

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1947

Comparison of adjustment ratings on the Rorschach and thematic apperception test

Frances Carol Haynes
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Haynes, Frances Carol, "Comparison of adjustment ratings on the Rorschach and thematic apperception test" (1947). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 5730.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/5730>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

A COMPARISON
OF ADJUSTMENT RATINGS
ON THE RORSCHACH
AND
EMOTIONAL APPERCEPTION TEST

by

F. Carol Haynes

B.A., Montana State University, 1946

Presented in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree of Mas-
ter of Arts.

Montana State University

1947

Approved:

Ernest A. Johnson
Chairman of Board
of Examiners

W. P. Clark
Dean, Graduate School

UMI Number: EP41197

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP41197

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Library
7-29-47
qt.-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II. A DISCUSSION OF THE PROJECTIVE TECHNIQUE . .	4
III. THE RORSCHACH TEST: THEORY AND METHOD . . .	10
Theory	10
Methods	12
Location of Response	13
Determinants	15
IV. METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND EXPERIMENT	25
Methods of Analysis	25
Experimental Methods	30
V. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS	33
Summary of Results	33
Conclusions	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38
APPENDIX I	39
APPENDIX II	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. DISTRIBUTION MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS . .	33
II. CORRELATIONS OF FACTORS ON THE MUNROE CHECK LIST WITH THE T. A. T. ADJUSTMENT RATINGS . .	35

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Rorschach test and the Thematic Apperception Test are clinically used to supplement each other in giving information concerning the personality of the client, since they are theoretically measuring different aspects of the same core of individual modes of thinking, feeling, and perceiving. They are based on the same principle of personality, the projective hypothesis, that assumes that the unique mental traits of the individual will have free rein to operate in a situation unstructured by cultural patterns of perception and behavior. The differing stimulus patterns utilized by the two tests call forth response from different aspects of the personality structure, but it is the same personality structure. The Thematic Apperception Test reveals specific presses on and needs within the personality, whereas the Rorschach results are more directly expressive of the dynamic structure of the personality. If these differences were not inherent in the tests, their clinical utility would be greatly decreased.

Although most of the studies in which the Rorschach and T. A. T. have been administered to the same groups of subjects have emphasized these differences in approach,¹ some work has

¹ Sargent, H., "Projective Methods: Their Origins, Theory, and Application in Personality Research," Psychol. Bull. 42:257-293, 1945.

been done in comparing detailed interpretations for similarities. Richardson,² studying the personality of stutterers, analyzed personality sketches for a single case based on the Rorschach and Thematic test and found that "there is considerable consistency insofar as they are comparable." In another study on the use of projective methods in clinical practice, Harrison³ found a considerable region of overlapping in the information yielded by the two tests. Here, too, the similarities were pointed out in the personality pictures and diagnoses of but a single subject.

It seems probable that evidence regarding the degree of adjustment would manifest itself in all aspects of the personality structure. If the personality is basically well-integrated, that integration should be reflected both in the picture of the dynamic factors of the personality and in the contents of the dynamics. Emotional disturbances should make their presence known through the presses and needs as well as in the balance of the personality structure.

The aim of this research is to attempt to determine whether a fundamental similarity exists between what is measured on the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test, and,

² Richardson, L. H., "The Personality of Stutterers," Psychol. Monogr., 56, No. 7:26, 1944.

³ Harrison, R., "The T. A. T. and Rorschach Methods of Personality Investigation in Clinical Practice." J. Psychol. 15:71, 1943.

if so, to what extent. The problem is approached by a correlation of an adjustment rating obtained from Rorschach data on 50 subjects by means of the Munroe check list with a similar rating independently derived from the Thematic Apperception Test.

CHAPTER II

A DISCUSSION OF THE PROJECTIVE TECHNIQUE

An examination of the theory basic to the so-called projective techniques is essential to an understanding of the purpose for which the comparisons made in this study were undertaken. "Projective test" is a term that has been widely used and seldom defined during the last decade. As a matter of fact, most of the better-known projective tests were devised long before the term obtained wide usage. The Jung Word Association Test was published in 1918, the Rorschach in 1921, and the Thematic Apperception Test in 1935, but it is only within the last ten years that they have become collectively known as "projective tests".

For many years psychologists fought a strenuous battle for objectivity in their researches into the nature of the human mind and reaction systems. They sought to dissect out an entity called intelligence for quantitative evaluation and statistical treatment. In the field of personality study they sought to identify "traits" that could be considered in isolation from the rest of the organism and made static so that a specific amount could be established. The questionnaire was the type of test usually employed in the measurement of these personality traits. Almost inevitably in a questionnaire or inventory

the individual is required to make a conscious evaluation of his behavior in respect to defined social situations and group patterns.

With the growing emphasis on the study of personality development, given quite a bit of impetus by the insistence of the psychoanalytic school upon the role of childhood experience in forming the later personality structure, the dangers of splitting the personality into discrete entities began to be realized, and importance began to accrue to the obtaining of a "dynamic" picture of the personality. The process of development is now accepted as an interreaction between the individual's unique modes of thinking, perceiving, and feeling on the one hand and on the other the social forces that tend to require him to conform to the cultural norms. There exist, then, two phases of behavior, the one reflecting culturally established norms and the other individual personality trends. As Frank⁴ stated it:

What we can observe then is the dual process of socialization, involving sufficient conformity in outer conduct to permit participation in the common social world, and of individuation, involving the progressive establishment of a private world of highly idiosyncratic meanings, significances, and feelings that are more real and compelling than the cultural and physical world.

⁴ Frank, L. K., "Projective Methods for the Study of Personality," J. Psychol., 8:590, 1937.

It is this latter, personal world that is referred to by the term "personality". It is this that the personality tests are designed to lay bare. However, in dealing with any situation structured by the norms of the society, there is an intimate and subtle fusing of the social and personal worlds. Then, too, as Frank⁵ again points out, there are many aspects of the subject's private world that the social situation tends to force him to conceal, even if he himself has the ability to understand and formulate them. It is these difficulties that the projective technique is intended to remedy.

The use of the word "projective" tends to cause confusion because of its similarity to the Freudian term for the tendency to attribute one's own motives and feelings to others. Cattell⁶ feels that only the Ssendi test can lay claim to the title of a projective test among the more widely used instruments going by the name, since it alone adheres to the psychoanalytic meaning to any extent. The projective technique, however, refers to another theory. It is felt that if the subject is presented with a situation that is not structured, or only slightly so, by any

⁵ Ibid., p. 395.

⁶ Cattell, R. B., "Projection and the Design of Projective Tests of Personality", Char. and Pers., 12:177, 1944.

cultural modes, the test material will serve as a plastic to be molded, structured, organized by the subject's own peculiar modes of thinking and perceiving. Thus, it is hoped, the basic personality structure is revealed.

Rapaport⁷ believes that the personality is manifested through the thought processes, and that instead of their limitations being measured, what happens is that the pattern of the association processes and the interrelations of their aspects is being traced. He states that:

In these tests it is the Ego, the carrier of conscious thinking, which demonstrates its bent and peculiarities. The unconscious makings of the thought process will occasionally become palpable, especially when thinking is disorganized; but in the main, projective tests are concerned with the type of organization of thinking palpable in the course of the spontaneous thought processes, and characteristic of the individual and his Ego.

It is apparent that the projective tests, by their very nature necessitate a good deal of subjective handling, and that because many trends that may appear are not overtly expressed, psychoanalytic theory is frequently resorted to for explanation. The majority of the tests are empirically based, clinically validated, and have been proven useful instruments. The element of subjectivity does remain, however. Even though standards of considerable complexity have

⁷ Rapaport, D., Diagnostic Psychological Testing: Vol. II (Chicago: The Year Book Publishers, Inc., 1946), p. 11.

been established to differentiate the modes of expression of emotion and thought and a number of response patterns are fairly well recognized, the grasping of the numerous interrelationships and subtle indicators still requires quite a bit of insight. However, the benefits to be gained from the study of these interrelationships would seem to far outweigh the subjectivity of the tests.

The projective tests have in common, then, that they seek to find the basic personality structure by furnishing unstructured material to be shaped and organized by the individual's own private world of meanings and affect. They do not necessarily uncover the same personality levels, and the type of information received may vary greatly with the type of stimulus presented. Rapaport⁸ compared the results of the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test by saying that the former gives a dynamic scheme of the personality, while the latter furnishes the "concrete contents of the dynamics". A battery of projective tests are frequently used clinically to supplement each other in clarifying all aspects of the client's inner life.

Even though the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test are angle shots pointed at the same composition, playing up different elements of the same whole, the fundamental

⁸ Rapaport, D., "Principles Underlying Projective Techniques," Char. and Pers., 10:218, 1942.

identity of the subject-matter of both constitutes a challenge for an attempt to trace the relationship. It does not seem unreasonable to expect that methods might be found for extracting correlating information from both tests concerning certain fundamental personality mechanisms or the integration of the whole, in spite of the varying clinical uses of the two tests.

CHAPTER III

THE RORSCHACH TEST: THEORY AND METHOD

There are several methods of handling Rorschach data. The terms, symbols, and methods used in this research are described in this chapter.

I. THEORY

There is little disagreement among the Rorschach authorities on matters of theory, except in how far from the original data it is valid to speculate on refinements of scoring and interpretation. And even here there does not seem to be any very fundamental cleavage. No impressive body of theory can be claimed for the Rorschach, though this situation is slowly being remedied. The test is almost wholly empirically based, and no one is quite sure just why people who clinically display certain personality trends also prove to be sensitive to certain aspects of the test material. The gap between the empirical evidence and theoretical foundation is reputedly frequently filled by the insight of the test's creator and developers. In many instances this insight is little more than an application of psychoanalytic theory, some concepts of which dovetail quite conveniently with phenomena evoked by the Rorschach.

The test consists of ten cards with standardized, symmetrical ink-blot on them. The ink-blot used were selected for the almost infinite possibilities they present for individual interpretation and the number of qualitative factors that may be avoided or incorporated into the response. It is believed that an individual's approach to life situations is reflected in the way he handles the potentialities of the blot; the type of area he selects on which to base his concept, the qualitative factors to which sensitivity is displayed, how well he is able to fuse other determinants with the form of the area, how well the form of the concept chosen agrees with the actual formal qualities of the blot, and to a certain extent the actual content of the responses. As Rorschach⁹ postulated in his original paper, the formation of a response is an apperceptive process. That is, the present group of sensations is identified with analagous complexes acquired in the past, and thus it becomes apparent how the earlier stimuli were reacted to by the individual reaction modes of the subject.

Once the qualitative elements appearing in the responses are transposed into quantitative terms, a number of

⁹ Rorschach, H., Psychodiagnostics, (Berne, Switzerland: Hans Huber, 1942), p. 17.

relationships emerge and an hypothesis may be made concerning the interactions within the personality pattern. This is the dynamic picture of the personality: by what means, and how well, balance is maintained, the stresses, conflicts, and compensations that are present. Although it is sometimes convenient to gauge over- and under-production of a single factor by direct quantitative comparison with a "normal" amount, and certain ratios have interpretative significance, it usually destroys the dynamic nature of the analysis to regard the factors in anything but relative terms. The interpretation of each factor is modified by its belongingness to the whole.

II. METHODS

Rorschach died the year following the first publication of his Psychodiagnostics, and though his test was at that time essentially the same as now, its potentialities were by no means fully developed. It is probable that the scoring and interpretation used by Beck¹⁰ most closely conform to the course Rorschach would have followed if he had

¹⁰ See Beck, S. J., Rorschach's Test: I. Basic Processes. (New York: Grune & Stratton, 1944).

been able to continue his work. Book assuredly adheres more closely to his original data than do most workers with the test. In the search for more subtle and refined indicators of personality processes, there exists a tendency to build a superstructure of theory, until at times there is a feeling of lack of very vital relationship between the protocol and some of the scoring elements. Klopfer's¹¹ approach to the problems of scoring and interpretation does not completely avoid this failing, but it seems to be the most widely used system, and Munroe's¹² adjustment rating, which is used in this study, is based on it. Therefore Klopfer is the authority for the scoring principles to be described in the following paragraphs.

The scoring categories are listed under the symbol that represents them in the scoring process.

LOCATION OF RESPONSE

W. The subject uses the whole area of the blot in his response or enough of it so that it is obvious that he was reacting to the blot as a whole. In the latter case it is

¹¹ Klopfer, E. and Kelley, D., The Rorschach Technique (Yonkers, New York: World Book Co., 1942).

¹² Munroe, R.L., "Prediction of the Adjustment and Academic Performance of College Students by a Modification of the Rorschach Method," Appl. Psychol. Mon. No. 7, Stanford Univ. Press, 1946.

known as an incomplete whole. The subject may also be reminded of a concept by a small area of the blot and assign this meaning to the whole blot. In this case, it is known as a D response. In some instances the form of the whole blot may so strongly suggest some response, or a response may be of such a vague character that little organizing ability is required, but most W responses indicate organization, and in large quantity, a predilection for the abstract.

D. This is the usual detail response. These details are obvious subdivisions of the blot either because of their isolated position or differences in color or shading. They are selected more often than any other areas. When this type of response is emphasized to the neglect of the others, it indicates a limiting of attention to the more obvious, down-to-earth aspects of living.

Dd. The subject selects an area of the blot that is rarely chosen. The unusual details may range from fairly large portions of the blot that are vaguely delimited or demand unusual organization to minute elements, tiny dots and lines. An overemphasis here might mean a preoccupation with trivia, an inability to see the forest for the trees.

S. The space response results from a reversal of figures and ground, with a blot itself only furnishing form to the space. Space is also frequently combined with portions of the blot in the formation of a concept, or to

supplement a response determined chiefly by the blot itself. The presence of more than three or four space responses in any protocol is usually interpreted to mean oppositional trends. If the experience balance is introversive it may be opposition to the self, if extravertive, it may be directed to the outer world. In the former case it would be likely to take the form of feelings of inferiority.

DETERMINANTS

M. Many subjects have a tendency to project action or life into the ink-blot. The M response refers specifically to such projection in regard to human figures, though if animals are seen performing acts usually attributed only to humans the M is scored. The figures may be seen in passive stance or even sleeping. The human movement response is the representative of inner control in the personality, of a capacity for fantasy life, the world of inner strivings. A preponderance of M over the sum of color responses denotes an introversive experience balance.

FM. This is the symbol for the projection of life into animal forms. The animal-movement response is on a more immature level than the human-movement, but otherwise has much the same significance.

M. A category of responses known as "minor movements"

receives the symbol m_1 . It stands for activity that does not center around any living creature but is the result of natural forces or abstract powers. The expressive description of parts of living creatures may also be m_1 , as when grotesque or threatening faces are seen. More than two or three strong m_1 in any protocol would prompt the examiner to look for evidences of conflict over the expression and recognition of inner strivings.

B. The mottling of the blot is used by the subject to represent how the surface of some solid object appears, the texture of it. If the use of shading is well differentiated and combined with the formal qualities of the blot, it is assigned a scoring of F_2 . Other scorings are eF and e_1 , depending on the extent to which form is utilized or the shading differentiated. This use of shading seems to be related to response in the bright color area, but of a more hesitant and subdued nature. Tact may be indicated by the F_2 responses, or in excess, an over-sensitivity in social relationships.

K. Shading may also be used to form concepts of depth, or the appearance of discrete objects separated in space. A strong relationship is maintained between the outline of the blot and the shading, and the response is scored as FK . This is known as the vista response. Or

the shading may give an impression of diffusion, as in clouds, or of space filled with darkness. This type of response is scored K. FK sets as the representative of introspective tendencies in the personality, accompanied perhaps by some self-consciousness. K responses are more likely to suggest the presence of free-floating anxiety.

k. Sometimes subjects react to shading as depth impression, but tone it down to a two-dimensional concept, such as X-ray pictures and topographical maps. As with K responses, the presence of feelings of anxiety or insecurity is to be suspected. Klopfer¹³ believes that there is an additional implication of feelings of intellectual inadequacy.

CI. Achromatic shade is occasionally used in the formation of concepts. It is rarely a main determinant, and usually makes a more or less minor contribution. If these responses outnumber bright color responses two to one, it may be a sign of depressive tendencies. The achromatic shade response constitutes a reaction to emotional stimulation, but in a more subdued manner.

FC. Klopfer¹⁴ defines the FC response as a "concept

¹³ Klopfer and Kelley, op. cit., p. 242.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 144.

with definite form in which the actual color of the blot plays an integral part in concept formation." The best FC is that in which the color of the blot approximates the conventional color of the object or animal named. There are concepts, however, such as anatomical charts, in which the actual color value is lost, and the scoring of P/C is assigned. These loose form-color combinations are considered as on the borderline between FC and CF in interpretation. An ability for mature, controlled emotional contacts is signified by FC responses, although if the form elements of a response are inaccurate, that response is interpretatively closer to CF.

CF. A concept is selected that, by its very nature, has no definite characteristics of form, but definite color. "Blood" is a frequently given CF response. Even though form qualities are negligible, a CF- may be scored if the card area used has strong possibilities for the formation of a concept with definite shape, that are ignored. Here again, the theoretical importance is closer to that of C than of CF. A more egocentric, impulsive, regressive emotional drive is signified by CF than by FC responses.

C. A C is scored whenever a certain color almost invariably evokes the same response without any attempt to associate it with other elements of the blot, when the various colors are simply named by the subject with no association,

when the surface appearance of the colors is described, or when the colors are given symbolic value. Uncontrolled, explosive emotionality is denoted by the presence of C in the protocol.

F* When only the form of the blot area determines the association, F is scored. This is the domain of conscious control. The pedantic person is likely to produce many responses suggested by the form alone in his search for close correspondences between memory picture and blot. Or a large amount of F may be found in the record of the unintelligent subject, whose personality simply does not have the versatility for more varied reaction. An overproduction of F may also point to a constricted personality, wherein there is a retreat from conflict into a world of rigid, conscious control.

F₁ The form elements in all responses, pure form and combinations of form with some other determinant, are evaluated in terms of how accurately the outline of the blot area fits that of the concept assigned it. From this accuracy level some deduction may be made as to the subject's accuracy in his evaluation of reality.

R Popular responses are those made most frequently to a given blot area, appearing in approximately one out of five records. Every clinically normal subject should be able

* This is the last of the determinants. Other factors will be discussed hereafter.

2-1
of

to recognize the plausibility of these concepts, if not spontaneously at least during the testing-the-limits period.

S. Theoretically, an original response is one that may be expected to appear not more than once in a hundred records. A concept so individual should be more than usually revealing of the perception modes of the subject, and therefore the form accuracy displayed in it is of crucial importance.

Succession. This term refers to the order in which the subject uses the location categories in each card. If the order is systematic, the categories W, D, d, Dd, and S are used in that order or its exact opposite. The order is unsystematic if there is any deviation. A sequence of Rigid, Orderly, Loose, or Confused is then scored according to the relative number of systematic and unsystematic cards. Succession is intended to gauge the extent to which the subject has the capacity to follow a logical order. An orderly sequence is optimum, for rigidity tends to cut down intellectual efficiency.

Ap. The emphasis placed on each of the major location categories constitutes the approach of the subject. The expected distribution is in the proportion of 6W to 20D to 4Dd. An overemphasis is indicated by marking exclamation points after the symbol, an underemphasis by placing it in parentheses.

The theoretical significance of these categories has been discussed previously.

41. The percentage of responses that is based on animal forms, whole or parts, is to a certain extent also a measure of the degree of stereotypy of interests. Animal forms are more readily perceived than any other type of content, and a high percentage of such responses might mean a limiting of interests to the obvious and narrow. On the other hand, it might merely be evidence of a pedantic mind with a compulsion to find accurate forms. Stereotyped thinking, of course, manifests itself in a preoccupation with any other single content category. Maps and anatomical concepts seem to particularly lend themselves to such limitation.

H+A:H+Ad. Most subjects tend to see whole figures, human or animal, in the blots (H+A). A special trend seems to be manifested by a consistent selection of concepts involving parts of bodies (H+Ad). This is a tendency to be hypercritical concerning the form qualities of the blots, though the significance of the trend is dependent on the total personality configuration. According to Klopfer¹⁵, the

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 218.

threshold for such a critical attitude is reached if the number of Hd4As exceeds half the number of H4As.

Sub-10%. The last three cards in the series of ten are printed entirely in bright color, and the percentage of the total number of responses that is made to these three cards is a measure of the extent to which the subject is susceptible to emotional stimulation from without. A percentage of much over 25 may suggest that the subject is spurred to greater productivity by the appearance of color, or it may be a concomitant of the color shock to be described below.

Color Shock and Shading Shock. These two phenomena are considered together because the same criteria are used for identifying both. Klopfer¹⁶ has adapted the criteria for color shock listed by Brosin and Fromm¹⁷ for application to shading shock as well. They are quoted from his manual as follows:

- (1) Significant increase in the reaction time to colored or shaded cards.
- (2) Emotional exclamations referring to color or shading effects.
- (3) Other significant comments indicating anxiety, irritability, or passive resistance.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 248.

¹⁷ Brosin, H. W., and Fromm, E. O., "Rorschach and Color Blindness," Rorschach Res. Exch., 4:39-70, 1940.

- (4) Significant differences in the productivity for colored or strongly shaded cards as compared with others.
- (5) Decline in the form quality of responses.
- (6) Impoverished content, based on a decline in richness of invention, and in the variety of interest.
- (7) Rejection of a card either by inability to give responses or by an obvious reluctance to touch it, getting rid of it quickly, or even tossing and bending it.
- (8) More irregular succession in colored or shaded cards than in others.
- (9) A decreased ability to see popular responses though they have been easily seen in other cards.
- (10) Avoidance of the use of texture or color as a determinant. In the case of color this can be limited to color shyness--avoidance of the red and pink portions.

Color shock, also known as neurotic shock, occurs when the subject is profoundly disturbed by the appearance of color, and is unable to handle the new situation without adopting new behavior patterns. Not exclusively associated with neuroses, color shock appears in other psychopathologies as well as in a fair number of normal protocols, but remains the most important single sign of a neurotic reaction. Shading shock is similar in nature and frequently occurs together with color shock. It is found most frequently, however, in subjects who shy from external contacts and have feelings of inadequacy. "It seems to indicate, more than does color shock, that the

individual is aware of his personality instability and that the disturbance is deeply rooted."¹⁸

Figure C. The ratio of the number of human movement responses to the number determined by color is expressive of the experience balance of the individual. If the subject is predominantly prompted from within, or has introversive tendencies, the heavier emphasis will be placed on M. The extroversive person, predominantly stimulated from without, shows an excess of C responses. Most subjects maintain some balance between the two sides of the ratio, and it is rare to find a person sensitive to only one type of stimulation, or nearly so. In the determination of sum C, FC responses are given a numerical value of $\frac{1}{2}$, CF of 1, and C of $\frac{1}{2}$.

The descriptions above are necessarily limited in scope to the more obvious and fundamental premises and factors of the Rorschach test. For anything beyond the crude delineation of the major scoring categories, reference is made to the manuals of Klopfer¹⁹ and Beck.²⁰

¹⁸ Klopfer and Kelley, op. cit., p. 388.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Beck, op. cit.

CHAPTER IV.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND EXPERIMENT

I. METHODS OF ANALYSIS

A system of deriving an adjustment rating from Rorschach data has been devised by Ruth L. Munroe.²¹ Her specific problem was one of judging both actual and potential adjustment to the college situation, but wider application of her method seems to be feasible. The factor of intelligence is disregarded except insofar as reverberations from inadequacies in this area might affect the personality picture, for example in causing symptoms of anxiety or feelings of inadequacy. Munroe²² states the definition of adjustment on which she based her rating scale as follows:

For an adjustment rating of "good" from the Rorschach we required merely that the student should (according to the indications of the Rorschach test) be able to function reasonably well within the limits of her capacity, without serious inner tension or distress. Conversely, an adjustment rating of "poor" implied evidence in the Rorschach results of any sort of personality disturbance, whether expressed outwardly in difficulties with the environment; or less openly in feelings of strain, moodiness, anxiety, or neurotic symptoms; or still more subtly in strong irrational limitations or peculiarities of interest, activity, and attitude. Probable success in college was definitely not included as a standard.

²¹ Munroe, op. cit.

²² Ibid., p. 20.

It met with

Several modifications of the usual scoring procedure are followed in obtaining an adjustment rating by the "inspection technique," as Munroe entitles her method. Most of these are chiefly time-saving devices, but a very important change is made in scoring determinants. Whereas only one determinant may receive main scoring and all others are additional in orthodox treatment, the inspection method allows two responses of nearly equal importance to be entered as main responses. Strong additionals receive more weight than others in determining a check.

The check list takes up the important scoring and interpretative categories one by one, and establishes criteria on the basis of which checks may be entered to indicate unhealthy deviations from the normal range. Although these criteria are presented in rather inflexible arithmetical terms, the author suggests that the sense of the distinctions is more important than the actual numerical values, particularly since many factors such as the length of the protocol act to alter their significance.²³

In general one check signifies an emphasis descriptive of an outspoken trend in the personality rather than a real break in its equilibrium, and may be entered rather freely. Two checks suggest a definite break of such dimensions that it represents a hazard to adjustment, unless

²³ Ibid., p. 86.

absorbed by good resources elsewhere. Three checks are usually suggestive of pathology.

Even with this modification, it is apparent that something of the dynamic nature of the test is likely to be lost by a more or less static evaluation of each individual factor. A considerable danger of oversimplifying exists, and setting the limits of the normal range or the point where a trend becomes a hazard is a nice problem for clinical judgment. Throughout the check list some attempt is made, however, to balance factors against each other, in that the scoring of one item is made dependent to a certain extent on the scoring of other items. Even so, compensatory adjustments are ignored, and might even be the basis for additional checks. Munroe²⁴ feels that an adjustment based on the balance of compensating trends is superficial and precarious, and that not making allowance for them is not a serious oversight.

The check list was originally intended to serve as an aid in assigning a rating of A through E, according to the integration of the personality and presence or absence of emotional problems. The possibility soon became evident that the total number of checks in itself might be used as the measure of adjustment. A comparison of this score with external criteria of adjustment yielded a χ^2 of 76.13, a corrected C

²⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

of #62.²⁵ The A through E, rating probably gives a better opportunity for the consideration of the total personality but it is also more subjective than totalling the checks. The latter approach lends itself more to correlational studies, and it is the one here used.

At least one of the categories included in the checking list seemed to be inappropriate for the purposes of this study, and was omitted. The scoring of succession appeared to penalize the longer protocols, because there must usually be a minimum of about 20 responses before it can be scored. In some instances no sequence pattern can be found even in longer records. Therefore, marking two checks for confused succession in one case seems to be penalizing an individual for something there is no means of verifying in another individual. If the purpose were not to assign relative positions within the group, there would probably be no objection to using this category, but the inclusion of it here seemed unwise.

It was found that the total number of checks per record ran somewhat higher than was to be expected from Munroe's²⁶ report of her results with the inspection technique, a range of from 6 to 29 checks as against from less

²⁵ Ibid., p. 71

²⁶ Ibid., p. 66.

than 6 to 17. A series of pathological cases showed a range of 15 to 25, and totals of 25 were obtained by the psychotics of the group. While it is very likely that a group of male subjects, predominantly veteran, would have a lower mean adjustment than the selected student body at Sarah Lawrence College, it is unlikely that there would be a large number of psychopathologies. It is more plausible that a rather too close interpretation was made of the scoring criteria. For example, color and shading shock were defined by Munroe²⁷ as being present if there was evidence that the appearance of color or shading was not taken completely in stride by the subject. On the basis of that definition some degree of color shock was noted for 30 of 50 cases, while Munroe reports it for nearly half of her subjects.²⁸ This is, however, by far the most outstanding illustration of a possible too close adherence to the letter of the law, and it is doubtful that more was done than to raise the entire range a few points. The relative positions within the range were probably little affected.

Form accuracy in our protocols was scored by Beck's lists, as were the popular responses. The first change would not make any adaptation of the check list criteria

²⁷ Ibid., p. 99.

²⁸ loc. cit.

necessary, but the second did. Klopfer²⁹ lists 10 popular responses, while Beck³⁰ lists 20, with the average person producing from 7 to 9. Therefore, Munroe's criterion for one check was changed from 3 to 5, and for two checks from 1 to 3.

The inspection technique, or quick-scoring method, was not used. The protocols were scored and summarized in the traditional fashion, but little adaptation was required for use of the check list. A reconsideration of the scoring of additional determinants was the only important revision.

II. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

The male members of general psychology classes over two school quarters were ranked by Lindquist's³¹ random number tables from the order in which they appeared on the class roster, and each fifth or sixth name taken, depending on how many were needed to fill the quarter's quota. Twelve of those selected did not appear to take both tests, which, however, were completed by 50 subjects. Eighty percent of the cases were veterans, and the age range was from 17 to 38. The mean

²⁹ Klopfer and Kelley, op. cit., p. 179.

³⁰ Beck, op. cit., p. 191.

³¹ Lindquist, E. F., Statistical Analyses in Educational Research. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company), p. 262-264.

age of the group was 22 years, with an average deviation of 2.66. No information was obtained concerning the factor of intelligence. Some factor of selection might have been at work in determining which subjects would not cooperate with the testing program.

It was decided to administer the Rorschach³² first, and then the Thematic Apperception Test, since the less structured test would not be as likely to influence the reaction to any subsequent test. At first the plan was to obtain a case history and Minnesota Multiphasic results on each subject as well, but the rate of attrition of these two items was so high that they were discontinued. The Rorschach was given in two sessions in some cases, because of the difficulty of finding unbroken blocks of time long enough for the purpose. There was no set interval between the taking of the two tests, and the lapse of time varied from a few days to two or three weeks.

The subjects were given a brief explanation of the purpose of the experiment, and told that they were taking tests of personality. Some of them had previously obtained information concerning the Rorschach in classes, shows, and popular articles.

The adjustment ratings obtained from the data received

³² Rorschach, H., Psychodiagnostics, Tables. (Hans Huber, Medical Publisher: Bern).

from these 50 subjects by means of the Munroe technique were compared with ratings based on the Thematic Apperception Test, according to Murray's³³ presentation of the well-organized personality. Miss Charlotte Eak administered and rated the Thematic test, and her methods of assigning the adjustment ratings will be discussed in detail in her forthcoming treatise.³⁴ All work of administering, scoring, and rating the two tests was done entirely independently.

³³ Murray, Henry A., Explorations in Personality. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), p. 200-207.

³⁴ Eak, C., unsubmitted Master's thesis.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The total number of checks allotted each record on Mumroe's check list was allowed to represent the adjustment rating of the individual, and the number of checks ranged from 5 to 29.³⁵ These figures were correlated with ratings derived from the Thematic Apperception Test data on the same subjects by Miss Eck. Her ratings were in terms of the percentage of disorganization or disintegration apparent in the records, and ranged from 29 percent to 67 percent. Means and standard deviations for the two distributions appear in Table I.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

	Mean	S. D.
Herschach	16.80	4.81
T. A. T.	51.09	7.95

The coefficient of correlation between the two adjustment ratings is $+.575 \pm .064$.

³⁵ A list of the ratings assigned each subject and summaries of the records on which the ratings were based, for the Herschach, is to be found in the appendix.

Correlations were found between the T. A. T. adjustment ratings and the items that make up the Munroe check list. Some items were not used because only 9 or 10 out of 50 cases had any checks entered for them, or because not more than one check was entered for any individual.

The symbols in the table represent the factors checked for over-or under-production, quality, or overbalance of one factor to another, depending on the check list criteria. These symbols are defined in Chapter III. The correlations are on page 35.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The method used to extract the adjustment ratings from the Rorschach data is by no means completely adequate. Some understanding of the interacting forces within the personality is sacrificed to the goal of assigning numerical values to trends that menace the integration of the personality. This factor, together with the subjectivity still inherent in the technique, would hardly act to increase the validity of these adjustment ratings as true measures. In spite of the imperfection of techniques, a fairly significant correlation was obtained with ratings on the T. A. T. Insofar as these adjustment ratings measure what they purport to, and when the specific techniques described above and in Eck's³²

³² Eck, op. cit.

TABLE II

35

**CORRELATIONS OF FACTORS ON THE MUNROE CHECK LIST
WITH THE T. A. T. ADJUSTMENT RATINGS.**

CHECK LIST ITEM	CORRE- LATION	CHECK LIST S. D.	CHECK LIST MEAN	NO. OF CATEGORIES
W	+.164	.670	1.40	3
Dd	+.324	.688	1.02	3
S	+.052	.694	.78	4
P	+.199	.670	.96	3
Range	+.272	.624	1.14	3
Form, B V E	+.305	.806	1.80	4
Shading Sheek	+.234	.796	1.24	3
FK, Fe	+.086	.726	1.04	3
G'	+.066	.726	.98	4
K, k	+.319	.600	.92	3
M	+.418	.856	1.48	4
FM, FM:M	+.477	1.120	1.60	4
Total Movement	+.191	.700	1.20	4
Color Sheek	+.216	.864	1.68	4
FC	+.189	.840	1.39	3
CF, CF:FC	+.326	.800	1.30	4
Total Color	+.129	.696	.92	3
Color:Movement	+.185	1.336	1.84	5

manuscript are employed, the evidence yielded by these two projective tests, the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test, concerning the personality adjustment of the individual is similar. If the Rorschach rating is available for an individual, the chances are 68 in 100 that it would be possible to estimate the T. A. T. adjustment rating within 6.5 points.

The correlations of check list items with the T. A. T. ratings are only suggestive. They do show consistency in that all are positive. The two highest correlations, $+0.477$ for FM, FM:M and $+0.418$ for M, indicate that factors of inner control and the maturity of that control might have contributed quite heavily to the correlation between the adjustment ratings. M responses seem to be the expression of inner strivings, of creative imagination, and of a fantasy life that may serve as a refuge from emotional stresses. FM responses result from more regressive promptings. A lack of M or K of poor quality may, however, result not only from restriction of expression, but from lack of anything to express. How much these two check list items are reflecting intellectual level would be difficult to determine.

Intellectual approach is reflected in the item Dd, which correlated $+0.324$ with the T. A. T. ratings. This factor indicates a tendency to dwell on minute details at the expense of the ability to organize parts into meaningful wholes.

The results of this study indicate that a similarity exists in what is measured by the two tests involved, in what is projected into the test material, at least with respect to the area of personality adjustment. It might be of value to make more comparisons of more specific mechanisms and personality factors, in an attempt to discover something of the scope of the core of sameness, as well as where some of the differences lie in the aspects of personality reflected in the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test.

formance of College Students by a Modificatic
Rorschach Method," Appl. Psychol. Monogr. No.
Univ. Press, 1945. 104 pp.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck, S. J., Rorschach's Test: Basic Processes. New York:
Grune & Stratton, 1944. 223 pp.
- Brewin, H. W., and Fromm, E. O., "Rorschach and Color Blind-
ness," Rorschach Res. Exch., 4:39-70, 1940.
- Cattell, R. B., "Projection and the Design of Projective Tests
of Personality," Char. and Pers., 12:177-194, 1944.
- Eak, Charlotte, unsubmitted Master's thesis.
- Frank, L. H., "Projective Methods for the Study of Personality,"
J. Psychol., 8:389-413, 1937.
- Harrison, R., "The T. A. T. and Rorschach Methods of Personality
Investigation in Clinical Practice," J. Psychol., 15:49-74,
1943.
- Klopfer, B. and Kelley, D., The Rorschach Technique. Yonkers,
New York: World Book Co., 1942. 436 pp.
- Klopfer, B. and Kelley, D., The Rorschach Technique
New York: World Book Co., 1942. 436 pp. onal Research.
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1942. 264 pp.
- Munroe, R. L., "Prediction of the Adjustment and Academic Per-
formance of College Students by a Modification of the
Rorschach Method," Appl. Psychol. Monogr. No. 7, Stanford
Univ. Press, 1945. 104 pp.
- Murray, H. A., Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford
University Press, 1938.
- Rapaport, D., Diagnostic Psychological Testing: Vol. II. Chi-
cago: The Year Book Publishers, Inc., 1946. 518 pp.
- Rapaport, D., "Principles Underlying Projective Techniques,"
Char. and Pers., 10:213-219, 1942.
- Richardson, L. H., "The Personality of Stutterers," Psychol.
Monogr., 56, No. 7, 1944. 41pp.
- Rorschach, H., Psychodiagnostics. Berne, Switzerland: Hans
Huber, 1942. 226 pp.
- Sargent, H., "Projective Methods: Their Origins, Theory, and
Application in Personality Research," Psychol. Bull.,
42:257-293, 1945.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF RORSCHACH FACTORS FOR EACH SUBJECT

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	1	2	3	4	5
R	72	101	42	27	33
T/IR-G	7"	10"	9"	12"	34"
T/IR-A	6"	7"	8"	11"	16"
H+A; Hd+Ad	19:19	20:20	15:11	12:2	9:3
C-9-10%	45	33	40	37	40
Seq	0	L	0	L	0
W	8	3	7	7	10
D	40	48	34	19	22
Dd	16	45	1	1	1
S	8-2	5-2	0-2	0-3	0
F+ %	70	72	61	85	65
A%	47	24	38	48	33
P	7	7	4	8	6
M	0	7	5	2	1
FM	8	3	9	7	6
m	0	1	0-2	0	0-4
k	4	1	0	1	0
K	0	2-1	0	0	5
FK	4	1-1	0	2	0
F	42	69	17	7	10
Fe	1	5	1	1	2-1
c	1	2	0	0	0-1
C'	2-1	1	4-2	1-1	1-4
FC	4-1	4	6	4-1	2
CF	4	4	1-2	2	6-2
C	2	1	0	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	6	7	8	9	10
R	27	29	15	15	17
T/IR-G	9"	17"	31"	8"	17"
T/IR-A	11"	14"	25"	26"	10"
H+A:Ho+Ad	16:3	7:0	8:6	8:0	9:0
S-9-10%	52	45	33	33	30
Seq	no	C	no	no	no
W	3	19	1	6	8
D	21	9	13	9	8
Dd	3	1	1	0	1
S	0-2	0-2	0	0	0-1
F+ %	74	69	87	93	88
A%	63	21	53	40	35
P	8	6	6	3	5
M	2	1	3	1	2
FM	16	3	1	3	4
m	0	0	0	0	0
k	3	1	0	1	0
K	0	0-1	0	0	0
FK	1-1	6	0	1	0
F	2	5	10	3	7
Fc	1-4	1	1	1-1	1
c	0	1-1	0	1	0-1
G'	2-1	2-2	0	1-2	0
FG	0-5	1	0	0	1-1
GF	0-1	8	0	3	2
G	0	0	0	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	11	12	13	14	15
R	34	17	69	34	17
T/IR-C	9"	9"	14"	10"	10"
T/IR-A	9"	6"	16"	4"	20"
H+A:Hd+Ad	15:0	10:4	21:13	12:2	11:1
S-9-10%	32	35	35	35	41
Seq.	0	no	0	0	no
W	17	2	7	5	9
D	16	12	35	21	8
Dd	1	3	13	6	0
S	0	0	14-1	2-1	0-1
F+ %	79	82	85	77	65
A%	38	59	41	35	59
F	7	7	9	7	7
M	3	3	6	2	2
FM	9	4	14	8	2
m	0-1	0	1	1-4	0
k	0	1	1	0	0
K	2	0	1	1	0
FK	2	0	0	1	0
F	11	8	37	14	8
Fe	0	1	5	1-2	1
c	0	0	0	1-1	0
Q'	1-2	0-1	3-1	0	1
FC	3	0	1	3-2	2
CF	3	0	0	2	1
Q	0-1	0	0	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	16	17	18	19	20
R	40	18	27	21	49
T/IR=0	18"	16"	20"	13"	15"
T/IR-A	14"	7"	31"	5"	21"
H+A;Hd+Ad	10:2	5:4	15:9	9:1	13:15
S-9+10%	23	22	52	62	45
Seq.	0	no	0	0	L
W	20	2	1	8	11
D	18	14	20	12	29
Dd	2	2	6	1	9
S	0-10	0	0	0-3	0-5
F+ %	83	77	75	76	77
A%	21	39	41	43	45
P	9	6	7	4	14
M	0	2	13	1	3
FM	10	2	8	7	6
m	0	0	1-3	0-1	2
k	1	1	0	0	0-1
K	5	0	0	0-1	0
FK	1	0	1	1	0
F	12	5	3	6	26
Fc	2-1	3-1	0	2	2
s	2-2	0	0-2	0	0-1
C'	8-10	0-2	0	0	2-1
FC	4-2	0	1-6	2	4-1
GF	3-1	0	0-3	2-1	4
C	0	5	0	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	21	22	23	24	25
R	27	11	18	19	23
T/IR-C	5"	30"	9"	10"	12"
T/IR-A	6"	48"	10"	13"	7"
HFA;HcAd	10:5	7:1	10:0	10:1	16:4
B-B-10%	56	36	33	57	50
Seq.	R	ne	R	0	no
W	4	3	8	3	5
D	20	8	8	14	16
Dd	3	0	2	2	2
S	0	0	0-1	0-1	0-2
F+%	80	73	63	72	87
A%	44	55	55	53	70
P	7	5	3	7	7
M	2	2	0	1	2
FM	11	3	7	1	13
m	0-2	0	2	0	1
k	0	0	1	2	0
K	0	0	0	0	0
FK	1	0	1	0	1-1
F	7	3	4	13	4
Fc	3-1	2-2	0	1	1
e	0	0	0	0	0
C'	0	0-2	0-2	1	1
FC	1	1	0-1	0	0
OF	2-1	0	3-2	0	0-2
C	0	0-1	0	0	0

ROBBACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	26	27	28	29	30
R	18	21	20	26	10
T/IR-C	25"	6"	7"	11"	16"
T/IR-A	20"	8"	10"	6"	6"
H+A: H+Ad	3:1	10:5	11:1	10:3	6:1
S-9-10%	44	48	35	38	30
Seq.	no	0	0	0	no
W	5	3	12	8	7
D	13	17	7	18	3
Da	0	1	1	0	0
S	0	0	0-2	0-1	0-1
F+ %	89	90	85	85	70
A%	17	62	45	35	60
P	7	6	6	7	4
M	2	2	2	3	1
FM	5	9	7	4	4
m	0-2	0-1	1-1	0	0
k	1	0	0	0	0
K	2	2	0	0	0
FK	1	0	2	2	0
F	4	7	4	12	4
Fe	3	0	2	2	0
e	0	0	0	0-1	0
C'	0-3	0-1	0-4	0-2	0
FC	0-1	1-1	0	0	0-2
CF	2-1	0-1	2-3	3	1-1
C	0	0	0	0	0

HORSESHOE FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	31	32	33	34	35
R	20	50	47	17	18
T/IR=0	11"	6"	13"	5"	47"
T/IR=A	7"	5"	14"	9"	34"
H:A:K:Q:AQ	13:5	10:0	17:17	9:1	3:2
S-9-10%	34	40	47	35	33
Seq.	0	L	L	no	no
W	4	17	10	6	13
D	20	27	21	9	3
Dd	8	6	15	2	2
S	0	0-8	1-2	0-1	0
F% %	85	69	78	82	77
A%	46	18	32	47	22
P	10	7	8	5	4
M	5	1	4	2	1
FM	12	7	9	7	3
m	0	0-2	1-2	0	3-2
k	0	0	1	0	0
K	0	3	0-1	0	2-1
FK	0	3	2	1-2	1
F	7	16	24	5	4
Fo	1-1	9-2	1-2	1-1	0
e	0	2	0	0	0
G'	0	0-4	2-5	0-1	1-2
FO	1-1	6-4	0-1	1	0
OP	0	3-2	3-2	0	3-3
Q	0	0	0	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	36	37	38	39	40
R	44	37	39	12	20
T/1R-0	15"	6"	11"	22"	25"
T/1R-A	16"	6"	7"	19"	52"
H+A:HC+Ad	5:14	23:10	20:5	6:1	3:9
8-9-10%	50	41	39	33	30
Seq.	L	C	L	no	0
W	1	9	16	3	4
D	33	26	16	8	12
Dd	10	2	7	1	3
S	0-1	0-1	0-9	0-1	1-1
F+ %	72	81	80	75	80
A%	34	59	41	58	40
P	7	7	6	3	4
M	1	8	8	0	3
FM	5	11	15	2	2
m	0	1-1	0-1	0	0
k	0	0	0	2	1
K	0	0	0-3	0	0
PK	2	0-1	3-1	0	1
F	23	11	9	3	8
Fc	8-3	0	3-2	3	2
e	0-2	0	0	0	1-1
G'	1	2	0-1	1-2	0-1
PG	4-1	3-1	1-2	1-1	1-1
GF	0	1	0-3	0	1
G	0	0	0-1	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	41	42	43	44	45
R	11	19	45	19	27
T/IR-C	41"	27"	28"	12"	14"
T/IR-A	30"	28"	30"	8"	11"
HAA:HdAA	3:3	6:9	24:2	8:2	12:2
8-9-10%	27	42	38	47	48
Seq.	no	no	0	no	0
W	6	4	19	6	14
D	3	14	21	12	12
DA	2	1	5	1	1
S	0	0	0-3	0-1	0-4
F4 %	73	90	76	84	83
A%	27	22	51	32	30
P	2	7	6	7	8
M	1	3	3	4	5
PM	2	3	17	5	4
m	0	1	0-5	0	3-1
k	0	0	0	0	1
K	1	0	4-1	0	0
PK	1	0	3-1	0	0-4
F	3	7	6	6	11
Fc	1	3	3	2	1
e	0	0	0	0-1	0
G'	0-1	1-1	1-7	0-2	1
FC	1	0	3-1	0	1-2
OP	1	0	4-4	2-1	0-1
G	0	1	1	0	0

RORSCHACH FACTORS	PERFORMANCE OF SUBJECTS				
	46	47	48	49	50
R	13	12	11	43	28
T/1R-C	18"	8"	28"	14"	5"
T/1R-A	16"	8"	18"	18"	5"
H+A:Hd+Ad	5:0	8:1	3:1	13:1	12:10
0-0-10%	31	25	35	56	43
Seq.	no	no	no	0	R
W	11	4	3	17	2
D	2	6	5	24	20
Dd	0	2	3	2	6
S	0-1	0	0-1	0-2	0-2
F+1	54	58	64	87	63
A2	23	50	18	31	71
P	3	4	2	7	4
M	2	2	1	5	0
FM	1	5	1	9	13
m	0	0	0-2	2-4	0
k	0	0	1	1	1-1
K	0	0	1	2-1	0
FK	1	0	1	1	0
F	7	3	4	11	12
Fo	0-1	1-1	0	2-2	0
s	0	0	0	1-1	0
C'	0-1	0-1	0-2	3-3	0
FC	0	1-1	0	2-2	2-2
CF	2	0-2	2	4-3	0
G	0	0	0	0-1	0

RORSCHACH ADJUSTMENT RATINGS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1	24	26	15
2	12	27	20
3	11	28	17
4	6	29	6
5	22	30	15
6	16	31	14
7	17	32	16
8	19	33	19
9	14	34	18
10	13	35	27
11	11	36	16
12	17	37	9
13	18	38	14
14	21	39	16
15	11	40	12
16	23	41	19
17	14	42	12
18	20	43	24
19	12	44	13
20	11	45	15
21	13	46	22
22	14	47	14
23	20	48	29
24	18	49	10
25	19	50	22