

From: Forensics Discussion List [FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU] on behalf of David Ranks [David.Ranks@IMAIL.ORG]
Sent: 09 July, 2008 08:48
To: FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU
Subject: Re: [FORENSICNP] R CS debacle

Sorry for coming in late. I agree with James on this, and feel he has stated the position well. I cannot agree with your comment Steve. The fact that these people do not know the test well enough to judge it scientifically does not mean that it is immune to verification outside the circle of believers. When Wood, Nejaworsky, McKinzey etc. focus on a very limited set of data on the test, and ignore a vast array of data that does not support their position, the bias in literature review and synthesis leaves them without the data to judge the test accurately.

I recall a number of years ago Norway was looking for a way to predict which people would successfully complete training for their Alpine combat team for their army. Sounded similar to our special forces. They found the Rorschach to provide predictive validity well above any other measures used - I may be wrong but I believe that included the MMPI.

When the criticisms came out, Greg Meyer helped facilitate research teams that included both proponents and critics of the Rorschach, to assess its strengths and weaknesses. That led to a series of 5 publications, and included the finding that the Rorschach, MMPI, and Wechsler Scales have very similar effect sizes, and that the Rorschach is better at predicting real-world behavior (because that's what it was standardized on) while the MMPI is better at predicting responses on other self-report measures. Greg included people from both sides to be sure the results would NOT be biased.

I am actually quite impressed with the openness of the Rorschach people - when they find valid criticisms, they take them in and use them to strengthen the test. Because the Rorschach works in ways that are not face valid and intuitively obvious, it actually has to have stronger research than tests like the MMPI.

I once attended a seminar with John Exner and Jim Butcher, where both addressed the same questions on the same cases, each using their test. Butcher ended up apologizing for the MMPI as a very limited self-

report measure that did not have as high a standard for reliability and validity and the Rorschach, and stated that the Rorschach is designed to address deeper and more wide-ranging issues than the MMPI was.

I agree with James that more facts and less dogmatism would be helpful.

David Ranks, Ph.D., ABPN

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

From: Forensics Discussion List [mailto:FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU] On Behalf Of Steve Rubenzer

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 5:23 PM

To: FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU

Subject: Re: [FORENSICNP] R CS debacle

James,

The notion that the critics of the test don't know enough to criticize is a really troubling argument, as it makes the technique essentially immune to verification outside its circle of believers.

Best regards,
Steve

Steve Rubenzer, PhD, ABPP

Diplomate in Forensic Psychology

American Board of Professional Psychology

NOTE: This e-mail is for professional purposes only. This e-mail may contain confidential, privileged and/or proprietary information intended only for the person(s) named. Distribution or disclosure to another person is strictly prohibited. You may not copy or deliver this message to anyone if you are not the addressee indicated in this message [or responsible for delivery of the message to such person]. If you are not the intended addressee, please destroy this message and notify the sender by reply email.

Thank you.

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

From: Forensics Discussion List [mailto:FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU] On Behalf Of james h waters phd

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 6:01 PM

To: FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU

Subject: Re: [FORENSICNP] R CS debacle

Kim, I'm not an apologist. I am getting pretty tired of your dismissive approach. I think there is plenty wrong with the Rorschach, and I don't need you to tell me that. (I did notice a typo in what you are quoting. I meant "a little less scorn".) Your overvaluing of your WWWR paper astonishes me. I have read it. There are some good points and a lot of not so good ones. Overall, I find its effect unhelpful, for reasons already stated, and I disagree that it ought to turn the heads of all thinking people. So is my credibility higher, now? No, I didn't buy the book. Nor have I bought "what's right with the ..." - if it's a book. I perused it on line. As for the WWWR book, I'd seen enough of the type of argumentation from the critics to have a pretty good idea what to expect; didn't and don't feel the need to buy it. I also read their Scientific American article, where it became apparent that they did not know enough about the Rorschach to criticize it. Their proliferation of straw men was astonishing, and led first to fatigue and finally a sense of ennui. I don't continue to read articles about the hazards of vaccination or continuing evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. It is a simple fact that there are plenty of intelligent folks on both sides of this controversy, and the critics with whom you seem to think you are aligning yourself have grudgingly admitted a fair number of points. If you don't know that, and you continue to denigrate dozens of knowledgeable people, that's your prerogative. I don't find it helpful or warranted. That's not a logical argument - truth by consensus - it's merely heuristic, in the context of probable inference. Your ignorance of positive evidence continues to disappoint me. It had seemed, at times, that your thinking had evolved a little beyond that exemplified by the critics' early statements in the late 90s and early 2000s that there was "no" evidence of the validity of the Rorschach or CS. (At least, for the most part, we do not have to listen to that, except from Lillienfeld.) So, on occasion, I have had some hope. Still, your apparent fixed belief that the entire enterprise amounts to fortune telling strikes me as approaching the delusional, or, to be less pathologizing, simply silly. It appears to be an irremediable blindness to the facts, as near as I can discern, though based on what, I do not know. That's my prerogative, and as far as this issue is concerned, this leads me to a decision. In closing, I say, deny the positive findings all you wish. For now, I have better things to do than

continue to fight with you about this, so I'm going to go back to using what few pieces of evidence I can from the panoply of instruments we have available. I'll use the E-HRB, Wechsler, MMPI, D-KEFS, Portland, VIP, and other flawed instruments, cautiously - as cautiously as I use the Rorschach.

I'll even use unstructured interviews, which, to date, I have noticed continue to escape any systematic examination in this forum except for one post by Wilma. This may strike you as foolhardy, but that carries little weight for me, since, as far as I can tell, the heuristic you are using is flawed. I'm aware that this has turned from a rational discussion to one regarding broader attitudes, though, of course, one can do research on heuristics, too. Nevertheless, my approach works well for me; perhaps yours does for you. I'll leave it at that. Bye for now

James H Waters PhD
Boulder, Colorado

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

From: Forensics Discussion List [mailto:FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU] On Behalf Of Kim McKinzey
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 3:19 PM
To: FORENSICNP@BAMA.UA.EDU
Subject: Re: [FORENSICNP] R CS debacle

At 6:29 PM -0600 7/7/08, james h waters phd wrote:

>What I would expect is a little scorn and dogmatism on the part of some
>people, such as Dr. McKinzey and Dr. Hartman, who seem to believe that
>it
is
>incredible that anyone could give any consideration to this procedure.
>"Astonished" strikes me as, frankly, a completely unwarranted reaction

Not surprising, given that you haven't read WWW. Don't you think it would increase your credibility as an apologist if you did?

>I object to the notion that it has somewhere been unequivocally
>established to the satisfaction of everyone that this is a totally
>flawed procedure used only by nincompoops.

sigh

>
>I am astonished. Have you read WWR? How about my 2 R papers?
>
>rkm
>
>McKinzey, R. K. (2005, May 15). The Rorschach's false positive rate
>is 81%. WebPsychEmpiricist Retrieved May 15, 2005, from
>http://wpe.info/papers_table.html
>
>McKinzey, R. K., & Campagna, V. (2002, April 27). The Rorschach,
>Exner's Comprehensive System, Interscorer Agreement, and Death.
>WebPsychEmpiricist. Retrieved April 27, 2002 from
>http://www.wpe.info/papers_table.html
>
>Wood, J. M., Nezworski, M. T., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Garb, H. N.
>(2003). What's Wrong With the Rorschach? Science Confronts the
>Controversial Inkblot Test. New York: Wiley.
><http://wpe.info/books.html>
>