DVs are really just translation issues.) Did he show you actual water (mp)?

Great way to wake up in the morning, wrestling with interesting Rorschach responses...

Aimee Yermish, doctoral student clinical psychology

 Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology

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.

Rick:

Re-reading p. 142, I observe once more how Exner looks precise but actually is not.

26 responses (F in Blend) in 15,000 protocols... say in at least 300,000 responses... how significant is that?

Also: " Almost all are in records collected from neurologically impaired or intellectually limited subjects..."

Now tell me: almost all = how many of the 26 responses and how many protocols does this "sample" contain?

What kind of sample is that:

 a) What does "neurologically impaired" mean (what type, how severe and what proportion?

b) What does "intellectually limited" subjects mean? (How severe and what proportion?).

c) "Or" does not state if this type of Blend is more frequent or even in both types of subjects.

So, what the heck are we talking about here?

This being said, how can the Master conclude: "... they are extremely unusual and

i interpretively quite significant"?

And, by the way, what does "significant" mean and signifying what? I am not aware of any Exner research on this issue.

So I wonder who displays some "disjointed" thinking besides me?

Also, I can imagine intellectually limited people (whatever that means) just not paying much attention to the necessity of linking all things together, without displaying disjointed thinking.

Evyatar: Exner does not seem to mention a link with anything as precise as "thought disturbance", but I do not see what he does mention actually. On the other hand, I would not score a separate F in the response you posted, because of the proximity and the relationship between the birds and the object. Mao and Fab2 are just what is needed.   And don't forget the pair, and the Ad content.

Gérald

S

Gérald