

Scoring Difficulty with the Comprehensive System

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] **On Behalf Of** Cornell, Dewey (dgc2f)
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2009 18:41
To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com
Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Interpretation book for Rorschach course

I have been teaching the Rorschach using the CS for 20+ years. I teach a two-semester course on personality assessment that incorporates both projective and non-projective testing. When I started teaching, I ran into the same problem you describe about the inordinate time it takes to teach scoring. This is one reason I am glad that the Meyers group is going to tackle the issue of a more parsimonious scoring system. My preference would be a basic scoring system that everyone learns, and more advanced scoring for those who want to do more advanced work or research on specialized topics. The time spent learning scores that are rarely used or require inordinate effort for small modifications in interpretation makes them too burdensome and inefficient.

One of the biggest problems is that scoring is so labor intensive that in a one-semester course on projectives, the tail starts to wag the dog. To resolve this problem, some years ago my students suggested that we break out the scoring portion of the course and do it intensively before the regular course. We now have a short summer course (10 sessions of 2-hours each, plus homework) where we work through the Workbook and many of the scoring exercises in the back of the Workbook, as well as several sample cases. If a summer short course is not possible, you might consider some evening or weekend intensive sessions to get students over the hump of scoring as an early phase of your course, so that you can teach a more balanced course. Think of it as a lab or discussion section that is adjunct to the main course.

I have all but abandoned use of the Primer except as a reference book for students to use as they become more experienced. It is too complex and 'jargony' and encourages a mechanical approach without understanding. I have found that Weiner's book is a good introduction because it helps them understand what the scores mean. I also spend time reviewing some basic interpretative steps and have them read some other approaches to interpretation (e.g., a few chapters from Schafer, a paper by Mayman). We apply these steps to a series of cases. Later in the course, we also read some of the criticisms of the Rorschach and rebuttals by its defenders. I think it is essential that you present students with the arguments against the Rorschach (e.g., Woods), let them read the replies, meta-analyses, and other high quality Rorschach research, and allow them to come to their own conclusions.

Dewey

Dewey Cornell, Ph.D.

Programs in Clinical and School Psychology

Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

Director, Virginia Youth Violence Project

<http://youthviolence.edschool.virginia.edu>

Phone: 434-924-0793

Fax: 434-924-1433