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ABSTRACT

Authorities on the interpretation of the Rorschach test have supported, in general, the use of Cards IV and VII as symbolizing the father and mother cards respectively. Results of previous research reveal discrepancies in choice of parental cards to the extent that it would prove difficult to use the IV-father, VII-mother concepts in a practical, clinical setting.

One purpose of this experiment was to explore an important personality variable that might have contributed to the previous contradictory results. An indirect technique (semantic differential) was used to evaluate the hypothesis that how Ss conceptualize (as positive or negative) their parents and themselves influences which Rorschach cards are responded to as mother, father, and self cards.

A further purpose was to explore the possibility that Ss who identify strongly with one parent will use the same Rorschach card as self and identified parent card.

The third major purpose of this experiment was to investigate the differences in mother, father, and self card selection as measured by the indirect technique (semantic differential) and the direct, overt choice technique.
Fifty hospitalized psychoneurotic patients served as Ss. Each S was seen individually for two one hour sessions. 

Session 1. Each S was asked to supply names of people whom he knew personally and who best fit the following descriptions: 1. an accepting person; 2. an attractive person; 3. a kind person; 4. an authoritarian person; 5. an aggressive person; 6. a rejecting person; 7. a repelling person; and 8. a cruel person. These names as well as the names of S's mother and father and his own name were written in the semantic differential (SD) booklet. The 10 Rorschach cards were then presented to S in standard order and S was asked to rate each on the SD. He was then asked to rate the names he had just given on the same SD.

Session 2. Each S ranked the eight descriptive adjectives from most positive trait to most negative trait. He was then asked to overtly select a mother, father, and self card. A parental identification scale was then administered.

Results indicated that mother, father, and self conceptualizations, as measured by SD, were not related to choice of father and self cards although two cards were significantly rated as positive mother cards. Two cards were significantly rated as father cards and two were rated as self cards. No card was rated as significantly positive or negative. The cards rated as mother and father cards on the SD were not the same as has been found using college
student Ss. The identification hypotheses were partially supported. With the low identifier groups, significantly more Ss chose different self and parent cards than chose same self and parent cards. In the comparison of the two techniques, there was no difference for mother card but the two techniques did yield different results for father and self cards.

Results were discussed in terms of neurotic defensiveness as well as the differences in regards to type of S used. The possibility that positive and negative conceptualizations do influence parental and self card choice was discussed. Results indicated that mother, father, and self concepts could not be used in an individual, clinical setting. The present results also offer a possible explanation for neurotic color shock although the implications of this will have to be explored in future research.
INTRODUCTION

For over 20 years, individuals have concerned themselves with symbolic meanings of Rorschach ink blots (RIBs). Two of the more important concepts advanced during this time were that Rorschach Card IV symbolized "father figure" and Rorschach Card VII symbolized "mother figure." According to this method of conceptualization, Ss' responses to Cards IV and VII should be predictive of or congruent with their attitudes toward and relationships with their father and mother.

Generally, the child's first social learning occurs in the home. These early experiences of the child in his interactions with his mother and father are assumed to be among the most important situations for his future emotional development. These early experiences are also critical in determining his attitude toward other individuals. When the infant's primary needs are gratified by the mother, the infant develops positive feelings and approach responses towards her. When the infant is not gratified, however, negative feelings and avoidance responses develop. More typically, both will exist simultaneously and the feeling manifested will depend on the situation. In later life, those feelings that were felt toward the mother will
generalize to other feminine figures.

According to Sullivan's point of view, the infant develops two interpretations of the mother: "good mother" and "bad mother." These fundamental concepts tend to persist as basic "personifications" throughout the life of the individual. These basic "personifications" form the nucleus for the child's interpretation of other individuals.

This basic formula is also advanced by Erikson (1959). Here, the early interaction between mother and child will determine whether the child develops a basic sense of trust or distrust of the mother. This basic attitude (trust or distrust) will form the core of all later attitudes toward other individuals.

Freudian theory dictates that the extent to which an individual loves and hates his mother and father depends on the degree to which the oedipal complex has been resolved. Again, the relationships the individual develops with others will depend on the quality of the relationships that were developed between himself and his mother and father.

There is basic agreement that during infancy and early childhood the individual does develop attitudes and feelings towards the significant people in his life and that these conceptualizations form the basic prototypes of how he will perceive other people in the future.

During his development, the child also develops
certain conceptualizations about himself. The individual's self-concept is very important to his emotional growth. The healthier and more successful a person is, the greater the probability that he has a positive self-concept. In general, people with positive self-concepts are more accepting of others and have a more positive outlook on life than individuals with a negative self-concept.

Because the conceptualizations an individual has about his mother, father, and himself do influence his emotional development and his behavior, knowledge of these conceptualizations would aid our understanding of him as well as facilitate our ability to make accurate predictions about him.

If particular RIBs can be interpreted as being symbolic of the mother, father, and self conceptualizations, then clinical psychologists would have an ideal tool for gathering information about an individual which would go beyond the typical data elicited by the Rorschach test.

For example, Hirschstein and Rabin (1955) found that with delinquents, responses to Cards IV and VII differed according to the availability of the parents when the delinquents were children.

Therapeutically, knowledge of how a patient conceptualizes his parents and himself may prove helpful to the
therapist in anticipating and understanding the transference relationship. The transference relationship, according to Freud (1963), develops when the patient weaves the figure of the therapist into one of the prototypes already constructed in his unconscious. The therapist might be associated with either the "mother-imago," the "father-imago," or some other important figure in the individual's past. If the therapist is aware of the substance of the prototypes prior to the establishment of the transference relationship, he may be in a better therapeutic position to help his patients.

In many clinical situations, it falls to the diagnostician to recommend whether a patient should be seen or not seen in therapy as well as which type of therapy seems indicated. Dana (1954) found that short term therapy is differentially effective with patients depending on their responses to the father card. When the patient's responses to Card IV were judged to be "adequate," prognosis for short term therapy was better than when the responses were "negative."

Knowledge of the positive and negative feelings a patient has about his mother, father, and himself and the discrepancy between the unconscious conceptualizations and the conscious descriptions given about each should aid the psychologist in determining whether psychotherapy is
necessary or not and if it should be, whether it should be short or long term, the theoretical orientation, individual or group, or whether the patient should have a male or female therapist, or both.

Knowledge about whether particular RIBs do elicit responses symbolic of how an individual conceptualized his parents would open another area for research on stimulus factors of the RIBs. This is an area of research already replete with individual pieces of data with little to tie them together. Understanding why a particular RIB elicits responses symbolic of that individual's mother would necessitate pulling together the various experiments done on the stimulus value of the RIBs including the areas of color, shading, form, card order, card preference, complexity, as well as physiological correlates of individual RIBs. This additional information would further our knowledge of how and why the Rorschach test works.
FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Review of Literature

Authorities on the interpretation of the Rorschach test (Alcock, 1963; Allen, 1966; Bochner & Halpern, 1945; Klopfer, Ainsworth, Klopfer, & Holt, 1954; and Piotrowski, 1957) support, in general, the use of Cards IV and VII as symbolizing the father and mother figures respectively.

Bochner and Halpern (1945) stated that responses to each of the RIBs could only be interpreted if the specific quality and character of each blot is understood. In describing the character of each card, they found that Card II "... represents danger, excitement, sex" (p. 79). For Card IV, "The heavy male figure may suggest the father or authority in general ..." (p. 81). For Card VII, they found that: "The two female faces ... as well as the generally soft, light quality, give this card a feminine quality, frequently with maternal implications" (p. 82).

Klopfer et al. (1954) have agreed with Bochner and Halpern concerning the symbolic meaning of Cards IV and VII although they have specifically warned their readers that "... it is unnecessary and unfruitful to stretch empirical reasoning to the point where every reaction to Card IV is interpreted as a reaction to father or authority" (p. 393).
Piotrowski (1957) found that Card IV elicited father associations more often than it elicited mother associations. He did, however, go on to caution against automatic interpretations.

Alcock (1963) reported that use of the title "father card" for Card IV is justified, although not without qualifications. Consideration of Card VII, as the mother card, "... has considerable justification in that it often evokes both concepts and percepts which would be appropriate to a mother-child situation" (p. 15).

This trend toward the interpretation of Cards IV and VII as father and mother cards was continued in a recent book on the Rorschach test (Allen, 1966). Concerning Card IV, Allen stated: "... the chief contribution of this plate for sequential analysis is to make accessible the individual's attitude, reaction, and adjustment to authority, the father figure" (p. 172). Allen reported that three ideas predominated for Card VII: 1. mother; 2. emotional security; and 3. emotional insecurity.

Both the techniques and results of research concerning the validity of the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis are varied.

One technique has been to show Ss the 10 RIBs and have them pick the card that most represented "mother" and
the card that most represented "father."

The investigation by Meer and Singer (1950) has been cited, as contributing strong support for the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis (Allen, 1966). In that investigation, 50 fraternity men were administered individual Rorschach tests and at the close of the test were asked to select a card to represent a "father card" and another to represent a "mother card." One S was eliminated and the data were analyzed on the basis of 49 Ss. Using frequency with which each card was chosen as mother or father card, chi-square analyses of the data were performed. Results indicated that Card IV was chosen as a father card at the .01 level of confidence and Card II was chosen as a father card at the .05 level of confidence. Both Cards VII and X were chosen as the mother cards at the .05 level of confidence. The investigators concluded that including the choice of a mother and father card during testing the limits phase of Rorschach administration would be a beneficial practice. They also warned that: "We cannot conclude definitely that patients who identify Card IV as a 'father card' respond to it as they would towards their fathers" (p. 483).

Rosen (1951), using a questionnaire, asked his Ss to choose from among the 10 RIBs that card which most nearly brought to mind the feeling or association of: 1. a male sex organ; 2. masculine aggression; 3. authority; 4. a
father symbol; 5. a mother symbol; 6. a family symbol; 7. a human being; 8. a female sex organ; 9. emotional insecurity; and 10. emotional security. Ten other concepts were used as neutral buffers. Subjects consisted of 118 male and 75 female college students. Some Ss were seen in groups where all 10 RIBs were projected simultaneously while other Ss were seen individually and had the 10 RIBs placed before them. Cards IV and VI were selected by Ss as representing the father symbol while Card VII was selected for the mother symbol. No single meaning, however, was assigned to a specific card by a majority of any group. Because of this, the investigation concluded that Rorschach stimuli have a partial but not a total symbolic community for Ss.

Using a slightly different technique, Sappenfield (1961) asked 53 male and 51 female undergraduates to assign the label of masculinity or femininity to each of the RIBs. Eight of the RIBs were perceived as masculine or feminine by percentages of Ss significantly different from 50%. Cards I, IV, VI, VIII, and IX were seen as masculine and Cards III, V, and VII were seen as having feminine stimulus value.

Sappenfield (1965) had normal Ss decide for each RIB whether it was an attractive card or a repelling card. Cards II, III, VI, and VII were seen as attractive while Cards I and IV were seen as repelling.
Evidence obtained by Hafner (1961) did not support the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis. Using emotionally disturbed children with a mean age of 10.5 years, he found that his Ss responded to Card III as both the mother and father card.

A further investigation of the stimulus value of the RIBs for children was undertaken by Magnussen and Cole (1967). As subjects, they had 93 children with a mean age of 10.7 years and who were receiving psychiatric services take the Rorschach test and then pick a card that most reminded the S of his own mother and one that reminded him of his own father. Large frequencies were found for Card III as being both mother and father card for the total group although Card VII was seen more frequently as the mother card. For the boys, Card IV had the highest frequency as the father symbol. These results only partially supported those obtained by Hafner.

In the majority of studies reviewed, Ss were asked to select a mother card and a father card. Magnussen and Cole (1967) attempted to reach a more personal level by asking their Ss (children) to choose a card that most represented their own mother and father. Charen (1957) had previously used this technique with adults. Charen's investigation was a result of his clinical testing of 50 adults who had been referred for testing by private
psychiatrists. The patients were of both sexes, white, and consisted of all socioeconomic groups except relief groups. All were ambulatory, had no cerebral involvement, and included all diagnostic categories although none needed hospitalization at the time of examination. After the regular administration of the Rorschach test, patients were asked to pick a card most like their own mother and a card most like their own father. Results demonstrated that all 10 RIBs were chosen as both mother and father cards.

Another technique used to test the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis has been to match the RIBs with dolls. Both Levy (1958) and Mayer and Binz (1961) used this technique with children with similar findings. Results of both studies demonstrated that Cards IV and VI were representative of maleness or father. For the mother card, Levy found Card IX matched most with the maternal doll while Mayer and Binz found Card X matched most with the maternal doll.

Since its introduction (Osgood, 1952), the semantic differential (SD) has been used to study the meaning of the individual RIBs.

The SD is a controlled association technique in which S is instructed to evaluate a stimulus on a number of bipolar scales. Each scale consists of two adjectives opposite in meaning to each other. These polar adjectives are separated by seven steps, one of which must be checked
in order to indicate the position of the concept or stimulus rated in relation to the adjective of opposed meaning. An example of such a scale is as follows:

Good :__:_::__:__:__:__:__:__; Bad

It has been demonstrated (Heise, 1965; Norman, 1959; Osgood, 1962; Osgood & Suci, 1955; and Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) that the SD is an accurate instrument for recording affective associations of stimuli and that these affective judgments on bipolar adjective scales would reliably resolve into three major factors: Evaluation; Activity; and Potency.

Heise (1965, p. 1) has summarized the principles of SD methodology as follows:

"1. Ratings of bipolar adjective scales—whatever the number and variety of scales used—are largely a function of a few dimensions of judgment" (Evaluation, Activity, and Potency).

"2. These dimensions or factors are meaningfully related to affect." The SD has been used previously in personality research (Osgood & Luria, 1954). They investigated the personalities of a patient having a multiple personality. The patient rated 15 concepts (Love, Child, My Doctor, Me, My Job, Mental Sickness, My Mother, Peace of Mind, Fraud, My Spouse, Self-Control, Hatred, My Father,
Confusion, and Sex) on 10 scales four times while in the role of each of her three personalities. Test-retest reliabilities ranged from .65 to .94 with the median being .89. From the SD data, Osgood and Luria were able to make "blind" interpretations about the different personalities which were in accord with the personalities as described by the patient's therapist.

"3. A few appropriate scales can be used to obtain reliable measurements on any one dimension." In constructing a test form, it is necessary to select at least two scales which have high correlations with one factor and low correlations with the other two factors. Scales should also be chosen for their relevancy to the purpose of the experiment.

"4. Measurements made on a given dimension are comparable for stimuli of greatly different character . . . Meaningful differences among words, sounds, colors, pictures, facial expressions, and a wide variety of concepts have been found using measurements on these dimensions."

The profiles of two stimuli are best compared by means of a general distance formula (Cronbach & Glesser, 1953; Nunnally, 1962; and Osgood & Suci, 1952). This formula \( D = \sqrt{\sum d^2} \) is obtained by summing the squares of
the absolute difference on each scale between the scale positions for the two stimuli being compared and then taking the square root of the sum. According to Nunnally (1962), the strongest argument for using D for the comparison of profile data is that it takes into account all possible information in the profile: level; shape; and dispersion. The smaller D is found to be, the greater the similarity in meaning between the two stimuli. For example, using a nine scale form of the SD, D for two concepts rated exactly the same would be zero while D for two concepts rated as extreme opposites (concept 1 rated at step 1 on all nine scales and concept 2 rated at step 7 on all nine scales) would be 18.

Rabin (1959), Rosen (1960), and Zax and Loiselle (1960) used the SD to define the connotative meanings of all 10 RIBs. All three studies employed male and female undergraduates except Rosen who also included 29 male and 7 female clinical psychologists. No major differences were found between clinicians and students and no major sex differences were noted in the direction of the concept rated. Both individual and group methods of administration were used with the total of 125 male and 114 female Ss. Results of the three studies were approximately the same and will, therefore, be combined in the following discussion. Results of the three studies indicated that:
Card I was seen as strong, dirty, cruel, ferocious, rugged, and negative;

Card II was seen as happy, good, peaceful, healthy, and exciting. Zax and Loiselle, however, found that this card was generally rated as negative;

Card III was rated as happy, light, clear, active, fast, and positive;

Card IV was seen as bad, dirty, strong, cruel, ferocious, heavy, rugged, masculine, and as the most negative of the 10 cards;

Card V was seen as a neutral card being rated as small, light, clear, active, and smooth;

Card VI was seen as having little connotative meaning although Zax and Loiselle's Ss rated the card as negative in connotation;

Card VII was seen as good, peaceful, light, delicate, feminine, and as positive in emotional content;

Card VIII was seen as good, clean, peaceful, and emotionally positive;

Card IX was seen as ambivalent. Rabin's Ss rated this card as good, beautiful, strong, pleasant, and honest whereas Zax and Loiselle's Ss rated the card as negative. Rosen found no outstanding connotations for this card;

Card X was seen as good, clean, happy, active, and as the most positive of the 10 cards.
This data is further supported by Schleifer and Hire (1960) who had their Ss check trait adjectives (57 trait adjectives used) which best described their reactions and feelings about the various cards.

Zax, Loiselle, and Karras (1960), using the SD with 40 schizophrenic patients, were able to substantiate the findings that Cards I and IV were rated as connotatively negative.

The IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis was directly tested using the SD by Kamano (1960), Little (1959), Sines (1960), and Smith (1955).

Kamano (1960) had 40 male and 40 female college students rate Cards IV and VII and the concepts "Mother" and "Father" on seven scales with high loadings on the potency factor. Results indicated that the meanings of Card IV and "Father" were closer than the meanings of Card VII and "Father." The meanings of Card VII and "Mother" were closer than the meanings of Card IV and "Mother." No sex differences were found.

Little (1959) had 20 male and 20 female college students rate each of the 10 RIBs and 8 concepts (book, woman, people, father, tree, man, self, and mother) on a 9 scale form of the SD. Each concept was then compared with each of the 10 cards using Osgood's generalized distance formula (Osgood et al., 1957). Results indicated a slight
sex difference and no support for the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis. Both the men and women rated Card VI as being closer in meaning to the concept father than any other card. Both the men and women rated Card VIII as being similar in meaning to the concepts mother and woman. Male Ss chose Cards VI and VIII as similar to the concept man while female Ss rated Card VI as similar in meaning to man. Major sex difference arose in the rating of a self card. For the men, Card VIII was rated as similar to the word self whereas women rated Card X as being similar to the stimulus word.

Sines (1960) had 20 undergraduates rate the 10 RIBs and 20 concepts (including mother and father). Results indicated that Card IV was seen as frightening and Card VIII was seen as being female but not mother.

Smith (1955) had 20 undergraduates rate the 10 RIBs and three concepts (My Father, My Mother, and Sex) on a 10 scale form of the SD. Using a form of McQuitty's (1956) agreement analysis, Smith found that the concept My Father ranked only seventh (out of ten) in profile agreement with Card IV, My Mother ranked only fifth in profile agreement with Card VII, and Sex ranked only sixth in profile agreement with Card VI.

These four studies offer only partial statistical support for the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis.

The final study to be discussed is that of Zelin and
Sechrest (1963). They tested the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis at a clinical level by comparing responses to Cards I, III, IV, and VII with S's relationships with their parents as described by S's therapist. Therapists rated their patients as to the patients' relationships with their parents. Independent judges rated the Ss' Rorschach responses on Cards I, III, IV, and VII on the same approximate scale of parental relationships that the therapists used. The two sets of ratings were then compared for the amount of agreement between the two descriptions of parental feelings. Results indicated that both Cards IV and VII did equally well at reflecting the type of relationship S had with his or her father while Cards I and III yielded the best results for the relationship with their mother.

Critique

The preceding review demonstrated that while most of the studies reviewed provide some evidence for the assumptions that Cards IV and VII are in some manner related to the concepts of "Father" and "Mother," other cards were also found to be significantly related to parental conceptions. The experimental evidence suggests that Cards II, III, VI, and X cannot be discounted as parental cards.

A majority of investigations reviewed may be divided into two groups according to the task required of S. Group
one represents experiments where S was asked to provide a culturally stereotyped response. These studies (Hafner, 1961; Kamano, 1960; Little, 1959; Meer & Singer, 1950; Rosen, 1951; and Sines, 1960) either asked S to pick a card that represented "mother" and "father" or which represented "a mother symbol" and "a father symbol" or had S rate the concepts "mother" and "father" on the SD. This task did not allow S to differentiate between how he feels about his father and mother, what he thought most fathers and mothers are like, or what he thought fathers and mothers should be. The way the task was presented, however, encouraged S to make his judgments independently of how he conceptualized his own parents.

Taniguchi, DeVos, & Murakami (1958) found that Japanese normal adolescents selected both Cards VII and X as "mother" cards while Japanese delinquent adolescents selected Cards VIII and X as "mother" cards. When asked to tell why they picked the card they did, responses revolved around the warmth and tenderness of the cards. The investigators concluded that the reasons given fit closely to what a mother should be in Japan where the use of color is culturally determined; i.e., the use of the color red is reserved for women under the age of 30 years and traditionally would not be used by either men or older women. From this,
Es concluded that using this procedure, choice of mother and father cards was culturally determined rather than dynamically determined.

In the second group of experiments (Charen, 1957; Magnussen & Cole, 1967; and Smith, 1955), S picked cards that most represented their own mother and father or Es had Ss rate the concepts "My Mother" and "My Father" on the SD. Results of these investigations threw suspicion on the validity of the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis. Only Magnussen and Cole found positive results for the hypothesis although they also found that Card III was chosen as both a mother and father card quite frequently. Results of Charen's investigation were complicated because his patients misinterpreted the task and instead of choosing a card that most represented their own mother and father, they tended to choose one of the responses they had already given and associated mother and father to that.

For clinical application of the mother and father card assumptions, the responses elicited must go beyond the level of a purely cultural stereotype. Rating the concepts "My Mother" and "My Father" rather than the words "Mother" and "Father" should operate against receiving a strictly cultural stereotype. This problem should be even further alleviated if Ss were directed to give personal responses by asking them to think about their own mother and father
and have them rate their parents by name.

Results of some investigations were misleading because of the statistical analyses used. Smith (1955) utilized a statistical analysis which is a shorthand technique for comparing profiles (McQuitty, 1956) and is not as powerful or inclusive as the general distance formula.

Results obtained in the investigation by Meer and Singer (1950), although statistically significant, are clinically useless. Using chi-square analysis, they tested the extent to which the observed frequency of card choice deviated from the frequency expected by chance. Card IV was selected as the father card at the .01 level of confidence and Card II was selected as the father card at the .05 level of confidence. Numerically, however, we get a different picture. Out of the 49 Ss in the investigation, Card IV was chosen by 12 Ss and Card II was chosen by 9 Ss. In addition, all remaining cards except Card V were chosen as the father card at least once. This also holds true for the choice of the mother cards. Cards VII and X were each selected by 10 Ss while all the remaining cards except Card IV were chosen at least once as the mother card. Rather than demonstrate that Cards IV and VII were parental cards, this investigation clearly pointed out that while Cards IV and VII were selected as parental cards more than any other cards, the majority of Ss chose cards other than IV and VII.
Rosen (1951), came to the same conclusion. The results of Rosen's investigation demonstrated that while more Ss labeled Cards IV and VII as parental cards than any other cards, those Ss did not consist of a majority of the total number of Ss.

Some investigations (Kamano, 1960; Zelin & Sechrest, 1963) prejudiced their results by not including all 10 RIBs in their investigations. Kamano used only Cards IV and VII while Zelin and Sechrest used only Cards I, III, IV, and VII. Use of all 10 RIBs may have resulted in different conclusions than those made by these investigators.

One major source of Ss for the investigations that have demonstrated partial validity to the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis was the university classroom.

Four investigations used patient populations as their Ss (Charen, 1957; Hafner, 1961; Magnussen and Cole, 1967; and Zelin & Sechrest, 1963). All four threw doubt on a strict interpretation of the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis.

One possible explanation for this was presented by Allport (1956): "... the direct responses of the psycho-neurotic cannot be taken at their face value. The defenses are high, the true motives are hidden and are betrayed only by a projective technique. The normal subjects, on the other hand, tell you by the direct method precisely what
they tell you by the projective method." Asking the neurotic subject to select a "mother" and "father" card overtly may raise his defensiveness with the result that the selected cards may not be ones that were unconsciously interpreted as the "mother" and "father" cards.

One solution to this problem would entail the use of an indirect technique for the selection of the parental as well as the self cards.

The SD is such a technique and has been used successfully in research dealing with parental identification and dream symbolism. Moss (1953) found that when dreams emanate from an unconscious conflict, the meaning of the dream symbols correspond more closely to unconscious than to conscious meaning of the things symbolized. For example, if a "metal stove poker" were used in a dream as symbolizing "penis" then the SD ratings of the "metal stove poker" made immediately after the hypnotic revivification of the dream would be more similar to the SD ratings of "penis" than to SD ratings of "metal stove poker" as used in ordinary experience.

Lazowick (1955) used SD methodology to study direct and indirect parent-child identification. He found that normal men identify more with their fathers than their mothers and more with both parents than a high anxious group of men.
Previous research has also been based on the assumption that regardless of how S feels towards and conceptualizes his parents, one particular card will be symbolic of all parental feelings. Research demonstrated that more than one RIB stands out as mother card and father card. Research also demonstrated that emotional labeling of the RIBs differ: some being seen as positive while others being seen as negative. For example, both Cards III and IV have been labeled "father card" but emotionally, Card III has been rated as a positive and attractive card while Card IV has been rated as a negative and repelling card. It is possible that which RIB is used to symbolize father may depend on whether S conceptualizes his father as a positive and attractive person or as a negative and repelling person. If this is true, there will be more than one mother and father card and isolation of the specific cards would be of paramount importance for the understanding of this phenomena.

**Purpose of Investigation**

Results of previous research concerning mother, father, and self symbolism on the Rorschach test are inconclusive. Discrepancies are found in choice of parental cards to the extent that it would prove difficult to use the IV-father, VII-mother concepts in a practical, clinical setting.
One purpose of this experiment was to use an indirect technique (SD) to explore an important personality variable that might have contributed to the contradictory results. Previous research suggests that the choice of a mother, father, and self card may be influenced by whether S conceptualizes his parents and himself in positive terms or negative terms. If this could be demonstrated, the use of parental and self symbolism on the Rorschach test may acquire a more valid clinical function.

Following Allport's (1956) discussion that the overt responses of neurotic patients cannot be taken at face value, another purpose of this experiment was to compare the results of choice of mother, father, and self cards as determined by the indirect method with selection of mother, father, and self cards by a direct method.

When an individual is identified strongly with one or the other of his parents, he should tend to conceptualize himself in the same terms as he conceptualized that parent. A further purpose of this experiment was to explore the possibility that if an individual does identify strongly with one of his parents, that card which is seen as a self card will be the same card seen as a parental card for that identified with parent.
Hypotheses

1. More than one card will be responded to as the mother card.

2. Those Ss who rate their mother as being similar to people with positive personality traits will rate their mother as being similar to different cards than Ss who rate their mother as being similar to people with negative personality traits.

3. More than one card will be responded to as the father card.

4. Those Ss who rate their father as being similar to people with positive personality traits will rate their father as being similar to different cards than Ss who rate their father as being similar to people with negative personality traits.

5. More than one card will be responded to as the self card.

6. Those Ss who rate themselves as being similar to people with positive personality traits will rate themselves as being similar to different cards than Ss who rate themselves as being similar to people with negative personality traits.

7. Those Ss who have identified strongly with their mother will rate, as a self card, the same card they rated as the mother card.
8. Those Ss who have identified strongly with their father will rate, as a self card, the same card they rated as the father card.

9. There will be a discrepancy between those cards rated as mother, father, and self cards by the indirect method and those cards selected by the direct method as mother, father, and self cards.
METHOD

Subjects

Fifty white, male psychoneurotic patients at the Veterans Administration Center in Gulfport, Mississippi were used as Ss. To qualify for inclusion in the experiment, S had to have an intake diagnosis of one of the psychoneurotic disorders (Anxiety reaction, Dissociative reaction, Conversion reaction, Phobic reaction, Obsessive-compulsive reaction, or Depressive reaction) and if S had any previous admissions to the hospital, he must have been consistently diagnosed as psychoneurotic. Psychological test data were submitted to a staff psychologist for an independent judgment concerning the validity of the psychoneurotic diagnosis. As a final screening technique, all potential Ss took an MMPI. Only those patients who were consistently diagnosed psychoneurotic and who demonstrated no evidence of psychosis, cerebral damage, or a primary sociopathic personality disturbance on all screening devices, who had no more than a total of five years hospitalization, and who were raised by both parents or parent substitutes were used in the experiment.

One hundred and forty-eight Ss who met partial requirements were screened over a three month period before
50 Ss could be found that met all requirements. The final selection of Ss consisted of 41 patients diagnosed Anxiety reaction, 7 patients diagnosed Depressive reaction, and 2 patients diagnosed Conversion reaction. Mean age of Ss was 46 years with a standard deviation of 6. Mean IQ was 103 with a standard deviation of 16. Mean number of admissions to the hospital was 2.6 with a standard deviation of 2. Mean for total length of time each patient had spent in the hospital was 254 days with 23 patients having less than 100 days total hospitalization.

**Apparatus**

One form of the SD was used as the measuring instrument (Appendix A). Nine bipolar adjectives were selected as meeting the criteria for good scales (factor weights and applicability). The Evaluation factor was represented by: 1. good-bad; 2. beautiful-ugly; and 3. pleasant-unpleasant. The Potency factor was represented by: 1. hard-soft; 2. tough-fragile; and 3. heavy-light. The Activity factor was represented by: 1. active-passive; 2. fast-slow; and excitable-calm. Five separate arrangements of the nine scales were prepared and arranged in a 21 page booklet so that no arrangement was repeated twice in succession.

The Identification Scale developed by Heilbrun (1965) was used as an independent measure of parental identification.
along with the SD.

Procedure

Each S was seen individually for two one hour experimental sessions.

Session 1. Following Kelly's (1955) technique for isolating important people in Ss past, S was asked to supply names of people who he knew personally and who best fit the following descriptions: 1. an accepting person; 2. an attractive person; 3. a kind person; 4. an authoritarian person; 5. an aggressive person; 6. a rejecting person; 7. a repelling person; and 8. a cruel person. Names of the people given by S as well as the names of S's mother and father and his own name were then randomly written at the top of the pages of the SD booklet (one name per page on pages 11 to 21). Pages 1 to 10 were used for the ratings of the 10 RIBs.

After the names were written into the booklet, the standard instructions for the SD (Osgood et al., 1957) with slight modifications for use with RIBs rather than verbal concepts were read (Appendix B). S was given a practice set to do and allowed to ask any questions relevant to the task. S was then given the 10 RIBs to rate. They were presented one at a time and in standard order. S was allowed as much time as needed. Once the RIBs had been rated, S rated the people whose names he had previously supplied.
S was asked to be honest and rate each person according to what he thought and how he felt about that person.

Session 2. Eight index cards, each of which contained one of the descriptive phrases used in session 1 (kind person, rejecting person, etc.) were given to S. He was then asked to rank the eight descriptions from the most positive trait to the most negative trait. The 10 RIBs were then laid out before S and he was asked to select one card that best represented his mother, one card that best represented his father, and one card that best represented himself. Once this was completed, the Identification Scale was administered.

Ten Ss were given a third session in order to collect reliability data. Time between the second session and third session ranged from five days to four weeks. During this session, S was asked to rate his mother, father, himself, the person given as an accepting person, the person given as a rejecting person, and Rorschach Cards I, III, V, VII, and IX on the same SD scales as before. S was again asked to rank the eight descriptive adjectives from most positive to most negative.
RESULTS

Each S's ratings were analyzed individually. The general distance formula (D) was used to obtain the semantic distance between the rating of mother and the rating of each of the eight individuals named by S and between mother and the rating of the 10 RIBs. This analysis was also done for the father and self ratings.

For each S, the one individual and the one RIB rated as most similar to mother were recorded.

From the rankings of the eight trait adjectives, the four traits that were ranked as most positive were recorded as positive while the remaining four were recorded as negative traits.

Once the individual rated as most similar to mother had been ascertained, it was recorded whether this person was representative of a positive or a negative trait. If the individual rated as closest in meaning to S's mother was representative of a positive trait, mother was considered positive. If the individual was negative, then mother was considered negative.

For each S, then, the RIB rated as being closest in meaning to mother represented that S's mother card and whether or not the individual rated as closest in meaning
to mother was ranked as positive or negative determined whether that RIB represented a positive mother or a negative mother.

This complete procedure was also performed for the father and self ratings for each S.

The .05 level of confidence was accepted as significant.

The frequency with which each RIB was rated as a positive or negative mother card on the SD is shown in Table I. Data from 5 Ss were discarded because they rated more than one card as being equally similar to their mothers. Chi-square analysis was performed on the total number of times each card was rated as a mother card. This analysis was significant. Further analysis revealed that frequency of choice of Cards VIII and IX was significant. Chi-square analysis for frequency of positive and negative choices for total number of choices was significant.

Chi-square analyses were computed for frequency of positive and negative choices for Cards VIII and IX. These analyses were corrected for continuity and were significant. Both Cards VIII and IX were significantly rated as positive mother cards.

The frequency with which each RIB was rated as a positive or negative father card on the SD is shown in Table II. Data from 7 Ss were discarded because they rated more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05
than one card as being equally similar to their fathers. Chi-square analysis was performed on the total number of times each card was rated as a father card. This analysis was not significant. Further analysis revealed that frequency of choice as a father card for Cards IX and X was significant. Chi-square analysis was computed for the frequency of positive and negative choices for total number of choices. This analysis was significant.

Chi-square analyses were computed for frequency of positive and negative choices for Cards IX and X. These analyses were corrected for continuity and were not significant.

The frequency with which each RIB was rated as a positive or negative self card on the SD is shown in Table III. Data from 5 Ss were discarded because they rated more than one card as being equally similar to themselves. Chi-square analysis was performed on the total number of times each card was rated as a self card. This analysis revealed that frequency of choice as a self card for Cards VII and VIII was significant. Chi-square analysis computed for the frequency of positive and negative choices for total number of choices was not significant.

Chi-square analyses were computed for frequency of positive and negative choices for Cards VII and VIII. These analyses were corrected for continuity and were not
TABLE III

FREQUENCY OF RORSCHACH CARD CHOICE AS POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE SELF CARD AS DETERMINED BY SD RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05
significant.

The frequency with which Ss who identified with their mothers chose the same or different self and mother card was compared with the frequency with which low mother identifiers chose the same or different self and mother cards. These frequencies are shown in Table IV. Two Ss were eliminated because they were the tied median score. Chi-square for the four groups was significant.

A series of 2 x 2 chi-square analyses were computed between the cells and revealed that: 1. difference between the frequency of low identifiers who chose the same Rorschach card for self and mother was significantly different from the frequency of low identifiers who chose different cards; 2. difference between high identifiers who chose same or different self and mother cards was not significant; 3. difference between the frequency of high and low identifiers who chose the same self and mother cards was significant; and 4. difference between the frequency of high and low identifiers who chose different self and mother cards approached significance ($p < .10$).

The frequency with which Ss who identified with their fathers chose the same or different self and father cards was compared with the frequency with which low father identifiers chose the same or different self and father cards.
TABLE IV
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH HIGH AND LOW MOTHER IDENTIFIERS
CHOSE SAME OR DIFFERENT SELF AND MOTHER CARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Identifiers</th>
<th></th>
<th>High Identifiers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Rorschach Card</td>
<td>4 Ss</td>
<td>Different Rorschach Cards</td>
<td>20 Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Rorschach Card</td>
<td>14 Ss</td>
<td>Different Rorschach Cards</td>
<td>10 Ss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These frequencies are shown in Table V. Chi-square for the four groups was not significant.

A series of 2 x 2 chi-square analyses were computed between the cells and revealed that the difference between the frequency of low identifiers who chose the same Rorschach card for self and father was significantly different from the frequency of low identifiers who chose different cards. All other comparisons were not significant.

The frequency with which each RIB was overtly selected as a mother, father, and self card is shown in Table VI.

Chi-square analysis was performed on the total number of times each card was selected as a mother card. This analysis was significant. Further analysis revealed that Cards VIII, IX and X were selected as mother cards significantly above chance.

Analysis of the total number of times each card was selected as a father card was not significant although Card IV was selected as a father card significantly above chance.

Analysis of the total number of times each card was selected as a self card was not significant. Card X, however, was selected as a self card significantly above chance.

A series of chi-square analyses were computed for the frequency of selection as a mother, father, or self card for
TABLE V
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH HIGH AND LOW FATHER IDENTIFIERS CHOSE SAME OR DIFFERENT SELF AND FATHER CARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Identifiers</th>
<th>High Identifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Rorschach Card</td>
<td>7 Ss</td>
<td>12 Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Rorschach Cards</td>
<td>18 Ss</td>
<td>13 Ss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH EACH CARD WAS OVERTLY SELECTED AS MOTHER, FATHER, AND SELF CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Chi$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.170*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>2.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi$^2$</td>
<td>36.400**</td>
<td>13.200</td>
<td>8.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05

** = .001
each individual card. Resulting chi-squares are shown in Table VI.

Analysis of frequencies for Card IV resulted in a significant chi-square with the high frequency being for father. Analysis of frequencies for Card V were also significant with the high frequency being for mother. All other comparisons were not significant.

Frequency with which each card was rated as a mother, father, and self card by means of SD and the frequency each card was selected overtly were compared by means of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. Frequencies and ranks are shown in Tables VII, VIII, and IX (Appendix C). All correlations were corrected for the presence of tied scores. For mother card, the resulting rank correlation coefficient was significant. For father card, the resulting rank correlation coefficient was not significant. Rank correlation coefficient for self card was also not significant.

Correlation coefficients were computed between the ratings from original testing and retesting for the 10 Ss used to measure rating reliability. Correlation coefficients for each S on each item rated are shown in Table X (Appendix C). Only the mean correlation coefficients for the ratings of mother, father, and self were significant. Considering the mean correlation coefficient for any one S,
only three Ss had a mean correlation that was significant.

The mean correlation coefficient for each S was then compared with the amount of time between first and second testing by means of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. Scores and ranks are shown in Table XI (Appendix C). This comparison was significant. Mean correlation coefficient for five Ss with the shortest amount of time between testings (less than two weeks) was compared with mean correlation coefficient for those Ss tested in from two to four weeks. Mean correlation coefficient for the short test-retest group was +.671 which was significant. Mean correlation coefficient for the long test-retest group was +.525 which was not significant.

Spearman rank correlation coefficients were computed for the two rankings of the eight descriptive adjectives. The mean correlation coefficient for 10 Ss was significant.
DISCUSSION

The question of whether or not Cards IV and VII of the Rorschach test yield information concerning a patient's unconscious feelings towards his father and mother is open to argument. Generally, however, these concepts have been accepted and are used by Clinical Psychologists.

The present experiment was an attempt to evaluate the mother card and father card hypotheses as well as to explore the possibility of a self card. It was further intended to examine the possibility that how a patient conceptualizes himself and his parents will influence his choice of a mother, father, and self card.

Major Hypotheses

The first hypothesis predicted that there would be more than one card chosen as mother card and was supported by the data. Cards VIII and IX were significantly rated as mother cards on the SD. These results do not support the general acceptance of Card VII as the mother card. These results are partially supported by Levy (1958) who, using children, found Card IX to be the mother card and by Little (1959) who, using college students, found Card VIII to be a mother card.
The second hypothesis predicted that those Ss who rated their mother as positive would have a different mother card than those Ss who rated their mother as negative. This hypothesis was supported to the extent that Cards VIII and IX were significantly rated as positive mother cards. A strict comparison between those Ss who rated their mother as positive and those who rated them as negative could not be performed because only 1 S out of 50 Ss rated his mother as negative.

The third hypothesis, that there would be more than one father card, was confirmed. Cards IX and X were significantly rated as father cards on the SD. These results do not support the popular acceptance of Card IV as the father card. No previous research has shown Cards IX and X to be father cards.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that those Ss who rated their father as positive would have a different father card than those Ss who rated their father as negative. This hypothesis was not supported. Cards IX and X were not seen as significantly positive or negative. Although there were significantly more positive fathers than negative fathers, the 10 choices for negative father card were spread over seven different cards.

The fifth hypothesis, that there would be more than one self card, was confirmed. Cards VII and VIII were
significantly rated as self cards. Little (1959) also found that men rated Card VIII as a self card on the SD.

The sixth hypothesis predicted that those Ss who rated themselves as positive would have a different self card than those Ss who rated themselves as negative. This hypothesis could be fully tested because there was no significant difference between total number of positive self ratings and negative self ratings. The hypothesis was not confirmed. Neither Card VII or Card VIII were seen as significantly positive or negative. The positive choices were spread over eight different cards while the negative choices were spread over nine different cards.

The seventh hypothesis, that those Ss who identify strongly with their mother will rate the same card as self and mother card, was partially supported. Within the group of high identifiers, there was no significant difference between whether S rated same self and mother cards or different self and mother cards. Within the low identifier group, however, significantly more Ss rated different cards as being self and mother than Ss who rated the same self and mother card. Significantly more high identifiers rated the same card as being both self and mother, than did low identifiers.

The eighth hypothesis, that those Ss who identify strongly with their father will rate the same card as being
a self and father card, was also only partially supported. Within the low identifier group, significantly more Ss rated different cards as self and father cards than rated same cards as self and father cards.

The ninth hypothesis predicts a discrepancy between those cards rated as mother, father, and self cards on SD and those cards overtly selected as mother, father, and self cards. This hypothesis was not supported in regards to the mother card. According to SD ratings, Cards VIII and IX were mother cards while overtly Cards VIII, IX, and X were selected as mother cards. The rank correlation coefficient between the frequency each card was used as a mother card under the two conditions was highly significant. In addition, the results of the overt selection of mother card do not support the generally accepted hypothesis that Card VII is the mother card.

For father card, the ninth hypothesis was confirmed. On SD, Cards IX and X were rated as father cards while overtly, Card IV was selected as the father card. There was also no relationship between the frequency each card was used as a father card under the two conditions. Results of the overt selection method were supportive of previous research which demonstrated that Card IV was a father card.

The hypothesis was also confirmed for self card. Under SD conditions, Cards VII and VIII were rated as self
cards while overtly, Card X was selected as the self card. There was also no significant relationship between the frequency each card was used as a self card under the two conditions.

Using SD methodology with hospitalized psychoneurotic patients resulted in different mother and father cards being selected in comparison with what has been found in previous research. There are two possible explanations for this. First, the overall methodology of this experiment may have influenced the results. This is doubtful, however, since SD has been used previously in investigations of mother-father symbolism on the Rorschach test and has yielded the same results as are obtained by overt selection techniques.

The second explanation, and the one that appears more probable, involves the population from which Ss were drawn. Experiments that have demonstrated validity for the IV-father, VII-mother hypothesis used Ss drawn from a college student population. Investigations which did not support this hypothesis and, in fact, did not support the use of any mother, father cards at all, used Ss with various mental disorders. The present investigation, however, used a well defined and carefully selected group of hospitalized psychoneurotic patients. Using this group, it could be shown that some cards do stand out as mother and father as
well as self cards and that these cards are not the same ones that are found to be mother, father, and self cards for "normal" college students.

For the identification data, results were complicated because Ss who fell within the high identification groups for both mother and father identification were not really strongly identified with that parent. The comparison is actually between low and moderate or relatively high identifiers. This data is supported by Lazowick (1955) who found that normal men identify with both parents more than a high anxious group does. Using a group of hospitalized psycho-neurotic patients who were predominantly diagnosed as anxiety reactions, we would not expect to find a group of extremely high identifiers. Generalizing from the group of very low identifiers, however, it appears that the identification hypotheses would be confirmed if high identifier groups could be isolated. This is a matter for future research.

A major difficulty arose in testing hypotheses two and four since for both mother and father, significantly more positive responses were given than negative responses. For mother card, there were 44 positive responses and 1 negative response while for father card, there were 33 positive responses and 10 negative responses. It appears that,
at least for mother and father ratings, the SD was unable to tap a level of responsiveness deeper than a conscious, socially acceptable level. The most parsimonious explanation is that for hospitalized psychoneurotic patients, asking them to think about and directly rate their parents increases their defensiveness to a point where SD reflects only a defensive, rigid, and socially acceptable attitude. That the ratings appear rigid is further exemplified by the reliability data. Correlation coefficients for mother ratings for all 10 Ss who were retested were significant regardless of the amount of time between testings. Four were significant beyond the .05 level of confidence and six were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. For the father ratings, far more negative ratings were evident. Only 7 of the 10 test-retest correlation coefficients were significant. For self ratings, where there was no significant difference between positive and negative ratings, only five test-retest correlation coefficients were significant. The rank correlation coefficient between the rank of the mean test-retest correlation coefficient for each S and the rank of the amount of time between testings was significant. For mother and father ratings, however, time between testing was unimportant. The fact that with these patients, these positive attitudes are firmly fixed, points to their defensive nature.
Further evidence for this is seen in the comparisons between SD mother cards and overt choice mother cards. The frequency of choice of cards is highly correlated for the two techniques and the final cards selected are the same. This was not true for the father card choice. Overtly, the traditional card (Card IV) was selected as the father card whereas by means of SD, Cards IX and X were rated as father cards. In conclusion, it appears that the closer what $ rated consciously related to his personality dynamics, the more defensive and rigid his responses became in the direction of socially acceptable responses.

Although hypotheses two and four could not be tested directly, data indicate the possibility that unconscious conceptualizations do influence choice of mother and father cards.

McKeever and Gerstein (1959), Mitchell (1952), and Wallen (1948) demonstrated that Card IX is generally liked least and rejected more often than Cards VIII and X. McKeever and Gerstein found that for 693 males of different diagnoses at a VA clinic Card IX was rejected significantly more often than Cards VIII or X. Card VII was tied with Card IX as being a rejected card. Mitchell asked 200 neurotics which one of the 10 RIBs they liked best and which one they liked least. Cards X and VIII were rated as being liked best by a significantly greater proportion of $s than
Card IX. Wallen found that with unstable men, Card IX aroused more dislike reactions than any other card.

Results of the present experiment indicated that Cards VIII and IX were rated as mother cards on SD. Card VIII is a card that has a positive emotional impact on neurotic patients while Card IX has a negative emotional impact on the same patients. The patients in the present investigation, however, rated both cards as positive on SD. This finding is highly suggestive of the idea that how one conceptualized his mother does influence which RIB is chosen as the mother card regardless of verbalizations and SD ratings about her. These results are also consistent with Allport's (1956) contention that the defenses of psycho-neurotic patients are too high to allow one to accept their responses at face value. As has already been discussed, SD was unable to penetrate Ss' defensiveness, at least for mother and father ratings.

The results of the present experiment also indicate that Cards IX and X were rated as father cards on the SD. Again, Card IX had a negative emotional impact on neurotic patients while Card X had a positive emotional impact. This suggested that how a patient conceptualized his father may have influenced his choice of a father card.

Rorschach Cards VII and VIII were rated as self cards. Card VII has been interpreted as both positive and negative
by neurotic Ss while Card VIII is positive.

The neurotic patients were highly selective of the multicolored cards (Cards VIII, IX, and X) and although they rated their mothers and fathers as predominantly positive, a significant number of Ss rated those positive mothers and fathers as being similar to Card IX which has been shown to evoke negative affect with neurotic patients. If these parents were really conceptualized as positive, Cards VIII and X should have been used but not Card IX.

**Contributions and Implications**

It has been demonstrated that using SD methodology, more than one RIB was symbolic of each of the concepts studied; mother, father, and self. It was also demonstrated that these RIBs were not the same as those previously found by other investigators.

Using the overt choice technique, mother card for hospitalized psychoneurotic patients was different than the mother card selected by college students. Both the patient population and college students selected the same father card.

These results point out the possible danger of generalizing from college student populations to hospitalized neurotic populations. Assuming that Cards IV and VII are father and mother cards respectively may lead a clinician
to make some very erroneous assumptions about his patient's unconscious conceptualizations of parents.

Although it could not be tested fully, results of this experiment provide further support for the possibility that unconscious conceptualizations do influence the choice of mother, father, and self cards.

Although some RIBs were significantly rated and selected as mother, father, and self cards, the total of these groups did not make up a majority of the total number of Ss except for selection of mother card by the overt choice technique where Cards VIII, IX, and X accounted for 31 of the 50 Ss. The implication is clear. Although some cards are significantly rated as mother, father, and self cards in a group situation, the variance is still great enough that use of mother, father, or self concepts on the Rorschach test in an individual, clinical situation appears to be an invalid procedure.

One unexpected implication of this experiment may be to help explain the phenomena of neurotic color shock. Color shock, according to Beck (1945) "... manifests itself by momentarily misshaping S's reaction pattern, most obviously in the intellectual sphere, but with effect also on the creative activity and in the affective experience. . . . What happens is that, under the influence of the shock,
the individual becomes more constricted, inefficient, inaccurate, impoverished" (p. 37). "Figure II, IX, VIII, in this order, are the ones that most commonly induce neurotic shock. . . . Figure IX more frequently effects disturbance, of an intensity sometimes reaching the point of paralysis" (p. 38). Beck goes on to say that in some rare cases, color shock does not appear until Card X. These findings for neurotic color shock and results of the present experiment are highly complementary. Our results demonstrated that Card IX was a negative mother card as well as a negative father card. The intense reactions of some neurotics to Card IX may be related to his having unconscious negative attitudes towards one or both parents that he is unable to accept. If Card IX does contain negative parental symbolism, this conflict may be stirred within the patient with the result being an intense response. Card VIII is the next most potent as far as neurotic shock is concerned. Card VIII was found to be a positive mother card. What appeared as color shock to Card VIII, perhaps, are unconscious positive feelings toward mother that the patient is psychologically unable to accept.

Theoretically, S's relationship with his mother is more important in shaping his personality than is his relationship with father. Card X was found in our experiment
to represent a positive father. Unacceptable unconscious positive attitudes toward father may be relatively weak as compared with attitudes toward mother as far as the development of neuroses is concerned. If this is true, it would follow that Card X should produce color shock less frequently than the other color cards. This is precisely what Beck found.

While neurotic color shock does occur to the color cards, the phenomena may not be the result of color. Baughman (1958), after surveying the literature on the effects of color on Rorschach responding, concluded that "... color shock signs do not vary significantly as a function of color" (p. 138). Even when Cards VIII, IX, and X are printed in achromatic colors, shock signs are still present. Again, neurotic Ss may be responding to the parental symbolism rather than the color.

This would also explain why non-neurotic Ss do not show color shock signs on Cards VIII, IX, and X. The literature reveals that the parental cards for college students were Cards IV and VII, not VIII, IX, and X. Color shock signs were not expected on Cards VIII, IX, and X from college students and were not received.

Implications for Future Research

Why should college students have different parental
cards on the Rorschach test than hospitalized psychoneurotic patients? One possible area that may be explored is the difference in complexity between Cards IV and VII and Cards VIII, IX, and X. Yarnell and Dawson (In Press) demonstrated that college students perceived the chromatic cards as more complex than the achromatic cards. Possibly, this dichotomy between complexity and simplicity may be involved in the parental symbolism. This speculation can be furthered by the statement of one S in the present experiment who, when asked to select a mother card, selected Card X because it looked the most confusing.

A positive affect card and a negative affect card were rated as similar to both mother and father although actual ratings of mother and father were predominantly positive. Future research should not overlook this variable. The SD was unable to tap the unconscious conceptualizations towards mother and father so the first step in developing this line of thinking will have to be the development of a measuring instrument that will provide the information needed. This instrument may take the form of another projective test such as the DAP or TAT. These, however, would involve E having to make inferences about Ss' parental conceptualizations.

Another technique may be to use Ss who are in psychotherapy. This may prove to be the most accurate means of
acquiring information as to the unconscious conceptualizations held by S.

Further exploration should be carried out to see if conscious attitudes towards parents influenced choice of parental cards by SD and overt selection techniques.

A further attempt should be made to test the identification hypotheses (if S strongly identifies with his mother, he will use the same card as self and mother card and if S strongly identifies with his father, he will use the same card as self and father card) with normal Ss where strong identifiers should readily be found. An attempt should be made to isolate a group of neurotic high identifiers to validate the generalizations made about them on the basis of results from the low identifiers.

Results of the present investigation suggested a new explanation for the phenomena of neurotic color shock. This explanation should be followed up with an intensive exploration of all possible aspects of the relationship. This research, however, will be delayed until a measuring device for parental conceptualizations has been developed.

If Cards IV and VII are parental cards for college students, and if the relationship between neurotic shock and parental cards holds, there should be a difference in responding to Cards IV and VII between adjusted and relatively maladjusted Ss. If parental symbolism is involved
in the shock phenomena, relatively maladjusted college students should show disturbances on Cards IV and VII or both.

Finally, even though some cards stand out as parental cards, the majority of Ss still rate and overtly select cards other than these as their parental cards. If the use of parental cards on the Rorschach test is to become a clinically useful tool, other variables besides the possible positive and negative conceptualizations of parents will have to be isolated. One place to start the exploration for additional variables may be to refine positive and negative conceptualizations into different and more refined personality traits that they represent. For example, a rejecting mother and a cruel mother are both negative mothers although we might find that one is represented by one card while the other is represented by another. Further refinement of personality characteristics of Ss may also yield additional information towards explaining why each S uses particular parental cards and does not use others.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this study were: first, to use an indirect technique to evaluate the hypothesis that how Ss conceptualize their mother, father and themselves influences which Rorschach cards are responded to as mother, father, and self cards; second, do Ss who are strongly identified with either parent use the same Rorschach card as self and identified parent card; and, third, is there a difference between overt selection of mother, father, and self cards and indirect, SD ratings of the same cards.

Fifty hospitalized psychoneurotic patients rated the 10 RIBs and 8 individuals whom they knew personally as representing particular personality traits, as well as their mother, father, and themselves on a nine scale SD. Each S also overtly selected a mother, father, and self card.

Using the general distance formula with SD data, the RIB closest in meaning to mother, father, and self and whether that card represented a positive or negative mother, father, or self was ascertained.

Chi-square analyses revealed that:

1. Cards VIII and IX were significantly rated as positive mother cards on SD;
2. Cards IX and X were significantly rated as father cards on SD;

3. Cards VII and VIII were significantly rated as self cards on SD;

4. There was partial support for the identification hypotheses. Major differences between same and different mother and father cards was seen with the low identifier groups;

5. For mother card, there was no major difference between card choice for the two selection techniques;

6. For father and self cards, there was no significant relationship between the two selection techniques. Different cards were chosen depending on the technique.

The results of this experiment indicated that there is a difference between the indirect and direct technique although the indirect technique used in this experiment was not entirely satisfactory. There is also a difference in card use between the indirect technique with neurotics and typical card choice of college students. Generalization from one group to the other may not lead to valid conclusions. One unexpected result was a possible explanation for neurotic color shock.
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APPENDIX A

Semantic Differential

| fast   | ___________ | slow   |
|_______|____________|________|
| unpleasant | ___________ | pleasant |
| hard   | ___________ | soft   |
| passive | ___________ | active |
| good   | ___________ | bad    |
| light  | ___________ | heavy  |
| excitable | ___________ | calm   |
| ugly   | ___________ | beautiful |
| tough  | ___________ | fragile |
APPENDIX B

Instructions for Semantic Differential

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet you will find a set of scales. I am going to show you a series of 10 designs. You are to rate the designs on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you use these scales:
If you feel that the design is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

fair x::__:__:__:__:_:_ unfair

or

fair __:__:__:__:__:__:x unfair

If you feel that the design is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check mark as follows:

strong __:__x:__:__:__:__: weak

or

strong __:__:__:__:__:x:__ weak
If the design seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active \(\_:\_:\_x:\_:\_:\_\) passive

or

active \(\_:\_:\_\_\_\_\_x:\_\_\_\) passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging. If you consider the design to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the design, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the design, then you should place your check mark in the middle space:

safe \(\_\_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\) dangerous

IMPORTANT:

(1) Place your check marks in the middle spaces, not on the boundaries:

This Not This

\(x\)

\(\_\_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\)

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every design—do not omit any

(3) Never put more than one check mark on a single scale
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TABLE VII
FREQUENCY AND RANK ORDER FOR MOTHER CARD SELECTION
BY SD AND OVERT CHOICE TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>SD Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overt Choice Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = +.886 \]

\[ p < .01 \]
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#### TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND RANK ORDER FOR FATHER CARD SELECTION
BY SD AND OVERT CHOICE TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>SD Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overt Choice Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = -.305$

$p > .05$
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TABLE IX
FREQUENCY AND RANK ORDER FOR SELF CARD SELECTION BY SD AND OVERT CHOICE TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rorschach Card</th>
<th>SD Frequency Rank</th>
<th>SD Frequency Rank</th>
<th>Overt Choice Frequency Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_s = +.111$

$p > .05$
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## TABLE X

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR EACH S RETESTED ON 10 VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>8.475</td>
<td>.848**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>7.655</td>
<td>.766*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>6.913</td>
<td>.691*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting S</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>5.937</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card I</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card III</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>5.851</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card VII</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>4.101</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card IX</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>5.393</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.764*</td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.676*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = .05

** = .01
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TABLE XI

SCORES AND RANKS FOR LENGTH OF TIME BETWEEN TESTINGS AND MEAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Between Testings</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r_s = +0.60 \]

\[ p < 0.05 \]
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