

Rorschach - How Exner Wrecked the Rorschach Forensically

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

From: law and psychology discussion list [mailto:PSYLAW-L@listserv.unl.edu] On Behalf Of Pomichalek, Milan

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 11:21

To: PSYLAW-L@listserv.unl.edu

Subject: Re: [PSYLAW-L] Future of the Rorschach

My views exactly, Paul. (I also trained on Rappaport, Gill and Schafer).

Milan Pomichalek, Ph.D., C. Psych.

MPomichalek@nemhc.on.ca

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

From: law and psychology discussion list

[mailto:PSYLAW-L@listserv.unl.edu] On Behalf Of Paul G. Mattiuzzi

Sent: September-24-09 2:12 AM

To: PSYLAW-L@listserv.unl.edu

Subject: Re: Future of the Rorschach

I mentioned that I wanted to see this issue discussed and to comment myself.

My view is that the CS eventually ruined the Rorschach as a useful clinical tool, at least in the forensic arena. It became all about science, rather than clinical inquiry, and my view is that you can't administer it if you might have to take it into Court and defend the science. A jury won't care and won't follow it. In the end, all they hear is: "he said this looks like a bat ... that's what you based your opinion on?"

Before I trained on the first edition of Exner, I trained on the Holt revision of Rappaport, Gill and Schafer, and on Schafer. In Rappaport, et al, introduction to the Rorschach, they talk about "clinical-psychological thinking and understanding of subjects" being replaced by interpretations emphasizing the significance of the scoring.

They warned that refinements in scoring would lead to cook book (or what they called "dream book") interpretations, saying that "such a preoccupation can easily blunt any appreciation of the psychological processes active in the subject taking the test, and can lead only to mechanical application and interpretation."

In his first edition, Exner derided Zubin for saying that the Rorschach was nothing more than an "interview."

Rather than moving forward with more sophisticated science, I'd like to go back to that time when it could be said that the Rorschach was just a useful interview technique. That, I think was more defensible. I'd like to go back in time to when Rappaport was saying that it should

be a simple procedure and largely idiographic.

I'd like to go back to when you could use the cards without being stuck with a data set that will be impeached if you don't have a computer printout and impugned if you do.

My thoughts,

Paul

Paul g. Mattiuzzi, Ph.D.

On Thu, 24 Sep 2009 03:17:16 +0000, Tyler Carpenter

<jtcarpenter30@HOTMAIL.COM> wrote:

And it is precisely the use of the Rapaport method that makes the Rorschach more efficient at eliciting thought disorder which is a major advantage this test has over the MMPI when trolling for certain kinds of psychopathology.

Tyler

J. Tyler Carpenter=2C Ph.D.