

Rorschach Scoring Klopfer vs. Exner

Interesting discussion.

I always had some trouble with Exner's point that a response is coded FQ- if the person must create contours that do not exist in the blot. And especially if this should hold true no matter what percentage of the sample reported that content. Let's take some of the face responses on Card X involving the use of S. What is the point in a priori deciding that these responses must be FQ-, no matter what percentage of the samples reported that content? After all this is an empirical question.

Regarding the shading-based form responses I read Lerner's chapter some years ago, and have found his understanding of the dynamics of the Fc response very useful and clinically meaningful. It is my impression that there might be a continuum from a normal trait of heightened sensitivity to the hypersensitive, hyper-vigilant narcissist, and that this continuum can be reflected in different nuances of this response type.

Teit Juel Jensen, Denmark

Hi Bob.

Very cool stuff. I've read the chapter you're referring to and I've since really liked Lerner's description of this general type of response as that of a hyper-sensitive, hyper-vigilant narcissism. Makes sense. I've thought about doing a study with this type of response but the base rate seems pretty low.

I really like your description from Klopfer about the justified or arbitrary use of differentiated shading to delineate form and the interpretations. Are the CS missing important distinctions by its classification of all these responses in one category? I guess one could say it's all just shades of gray (ooh, bad joke) . . . But seriously, on a very basic level -- clinically, it would make sense that it would be easier to address the more justified form level variety with the person, it would be the content that is projected that would be the hardest to let go of, not so much the ability to recognize it when it's pointed out. Anyway, I agree that the CS method of putting these all in the same category would miss clinically important distinctions.

Joni

In a message dated 2/9/2005 7:22:42 PM Eastern Standard Time, [rerard2000@AMERITECH.NET](mailto:rerard2000@AMERITECH.NET) writes:

I just checked Klopfer and found his example for Ddo 22 on the LEFT SIDE(!) was as

follows:

This is a Cavalier from the time of Charles I.

INQ: "Here are his eyes, eyebrows, long, curling hair, get wind of, moustache, beard, and the suggestion of a ruff, here. He's looking out of the corner of his eye in rather a distrustful way".

[Man, they just don't give Rorschach responses like they used to...]

Klopfer's score of Di Fc-M Hd O 4.0 (the hyphen being a tendency arrow). In his scheme, a 4.0 is an extraordinarily high form level rating.

Surely, whatever else it may be (such as a strong argument for Lerner's hyper-vigilant narcissist hypothesis for Fc responses), such a response is also a sophisticated achievement with some kind of positive implications?

Klopfer distinguishes between good/justified and bad/arbitrary use of differentiated shading to delineate form. He hypothesizes: "If there is little objective basis for the concept in the differentiations of shading in the blot material, and hence a minus form-level rating, the "di" response is a pathological one, perhaps most characteristic of a schizoid personality fighting against disintegration. If however, the di response is well seen and hence has superior form-level rating, the hypothesis is that there is anxious preoccupation with matters of interpersonal sensitivity; such a response is most often found with intelligent artistic subjects who like the shading aspects of the blot material" (Vol. I, p. 308).

Surely not even all of the high quality responses of this type meet the Exnerian criterion of "quickly and easily seen. OTOH, once they are seen, they are often very compelling. If we must paint them all with the same pathological brush (minus form) in the CS, aren't we perhaps failing to capture a valuable distinction?

For those who may be interested, other similar responses include the rather well formed breasts and partial torso (including navel) in the bottom half of D2 on the right of Card I (Klopfer form level 2.0); a small, but nearly photographic female profile in the reddish area in the middle of D1 on the right side of Card II; a little girl (Shirley Temple-ish) wearing a cap with a curl coming down from her forehead comprising most of the interior of D5 on Card VI; a rather malicious face with bared teeth, sometimes seen underneath a long cap, immediately beneath D5 on Card VII; and 2 hooded figures, one on each side of D5 close to the center of the card on Card VIII.

(And no, I didn't make them all up myself!).

Robert E. Erard, Ph.D.

Psychological Institutes of Michigan, P.C.

Franklin, MI

[rerard2000@ameritech.net](mailto:rerard2000@ameritech.net)

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

From: Rorschach Discussion and Information Group

[mailto:[RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU](mailto:RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU)] On Behalf Of Robert Erard

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 2:08 PM

To: [RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU](mailto:RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU)

Subject: Card IV, Ddo 22--Is it just me?

Is it just me or does "face" for Ddo22 look like outstanding form level (nearly photographic, much like the ordinary form-level "alligator" on Dd33)? Why do we score it F-?

Robert E. Erard, Ph.D.

Psychological Institutes of Michigan, P.C.

Franklin, MI

[rerard2000@ameritech.net](mailto:rerard2000@ameritech.net)