

FQu vs. DQ Scoring Criteria and Significance

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf of Gérald Lajoie Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 07:05 To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Digest Number 1338

William:

You are right: my statement is a bit simplistic. FQu responses are sometimes very creative, original, and playful. My insistence on the statistical basis of FQ in the CS was meant to stress the different rationale for FQ as opposed to DQ. (In a way, the FQu may not quite fit the stimuli according to the general opinion...)

As for DQ, you are also right: we would need some deeper probing of this variable.

Not only would we need to solve some of the problems with criteria (for instance in the vague category: very dull, unarticulated "animal of some sort" type of responses vs. the vague description vs. the amorphous formless, etc.), but much research would be necessary to better understand the psychological processes involved in DQ. This would imply scrutinizing works by Dvoretzki, Friedman, Mayman, Rapaport, and others.

Exner's treatment of DQ is very limited, and never considers any links with defense mechanisms, anxiety, etc.

Gérald

-----Original Message----- From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of William J. Ryan Sent: 16 mars 2009 08:15 To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com Subject: Re: [Rorschach_List] Digest Number 1338

I appreciate your thoughtful analysis of form quality; I think we also need this with DQ.

One statement you made, quoted here, is not quite accurate. "The frequency basis just says: according to the general population, your percept does, do not, or does not quite fit the stimuli. So your perception of this object is normal, very weird, and or rather unusual."

FQ unusals do fit the stimuli. It's only that they are statistically rare, often for other reasons. FQu may be very weird, too. The FQ- is just plain inaccurate (or uses arbitrary lines). Weirdness (often reflected in the WSum6, does not necessarily on impact the FQ.

<Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com> 3/16/2009 6:57 AM >>> There are 5 messages in this issue.

Topics in this digest:

1a. Re: New file uploaded to Rorschach_List From: hibpsych@sbcglobal.net

2a. Re: FV and FD in same response - scoring from: hibpsych@sbcglobal.net

2b. Re: FV and FD in same response - scoring From: hibpsych@sbcglobal.net

2c. Re: FV and FD in same response - scoring From: Jeanette Hawkins

3a. Re: Transparency? Scoring help

From: Pamela Olsen

Messages

a. Re: New file uploaded to Rorschach_List Posted by: "hibpsych@sbcglobal.net"
hibpsych@sbcglobal.net hibpsych2 Date: Sun Mar 15, 2009 4:10 am ((PDT))

Let me add my own, maybe weirdly nuanced contribution to this discussion. And let me ask for some principles or principled guidance in understanding C.S. scoring.

Regarding FQ none, I think there are two basic types, the type of abstract movement response such as "depression" to almost any card, and a pure C (or C', T, Y, etc.), which is coded as such because in no way was form used to determine the response.

A critical, and perhaps potentially troubling axiom is that "pure" Cs, Ts, C's, Ys, etc., axiomatically do not receive form quality scores, i.e., the total absence of form as a determinant means that the response cannot then receive a form quality score. This constrains the notion of determination by form in such a way that, at minimum, a thing's having "form involvement" is sufficient to exclude it from being "pure", and a thing's not having "form involvement" is necessary to include it as being "pure" (i.e., pure C, Y, T, etc.)

It used to be the case that Exner and Rorschach Workshops made a distinction between form demand and "form involvement". Without addressing anything having to do with categories of DQ thematically, we can say that the criteria discussed for DQ are met when, either in the response or inquiry phases, the object is articulated in a way that presents form demand. (Of what degree of specificity I am not here discussing. I think good arguments can be made that "bush" and "tree" have greater form demand than either "island" or "lake", even though Exner apparently felt that each of these was equally DQ = v. But that is another discussion.

Some other concepts, such as "island", "drop of blood", etc., might not have a specific form demand, but have form involvement. The difference being that "island", "lake", "drop" do not have a specific form demand, but each must take some form, defined presumably in terms of some type of spatial configuration. In this way, any of these will have some scorable form quality, and using Viglione's elaboration of the two dimensions of form quality, will receive either an "o" or a "u". An individual entity seen on the Rorschach that has no form demand whatsoever, but has form involvement, will automatically default to either "o" or "u", since by definition, there is no way it can defy an reasonable "critical bits" that would require a minus FQ score. But now for my question. In this context, I have understood (concluded, really; nowhere have I seen that Exner nor other Rorschach Workshops folks state this) that since the class of "pure" Cs, C's, Ts, Ys, Vs, must by definition have no form involvement, some DQ = v responses can be coded for form quality (i.e., "a bush", "an island", "a drop of blood", when articulated in inquiry without any specific demand, nonetheless have form involvement), but no "pure" Cs, C's, Ts, etc., can be anything other than DQ = v. If this is all correct, then I think

(but I am not sure) that a necessary condition for a percept's being formless, either as a

movement response ("depression") or as one of the class of "pure" C, C', Y', etc., is that it not be an individual in any sense that makes it spatially bounded or spatially defined as a certain spatial (or spatio-temporal) entity. It lacks any conditions of being a specific entity or a "particular". I would move us here into a philosophical discussion, but I believe that this is necessary to understand the scoring criteria. It means that the class of "pure" Cs, C's, Ys, etc., corresponds to what Aristotle might have called "matter" terms, and what in modern times Quine would have called "mass" terms, i.e., terms that (unless one is an ontological Platonist, believing in other world of forms) refer to "stuff" scattered through space time, such as matter terms, e.g., "water" and other liquids like "blood", color terms like "darkness" or "red", element terms like "snow", "smoke", "fire", maybe also other perceptual quality terms such as "roughness" or "coarseness", etc. In other words, the class of "pure" Cs, C's, etc., could not be any one spatio temporal particular, as captured even by phrases like "a . . ." (a bush, a tree) or "a drop of . . .", a group of . . . a cloud of . . ., etc., so long as what is followed by "a . . ." is thought of as a particular, identifiable entity. Is this correct?