Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology MJCP

ISSN: 2282-1619 VOL. I, N. 2 (2013)

Doi: 10.6092/2282-1619/2013.2.923

EDITORIAL

Rorschach: reactive or test?

SALVATORE SETTINERI¹

¹ Associate Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Messina, Italy

Email corresponding author: salvatore.settineri@unime.it

A phenomenon, both in reality and in virtual, can be read into and interpreted from several points of view. Such views can mutually exclude as much as include and integrate each others. In science can therefore exist some dichotomies and in case of reactive Rorschach responses, each of them should be considered more an expression of a system than a summation of signs. The Rorschach response can classically be summarized and reduced to an apperception (spatial location); a determinant (response reason); a content (i.e. sense) and possibly frequency (popular) or rarity (original) of response. These elements allow the interpretation process to exceed the simple sum of the parts of which it is composed.

The projective reactive, both in the single card administration and as a whole, activates a process whose evaluation should be read differently if the response is a perception or a representation. In the first case, the response may be evaluated following the percept rational, therefore the comparison may nimbly walking into what is acceptable. In the second case, may be evaluated in the representation sphere and then at a subjective level.

Failing to take account of these two points of view in phenomenology is a source of error, since perceptions show, phenomenologically speaking (K. Jaspers), characters of corporeity, external spatial location, well-defined

2 SETTINERI S.

design, sensory freshness, consistency, will independence. Conversely representations have an imaginary character, internal spatial location, undefined design, inadequacy, relative dependence on the will.

These areas are antithetical, dichotomous and opposite. Their antithetical nature increases or decreases according to proximity between blot and percept, which is typically suitable in the V table. Then relation with consciousness elaboration, with its integrative dynamics, is therefore representative of a structure that nowadays justifies the wide clinical use of the instrument.

Furthermore is worth the difference, placed on the semiotics level, of stimulus (blot) - response (U. Eco), that separates the above phenomenon, as a communication process, from a broader term which includes the response. This phenomenon is a sign system, i.e. an algorithm in which the elements are divided into acceptable and unacceptable and around which the whole problem of the goodness of determinants revolves. It can't be liquidated with a + as the result of the recurrence, or statistical – for its opposite. If that happens, we may have a statistical evaluation of the Rorschach Test, but not necessarily clinic.

In the same reactive administration, in its original formula, it's asked "what represents" the card, that in its formulation is carefully distinguished from the possible error of beginners "what do you see in this table"; the table perception can't be other than a blot, commonly not considered a response.

The Rorschach response is placed therefore in an explorative perspective of representation. It follows that the representation, unlike the perception, presents some intermediate steps; for example, one of these is the time between administration and response emergence, normally it's impossible to know what happens in the mind during that laps time, but it is likely that the process includes a quantity of excitation as a whole, as it seems documented by the fact that depressed patients manifest times elongation. If we consider that the response actually refers not only to the stimulus (which in fact is just more or less coloured ink), but its internal resonance, the phenomenon that leads to the response is subjective and therefore not necessarily acceptable because it is produced from a absolutely individual history and with the characteristics of each subjective system. This last sense retrieves the statistical difficulties in the clinical and in the relationships.

The assessment is in any case rather than a truth, which could be the comparison between data and his relationship with the Gaussian distribution, a possibility with all the restrictions that this entails, including the potentially infinity multiplication of possibilities that reduces the same

possibilities of objectivity, even if in the beginning of Rorshach such objectivity there is only in the difference between popular and original.

On a semiological level U. Eco well expresses the process of what happens when a human being interprets a table of ink. He will report to his current perception, the memory of a past percept and an abstract review.

Since the response process is a triadic model, the risk is to underline only the perception (percept), the memory (engram) or the connecting category (abstraction). The emphasis placed on one of these three factors leads to a limit and a false interpretation: it is difficult then to establish rules leading the interpreter to be strongly conditioned by the context and that's why I think that the responce is more influenced by motives of examination than by possible simulations.

All this must be taken into account in forensics.

Similarly to this assumption by Eco, proposed in biological recognition, it must be inferred that we should reject an interpretation even in favour of Rorshach.

Eco says that semiological models can be used only as models. The Rorschach would be a working model of the mind, not the only, nor the exclusive, not even the cardinal and, in particular, the reactive is well suited, like other projective, to describe the mental functioning through mental functioning through images and probably the representations recurring structure. Unlike the TAT or ROT, in which representation arises too, but better articulated in terms of associative processes and thus of tale.

A further contribution of Eco leads us to consider whether the reactive is a scale model or a metaphorical model.

The writer opts for a mixed model. In his first formulation the Rorschach reactive, so far as it attains to a numerical summary, would seem appropriate for a system of scales. Neverthless scales and indexes have become so many to originate a Babel that led to the Escher paradox, that is that kind of phenomena representations which change simply by moving the point of view: this is extremely dangerous because does not allow the synthesis through which express the opinion. Such paradoxical dimension has effectively sidelined the unscientific use of the instrument leading to a rare use in the detailed research, especially where it would be particularly valuable, like in the field of personality disorders.

In conclusion we are in agreement with Castiello D'Antonio A. who affirms that the reading of the Rorschach, as other projective reactives, should be carried out following the reading bases of mental functioning: in this perspective can be applicable biunivocal relationships between constructs

4 SETTINERI S.

and indicators research, that make sense for the subject and on which is based clinic meant as relationship.

On the other hand, over time will be possible to identify, through scientific research, the most satisfactory methods to objectively understand the reactive. For the time being there is no doubt that the current validity of the instrument must take into account how much light gave the comprehensive reading of the patient and how many shadows gave in honor of that alleged altar of truth suitable for exact sciences, but far less for the spirit one's.

References

Castiello D'Antonio A. Il Rorschach e le Tecniche Proiettive. Giornale Italiano di Psicologia. A XXXVI, n.4 dic. 2009.

Eco U. I limiti dell'interpretazione. Bompiani, Milano, 1990.

Jaspers K. Psicopatologia Generale. Trad. it. Il Pensiero Scientifico Editore. Padova, 1964.

Rorschach H. Psicodiagnostic. Trad. it, Roma, 1981.

Valente Torre, Freilone F. Elementi di Psicopatologia Clinica e psicodiagnostica. UTET, Torino, 1996.