Projective Testing with Asian Clients

8

Sanjay R. Nath, Alan J. Lee, Zoe Belcher-Timme, and Chin Pui Chau

Introduction

The use of projective tests—now more typically labeled "performance-based" measures (Meyer & Kurtz, 2006)—has a long history in the psychological assessment of individuals, often associated informally with more subjective analysis of response content and psychoanalytic interpretation. The full history behind the projective hypothesis, the development of projective instruments, various interpretive systems that have existed throughout the second half of the twentieth century, the positioning of projective instruments vis-à-vis academic and applied clinical psychology, and details of the controversies regarding the reliability and validity of projective measures is beyond the scope of this chapter. Despite this complex and variegated history, the contemporary use of performance-based measures continues to play an important role in the context of personality assessment, diagnostic formulation, forensic assessment, and a number of referral situations where assessing socio-emotional functioning may play an important role in understanding individuals. Projective tests continue to be widely used in clinical settings in the USA, and projective assessment continues to have an important role in providing convergent personality data in the context of an assessment battery (McGrath, 2008).

Very few authors have explicitly discussed the relationship between cultural variables and projective instruments—one notable exception is Dana's *Handbook of Cross-cultural and Multicultural Personality* (2000) with two chapters on projective methods. This book, like much writing on cultural variables and assessment, tends to be broad in its approach, noting gender differences, racial/ethnic differences, and issues related to norms with projective methods. This chapter reflects an attempt to present an often disparate literature on Asians and Asian-Americans with regard to two primary projective testing methods: (1) the Rorschach Inkblot Method (RIM) and (2) story-telling assessment tasks, such as the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Murray, 1943). These methods continue to be some of the most widely utilized projective measures, and each also has a small but substantive literature for Asian populations both within the USA and internationally that has important implications for conducting assessment with Asian clients.

One might wonder why this chapter does not review information on projective drawings such as the house-tree-person or incomplete sentence blanks, also categorized as frequently used projective measures. They are omitted here because their use tends to be almost entirely idiographic as opposed to nomothetic (for example, compared to

S.R. Nath, Ph.D. (✉)
Institute for Graduate Clinical Psychology, Widener University, One University Place, Chester, PA 19013, USA
e-mail: snath@widener.edu

A.J. Lee • Z. Belcher-Timme • C.P. Chau
Widener University, Chester, PA, USA

L.T. Benuto et al. (eds.), *Guide to Psychological Assessment with Asians*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-0796-0_8,

the Rorschach where reliable manualized scoring and statistical normative comparison are an integral part of the method). Story-telling tasks, while also often analyzed idiographically, have also had a number of cultural variations produced (e.g., the Tell-Me-A-Story Test or TEMAS Test that features Asian, Hispanic, and African-American characters and urban settings). In addition, more research exists on cultural factors associated with story-telling tasks given the TAT's status as one of the oldest projective measures that has had a number of variations developed and has been studied extensively over the decades. Thus, while projective drawings and sentence blanks may be used with Asian clients, the literature on their general use is so scarce as to make a review of these tasks for Asian clients specifically quite limited or cursory in scope.

Given the limited recent literature on projective measures to begin with, this chapter will examine research from US-based samples as well as research data from international samples. While this broad focus is not ideal in that it addresses different Asian populations, international data may be more useful when assessing clients who have recently arrived in the USA or are less acculturated. Also, research that utilizes US-based samples often does not explicitly control for generational status or level of acculturation, so that a sharp divide between US-based studies and international studies may not be warranted. These issues related to sample origin are important (see Okazaki, 1988 for a discussion of this issue) but given the limited data available on such specific cultural factors, a broad approach (including both US and non-US sample data) is cautiously undertaken here, and caveats and limitations of the conclusions noted whenever possible. When research data is limited to specific Asian subgroups it is noted as well; Rorschach research on Asian populations has been conducted mostly in the nations of Japan, China, and India. Table 8.1 provides a summary of these measures, adaptations for cross-cultural use (primarily translation of instructions in the case of the Rorschach) and some salient references.

Rorschach Inkblot Method/ Rorschach Performance Assessment System

Given that the Rorschach utilizes a set of ten standard inkblots and has only a few sentences of instruction that might easily be translated or utilized with culturally diverse groups, one might imagine that the Rorschach is an instrument that is ripe for broad cross-cultural or multicultural adaptation. At the current time, there are two primary, viable systems of Rorschach scoring and interpretation in the USA—the Comprehensive System (CS) developed by Exner (2003) and the more recent update to this system known as the Rorschach—Performance Assessment System or R-PAS (Viglione, Blume-Marcovici, Miller, Giromini, & Meyer, 2012). The Rorschach CS has indeed been utilized in a number of international settings (see the special issue of *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *89*(*S1*), 2007 for international Rorschach CS data Israel, Spain, Greece, the Netherlands, Romania, Denmark, Italy, Argentina, Finland, Japan, Brazil, and Portugal). While some of this international research is focused on cross-cultural variations, some is driven by the desire to understand universal aspects of responding to the inkblots and to diversify the normative base.

At first blush one might consider the Rorschach an important instrument to use with Asians, being able to transcend cultural barriers given that the stimuli are easily administered and does not have items that need translation. However, since the results of the coding systems are heavily dependent on language and group norms (for example, the most frequently seen images, known as popular responses), it is also subject to difficulties related to cultural variation and how to best interpret the meaning of differences with Western samples. The current norms available for the Rorschach CS are based on gender and age (Exner, 2001). There is no systematic data in the CS normative tables that address the issue of different mean scores based on race, ethnicity, or national origin. As such, the normative database must be considered heavily US based and in line

Table 8.1 Summary of projective measures, adaptations, and salient references

Instrument	Adaptation	Salient references
Rorschach Performance Assessment System	*Stimuli*: Same (not culturally dependent since they are image-based inkblots) *Initial instructions*: "What might this be?" [In translation for various cultural adaptations; other aspects of administration (introduction to test, queries) also in translation; responses written down and scored verbatim in language of person assessed]	Meyer, G. J., Viglione, D. J., Mihura, J. L., Erard, R. E., & Erdberg, P. (2011). *Rorschach Performance Assessment System: Administration, coding, interpretation, and technical manual*. Toledo, OH: Rorschach Performance Assessment System. http://www.r-pas.org/ (online scoring and training Web site)
Rorschach Comprehensive System (Exner)	*Stimuli*: Same (not culturally dependent since they are image-based inkblots) *Initial instructions*: "What might this be?" [In translation for various cultural adaptations; other aspects of administration (introduction to test, queries) also in translation; responses written down and scored verbatim in language of person assessed]	Meyer, G. J., Erdberg, P., & Shaffer, T. W. (2007). Towards international normative reference data for the Comprehensive System. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *89*, S201–S216. doi:10.1080/00223890701629342. http://www.rorschachtraining.com/
Thematic Apperception Test	*Stimuli*: Tell-Me-A-Story-Test (TEMAS); images adapted for Puerto Ricans, other Hispanics, African-Americans, and non-Hispanic Whites; pilot version for Asians *Instructions/responses*: Responses recorded and interpreted in any language	Costantino, G., Dana, R. H., & Malgady, R. G. (2007). *TEMAS (Tell-Me-A-Story) assessment in multicultural societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

with the sample drawn from various US subpopulations in the early 1990s (Exner, 2001). The normative sample from Exner's CS (2001) utilized 600 protocols and was intended to be updated, including data collection of 450 additional individuals (Exner, 2007), but this update was not completed after Exner's death.

This situation led to the development of the R-PAS, which was intended to develop the CS further by including variables with the strongest empirical evidence base (see Meyer & Eblin, 2012 for an overview). The R-PAS is relatively recent, and thus there is only a small literature base on it specifically, although the variables included are primarily from prior scoring systems. Its normative database ($N = 1{,}396$) is largely drawn from rescored CS protocols, including subsamples of the international data collected in 2007, but since its scoring system is online, and thus allows for expansion of the database as usage of the new scoring methodology grows. Unfortunately, there are no studies that yet examine Asians or Asian-Americans utilizing the R-PAS, but this undoubtedly may be a next step, especially since all included variables are *T*-scores and will provide for easier statistical comparison, especially in the cross-cultural realm. Again, as with Exner's CS, the norms for the R-PAS are adjusted only for age and gender, and thus do not make any type of adjustment for race, ethnicity, or national origin, although given its international dataset base, this may become more possible as the system evolves.

One issue with presenting research data on the Exner or R-PAS systems is that each protocol consists of several dozen variables, ratios, and indices, so that comparing Asian-based samples is difficult without a priori hypotheses about what differences might be expected. A number of studies tend to present descriptive data on Asian samples, but hypothesis testing comparisons to other groups or to general norms tables may or may not be included due to the likelihood of Type I errors given the number of comparisons possible within the coding systems. In addition, the scoring and interpretation of each protocol is quite time-consuming, and so many studies utilize small sample designs. Both of these issues make conclusions from such studies tentative at best.

A final difficulty with international data is that many researchers conduct and publish research in other languages and are more likely to have utilized older systems of Rorschach coding depending on what coding systems have been translated into other languages and when the research was conducted. In the heyday of projective testing in the USA (1940s to1970s) there were a number of cross-cultural studies conducted, but they tended to use older coding systems with less established reliability and validity compared to the current Exner CS or R-PAS. Thus, finding research data that is both methodologically sound and relies on more contemporary coding systems is a goal not easily attained. Meyer et al. make one such attempt with the development of international data for the Rorschach (Meyer, Erdberg, & Shaffer, 2007), but more with an eye to cross-cultural validity and convergence rather than guidelines on use for particular cultural groups. In their approach, cultural differences are a source of error and thus norms are strengthened by including data from disparate cultures.

Rorschach Data on Asians from Within the USA

There is quite limited published data that provides cross-cultural comparison of the Rorschach utilizing US-based samples. The existing information is limited to older studies from the 1950s to 1980s that are reviewed briefly here, as well as a few, more recent, unpublished doctoral dissertations. The results must be viewed with caution, particularly since this era was prior to the development of the more systematized CS system. While older systems of coding (e.g., Beck, Klopfer) often used in these studies do have variables that were carried forward to the CS and had a growing empirical base at the time, the methodology often employed, and typically small sample sizes, means that results such be viewed quite cautiously. It is also quite difficult to say whether studies that are now as much as 50 years old have relevance to current cross-cultural comparison given the generational changes that are likely to have occurred.

One of the oldest cross-cultural investigations of the Rorschach analyzed data collected in the 1940s as part of the Columbia University "Research in Contemporary Cultures" grant-funded project. The study, conducted by Abel and Hsu (1949), comparing a nonclinical China-born US-based sample ($n = 27$) with a nonclinical American-born Chinese sample ($n = 29$), and thus examined the effect of acculturation by utilizing birthplace as a proxy for level of acculturation. All subjects were between 20 and 30 years old. The investigation examined how individuals who were born in China and received their education there differed from their American-born counterparts on the Rorschach, and also undertook an examination of gender differences in the two groups on the Rorschach. The study was considered exploratory, and the system of Rorschach scoring was unspecified, although many of the results utilize what were to become Exner CS variables. The authors calculated ratios between the two samples on a number of variables, and conducted basic statistical tests on the ratios, reporting results at the $p = 0.01$ level.

The results of this study suggested that China-born subjects tended to provide more whole responses (*W*), while American-born subjects provided more detail responses (*D*). China-born subjects also perceived whole human responses more frequently than American-born subjects, who tended to provide human detail

responses more frequently. China-born groups also gave more FC than CF responses than American-born groups. When examining content, there were notable sex differences: American-born females described aggression or fear of aggression in 21 out of 87 responses, whereas China-born females described no aggression or fear of aggression. China-born females also provided more dependency content than American-born females. China-born females tended to describe their human responses in greater detail (age and sex characteristics), whereas American-born females describe seeing men or women (and more often, mythological people). China-born male participants tended to give "hard anatomy" responses (e.g., bony structures) while American-born male participants tended to give "soft anatomy" responses. The authors conclude that Chinese-born Americans fit "into this Chinese cultural pattern of controlling their impulses and maintaining a pliant but to some degree dissociated role in interpersonal relationships" (Abel & Hsu, 1949, p. 299) compared to American-born Chinese individuals who "less rigid control, more spontaneity, more overt expression of feeling" is apparent (p. 301). Nonetheless, these results must be taken in quite cautiously given the small sample size and the dated nature of the findings.

Hsu, Watrous, and Lord (1961) present a follow-up study describing differences between two groups of high school students—one a Hawaiian-based Chinese sample ($n=28$), the other an American, Chicago-based sample ($n=24$) based on Beck's normative adolescent data that was available at the time, with the samples matched for age. They utilize Beck's system of scoring. The Chinese sample produced a lower number of responses ($M=30.10$, SD = 19.80) than the American sample ($M=41.35$, SD = 15.00) on the protocols. The authors also note fewer vista responses (FV) and shading responses (C') among the Chinese sample, although the authors only conduct "a rough comparison" (p. 39). While most variables on the two samples do not appear to differ, the authors do note higher mean Hd responses in the Chicago group ($M=4.16$, SD = 3.98 compared to the Chinese $M=2.25$, SD = 3.18). What is most striking about their results is the level of similarity between the two samples despite the different subpopulations; the authors note that many Hawaiian-based Chinese are quite acculturated and may have resided in Hawaii for a number of generations.

A similar cross-cultural line of research was also developed for Japanese-Americans by De Vos (1954, 1955), a Fulbright fellow who spent time studying neuropsychiatry in Japan. The studies examine Japanese Americans in the Chicago area and in particular highlight differences between first and second generation Japanese immigrants. The studies utilized 140 Japanese American individuals ($n=50$ first generation, $n=60$ second generation, $n=30$ for a group that returned to Japan while growing up) and an American comparison group ($n=60$ normals, $n=50$ "neurotics", and $n=30$ individuals with schizophrenia). The Japanese American sample was randomly sampled from over 17,000 Japanese Americans living in the Chicago area, and was balanced for gender. The samples were also described in terms of class status and occupation in a detailed manner. The protocols were scored utilizing the Beck system (the American comparison group is data from Beck), and chi-square tests were used where appropriate to ascertain differences, as the authors note that many Rorschach variables are not easily compared on means due to the nonnormality of the distributions.

De Vos presents highly detailed results by Rorschach cluster, indicating differences in generational status, American-Japanese sample differences, and gender differences (1954); these results are summarized very briefly here. De Vos noted that Japanese Americans tended to produce shorter protocols (R), although the protocol length increased with generational status. In addition, Japanese Americans produced more W responses and fewer D responses and that the Japanese sample tended to have a greater organizational complexity (Z-scores) that is hypothesized to relate to intellectual striving in the Beck system. Additionally, Japanese protocols had higher number of color responses compared to Americans (C), and second generation Japanese Americans in particular had higher movement

(*M*) responses and shading responses (*Y*). In terms of content, the first-generation Japanese group evidenced significantly greater body preoccupation. De Vos also notes throughout that the second generation group more often resembles the American control, and that the first-generation group often differs from the second generation group, with the group that returned to Japan during childhood being intermediate. This suggests that the data do show a cultural difference that is attenuated by acculturation in a graded manner.

Takeuchi and Scott (1986), a number of years later, compared normal Japanese 5- and 6-year-olds ($n=20$) with their American counterparts based on the Exner CS norms for these age groups, with a particular interest in educational productivity of the Japanese educational system. The Japanese school-aged sample was Japan based and thus this was a truly cross-cultural (rather than immigrant-based) comparison. Japanese children produced nearly double the responses of their American counterparts and fewer whole (*W*), but more part (*D* and Dd) responses. This reverses the trend seen in the adult studies described above. Form quality scores (FQ) were also significantly lower for Japanese children, which might be expected since the answers would be less conventional or typical compared to US data and may reflect cultural variation.

Perhaps the most statistically rigorous study analyzing Exner CS Rorschach data involved an examination of Korean and American individuals conducted by Moon and Cundick (1983). The study utilized four groups: a monolingual group from Korea (non-English speaking) ($n=20$), a monolingual American college student group ($n=20$), a bilingual Korean immigrant group who had been in the USA more than 5 years ($n=20$), and a bilingual American group that had worked as missionaries in Korea for several years teaching Korean ($n=20$). The design allowed for Rorschach administration in Korean and English, and to compare not only Korean and American performance, but also the effect of monolingualism versus bilingualism. The study also limited exploration to 16 Exner CS variables and conducted ANOVAs to compare means. When comparing Korean and American monolinguals, six variables were statistically significant of the 16 (*R*, card rejection, *W*, *M*, *H*, and *X*+%). Korean participants had a lower number of total responses, higher card rejection, fewer whole and human responses, and less movement (*M*) and *X*+% scores. When comparing Korean and American bilinguals, five variables were again statistically significant—*W*, FC, CF+*C*, Sum *C*, and lambda. All of the variables had significantly lower means in the Korean sample except for lambda which was higher. The authors note that most variables were not statistically different. By contrasting the pattern of monolingual versus bilingual differences with the nationality differences, the authors concluded that the variables that were susceptible to cultural difference were those likely to be affected by acculturation rather than language. They state that, "in the main, it appears that the Rorschach test is perceived in many similar ways by individuals in Korean and American cultures and that the initial differences are reduced by acculturation" (p. 349).

Despite the numerous limitations of the methodologies and age of the studies reviewed here, there are a number of consistencies for the studies that utilized adult samples (this is not a surprise given the remarkable variation in children's Rorschach norms cross-culturally and even within the USA). Across the studies, there are a lower number of responses and more whole responses, less expression of affect and evidence of some affective constriction—while this may not represent the differences between the countries of origin where studies were presented, this nonetheless may fit with a "stereotypical" understanding of Asian emotion regulation and approach to testing circumstances. Such an approach, given the normative data presented here, should be considered strongly as part of the cultural makeup of individuals as opposed to psychopathology. Additionally, many of these variables were shown to have attenuated differences in the context of acculturation.

More recently, there have been two unpublished doctoral dissertations that examine the Rorschach and the effects of Asian ethnicity from within the USA from the last 10 years.

These documents must also be viewed quite cautiously given that they often employ small sample sizes and have never been peer-reviewed. Umina (2006) compared a sample of 42 East Asian college student's Rorschach scores to US norms employing Exner's CS and correlated results to acculturation level measured by self-report, examining nine selected variables. Finally, Chang (2011) compared Asian-American college students' performance on the Rorschach to European-American college students (in addition to other measures). These studies appear to corroborate aspects of the older studies, but further investigation is necessary.

Rorschach Data on Asians from Outside the USA (International Data)

Available international Rorschach data is primarily available from India, China, and Japan, with the bulk of published literature from Japan and India. In India, the *Journal of Projective Psychology and Mental Health* has been published by the Somatic Inkblot Society since 1994 (two issues a year) dedicated to projective testing that features numerous research studies on the Rorschach, including normative and clinical populations. Manickam and Dubey (2006) provide a historical review of the use of the Rorschach in India and various scoring systems employed, populations assessed, and the current status of the test. Sorai and Ohnuki (2008) provide a historical review of the Rorschach in Japan, beginning with initial interest in the Beck and Klopfer scoring systems, and then noting that many contemporary clinicians and researchers have adopted Exner's CS. China has the much lesser usage of the Rorschach, partially due to less interest in psychodynamic psychology, and also due to less contact with European/American psychology. There were a series of early studies in the 1960s but the test is not in the top 25 employed by Chinese psychologists (Cheung, 1996). Ryan, Dai, and Zheng (1994) provide an overview of the most popularly utilized assessment measures in China, and both the Rorschach and TAT were not commonly utilized.

The major issues in India for utilizing data towards understanding how to consider Rorschach profiles in the Asian-American context is the absence of standardized Indian norms and the lack of studies that compare Indian data to Western data for normative or clinical groups. There are a large number of studies that examine many clinical subpopulations within India and compare data within the Indian context, but this is less useful for Western assessment practitioners. However, there are a few larger scale published studies that assessors might turn to when examining a client of Indian origin. Shweta, Bajpai, Sengar, Singh, and Desai (2010) present data on 238 nonpatient Indian adults who were administered the Rorschach utilizing the Beck system, and focus on gender differences. They do present data (means and standard deviations) for the 238 person normative sample for 14 variables and eight content categories and also present gender differences on the available data. Chaudhury, Saldanha, et al. (2007) also provide data on 282 normal older Indians and compare them to 160 clinical patients in a number of categories (dementia, alcohol dependence, schizophrenia, mania, depression, and anxiety) utilizing the Rorschach and Klopfer's methods. They present detailed means for Rorschach variables of these individuals that would be quite useful in assessing an older Indian even in the US context if immigration was more recent; the authors conclude that using US norms with older Indians would be quite misleading given the pattern of data. Chaudhury, Sudarsanan, et al. (2007) also present data on extensive data on 313 children and adolescent patients broken down by diagnosis (schizophrenia, mania, depression, anxiety state, hysteria, nocturnal enuresis, head injury, epilepsy, and mental retardation).

In Japan, there is older Rorschach data on juvenile delinquents (De Vos, 1979; Taniguchi, De Vos, & Murakami, 1958) and aging adults facing terminal illness (Shimonaka & Nakazato, 1991), as well as more recent Exner CS data on Japanese children (Matsumoto, Nobuko, Shirai, & Nakabayashi, 2007), adolescents (Nakamura et al., 1992), adults (Nakamura, Fuchigami, & Tsugawa, 2007), and those suffering from chronic

pain (Yamamoto et al., 2010). The child and adult normative data was published in the *Journal of Personality Assessment* supplement that detailed internationally compiled data discussed above and provides tables of data for use with recently immigrated Japanese individuals.

The childhood data reported descriptive Exner CS data from a series of studies with normal Japanese children (ages 5, 8, 9, 12, and 14; $n = 346$). Of the sample, 32 had less than 10 responses, 112 had 10–14 responses, and the remainder averaged 18–20 responses, suggesting shorter protocols that may be affected by level of verbal expressiveness. The authors concluded that Japanese children had extremely high lambda (ranging from 4 to 8), low EA (ranging from 2 to 4), as well as high *X*–% and low *X*+% when compared to US-based norms. Adolescent data from the early 1990s (Nakamura et al., 1992) similarly suggested that lambda was higher than expected and that a very high percentage was positive for the hypervigilance index (35 % of adolescents). The adult normative sample (Nakamura et al., 2007) involved 240 Rorschach protocols with participants that had never received psychiatric treatment, including any form of psychotherapy. The sample consisted of 89 males and 151 females between the ages of 18 and 66. All participants spoke Japanese as their primary language and 78 % were middle-class, college/university graduates. The authors identified three main results: a mean lambda of 0.86, 40 % had an introversive style compared to 7 % extratensive, and 26 % of the sample were positive for the hypervigilance index (clothing response mean = 3.13, whole human content mean = 8.21, space response mean = 3.73, and Zf mean = 16.16).

Storytelling Projective Tests

As Ephraim (2000) has noted, there is a long history of a psychocultural approach to thematic concerns expressed by individuals in response to the ten Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Murray, 1943) cards, the most widely utilized story-telling projective test and the main task for which data that pertains to Asians/Asian-Americans exists. Underlying this psychocultural interpretive approach is the idea that expressed projective themes (grouped as instrumental or expressive) are evident in all human relationships and that cultural context may impact the relative importance of such themes. Basic instrumental themes are achievement, control, cooperation-competition, competence and responsibility. Basic expressive themes are pleasure, nurturance, affiliation, appreciation, and harmony. Coding systems have emphasized some of identifying the presence of the ten themes themselves (e.g., the need for achievement; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1976), activity versus passivity in relation to the themes (De Vos, 1973), horizontal or equal status relationships versus vertical or unequal status relationships, and descriptors such as positive/negative/unresolved (Ephraim, 2000).

Early approaches examined differences in response to specific TAT cards, such as the need for achievement as part of TAT card 1, depicting a boy with a violin. Such research (Caudill & De Vos, 1956; De Vos, 1996) compared responses to this card from Japanese immigrant to the USA, Japanese-Americans, and White Americans. For example, this study in particular noted cultural differences such as Japanese youth in high schools focusing on achievement and competence while White youth emphasized control issues of parental pressure and negative affiliation/nurturance.

There are also contemporary idiographic examples of TAT psychocultural interpretation for Asians in the clinical literature, including a sample interpretive protocol for a 49-year-old Fillipino male (in Dana, 2005). Ching et al. (1995) present TAT-based data on family values and roles among Japanese-Americans when comparing four Japanese-American families with seven European-American families, noting differences in views of the father (Card 2, viewed as more protective and nurturant by Japanese-Americans) younger woman (Card 3, viewed as more submissive by Japanese-Americans), and older woman (Card 3, happier in European-American stories). De Vos (1983) presents more detailed idiographic data

by TAT card but also utilizes a larger sample and notes proportions of themes as well as cross-Asian comparative data. De Vos (1983) work includes a sample of 50 Korean individuals, 30 Japanese first generation immigrants, 40 Japanese second generation immigrants, and 60 Whites. Similarly, De Vos and Kim (2004) present data on 100 Koreans, 31 Japanese, and 50 Koreans residing in Los Angeles. These works have a tremendous amount of descriptive depth (include proportions of achievement motivation, authority, harmony/discord, and family/interpersonal relationships by Card and ethnic group) and are undoubtedly useful to anyone utilizing the Tat with Koreans or Japanese immigrants or second generation individuals.

In contrast to such rich idiographic data that is worth becoming familiar with when assessing Asians/Asian-Americans with storytelling projective tasks, there is also larger sample data that differences highlights differences to story-telling between US-based ethnic/cultural groups. In one large scale study ($n = 323$) of ethnicity and imaginative story-telling (Pang & Schultheiss, 2005), US college undergraduates were administered images from the Picture Story Exercise (Koestner & McClelland, 1992) that assessed need for achievement, need for affiliation, and need for power. The authors found when comparing African-Americans, Asians, and Whites (the largest ethnic group participants) that Asians affiliation strivings were higher than Whites but similar to African-Americans. The groups did not differ in needs for power, but African-Americans had slightly higher needs for achievement than Asians. Similarly, Salili (1996) examined achievement motivation in a large sample ($N = 764$) British and Chinese students aged 13–55, noting results revealed age, sex, and cultural differences in the level of achievement motivation. Chinese high school students were more affiliative and had a higher need for achievement when compared to the British students. Yu (1980) also examined the need for achievement in 401 Taiwanese students, who evidenced strong collective identity rather than individualistic identity.

Additional Picture Tests

The Tell-Me-A-Story (TEMAS; Costantino, 1987) was developed for minority and nonminority children and adolescents (an updated narrative-based picture test analogous to the TAT) has produced a detailed research base and standardized norms for Puerto Ricans, other Hispanics, African-Americans, and non-Hispanic Whites. It has a very strong research base with Hispanic individuals where it has been utilized in English and Spanish with a reliable and valid scoring system and primarily urban-based norms. While there is a pilot form of the test with Asian-looking characters (to be utilized in English, Cantonese, Mandarin), there is not sufficient data to confirm its psychometric properties or to "justify reliable and valid clinical decision making with this version of the TEMAS test" (Costantino & Malgady, 2008, p. 567) at this time, although this is certainly a promising line for future research and clinical application.

In addition to some earlier Taiwanese data (Yang, Kuo, & Costantino, 2003), there is also pilot data on the TEMAS (Costantino, Dana, & Malgady, 2007) with 48 children from elementary schools in Taipei that utilized the Asian TEMAS cards and nonminority TEMAS cards in counterbalanced order, and attempted to correlate responses with paper-and-pencil adjustment measures. The two versions did not appear significantly different and did appear correlated to daily life adjustment, a measure of children's depression, and affective functioning; the Asian version also was more correlated with measures of aggression and interpersonal relationships on one self-report while the nonminority version appeared to have a stronger correlation with affective functioning.

Clinical Recommendations

In clinical practice, the use of projectives, and in particular the Rorschach and TAT, can add incrementally to the assessment findings. When faced with the assessment of an Asian or Asian-American,

this information may be particularly valuable since stigma is often a factor in utilizing self-report data and these indirect performance-based measures may provide a valuable window into such clients' internal experiences. Clinicians are presented with Asians/Asian-American clients in the assessment context that may greatly benefit from the socio-emotional data that is gathered via projective assessment. Any such data must be utilized sensitively and cautiously. Assessing the level of acculturation of individuals is paramount before deciding to rely on any US-based norms at all; if less acculturated, it may very well make sense for clinicians, depending on the nationality of clients, to utilize data from many of the more recent studies described above where international data may suggest a path to interpretation. While there has been a tremendous amount of research on projective instruments, the authors truly lament the lack of greater focus on ethnic minority populations when considering the use of projective instruments.

It is particularly important to ascertain the examinee's comfort level with English in administering projective measures such as the TAT and Rorschach or to consider the issues involved with administering such tests in another language. One must be quite adept at understanding Asian/Asian-American clients in a holistic context and to gather such information during assessment intakes, including information on length of time in the US, level of acculturation of the household individuals grew up in, and the type of educational system individuals were exposed to. It is also important that clinicians develop a nuanced understanding of the experience of the client vis-à-vis the particular Asian culture of origin.

Perhaps most important initially is a consideration of the validity of projective data with a given individual Asian/Asian-American client. While the respective measures' standardized instructions are maintained, some modifications in the overall introduction to the assessment process may enhance utility of the data collected. From the authors' experience, the ambiguity and vagueness inherent in projective methods is often particularly difficult for many Asians to grasp. In a culture that often focuses on rational and emotionally detached thinking, the vagueness inherent in instructions such as "What might this be?" can be rather stymying. As such, some preliminary but thorough preparation in introducing the assessment procedures is particularly helpful. In particular, instructions and frank discussions that there are no "right" or "wrong" answers often helps allay some of the intrapsychic pressure to produce the "right" answer or responses on the task.

Especially given that shorter protocols have limited interpretive validity, and may be more culturally related, it is important that assessors be aware of the increased likelihood of short protocols with Asian and Asian-American clients and be prepared to understand such shortened protocols in context. In the R-PAS, the prompt part of the "prompt-pull" rule may help ensure a record of adequate length; in the CS it is important to attempt to elicit more than one response from Card I and promote a response set to provide more than one response per card. In the inquiry phase of the CS, the often verbal brevity among Asian examinees may limit elaboration in this phase. Nonetheless, shorter protocols are more likely among Asian/Asian-American clients, and this group-level finding must be considered carefully before over-interpreting a short protocol or questioning its validity prematurely.

In turn, the examiner's working familiarity with the coding system, and specifically ensuring that adequate inquiry and prompting (without over-inquiring) helps refine important coding distinctions such as form-dominance in color (FC-CF-*C*) or shading responses. Without sufficient prompting in inquiry, there runs a risk of excessive numbers of Form and Form-dominated determinants. Even so, the authors' experience has often been a preponderance of Form responses with Asian/Asian-American clients, contributing to a relatively high Lambda (*L*). While Lambda has been associated with different implications of situationally related response-style as well as trait issues, the authors have often been inclined to interpret high Lambda more as a product of the culture's emphasis on the rational and unemotional style (avoiding the use of affect and emotions). The heightened occurrence of mythological/

fictional human and animal may also reflect the culture's often belief in the same (e.g., the dragon or phoenix). Thus, these culture-based interpretive differences are both likely and especially important to adjust traditional interpretations of high Lambda.

It is fair to say that for the Rorschach, Asian/Asian-American clients are likely to produce shorter protocols that employ greater form, as well as produce protocols that suggest greater emotional constriction and less expressiveness. Many such protocols will have greater effort of putting together percepts into the whole blot, suggesting organizational energy and consolidation suggestive of hypervigilance. All content produced on Rorschach protocols must be interpreted in a limited fashion and considering cultural aspects of content, and in addition measures of reality-testing may be skewed due to the norms being grounded in Western cultural percepts. These protocols must be considered as normative and clinicians must be exceedingly cautious not to over-pathologize these results in clients, particularly by simply comparing them to US-based general norms and reaching grossly inaccurate and untenable conclusions. With these possibilities in mind, it is also not easy to say whether such differences are the result of differences in verbal expressiveness, attention to field rather than ground on inkblots, or due to differences in personality, so even interpreting what consistently appears different is a difficult given the complexity of cross-cultural research.

Story-telling tasks in Asians have often been particularly challenging, especially when the examinee is unfamiliar with the English language. There may be a dearth of detail or elaboration that often limits the seeming utility of story-telling tasks in identifying themes, conflicts, and core issues. With story-telling tasks, clinicians' own cultural biases and stereotypes may play into how such narrative data is summarized, utilized, and interpreted. It may be particularly important to consult references with additional cultural information and/or to consult with colleagues familiar with the Asian culture of origin to ensure a less biased approach.

Conclusion

As should be readily apparent from the above review, the literature on projective testing is itself in a period of decline in the last 20 years. There remains a very limited literature on either the Rorschach or TAT that is both recent and provides adequate data on US-based ethnic group differences, and in particular on Asians and Asian-Americans. In conclusion, these authors suggest that projective measures such as the TAT and Rorschach can be ethically, reliably, and validly utilized with Asian/Asian-American clients. Currently, a lot of the pressure to do so rests on the assessor; there are a number of roadblocks for that assessor to overcome in terms of knowledge, skills, and the art of how and when to adjust and accommodate interpretation based on ethnic group membership. These authors hope this chapter is an aid in clinicians faced with the need to use projective measures with Asian/Asian-Americans, and that it will be a useful resource as such clinicians, perhaps in consultation with others, attempts such an approach.

References

Abel, T. M., & Hsu, F. L. K. (1949). Chinese personality revealed by the Rorschach. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 13*, 285–301.

Caudill, W., & De Vos, G. A. (1956). Achievement, culture and personality: The case of the Japanese Americans. *American Anthropologist, 58*(6), 1102–1126.

Chang, J. (2011). Examining intra- and interpersonal variables involved in neuropsychological and personality assessment: Are Asian Americans the "model examinees"? (Order No. 3481953, University of California, Santa Barbara). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 169.

Chaudhury, S., Saldanha, D., Srivastava, K., Jyothi, S. G., Sundari, G. S., & Augustine, M. (2007). Rorschach responses of Indian children and adolescents with psychiatric disorders. *Somatic Inkblots Series Journal of Projective Psychology and Mental Health, 14*, 150–161.

Chaudhury, S., Sudarsanan, S. S., Seby, K. K., Salujha, S. K., Srivastava, K., Kundeyawala, S. M., & Rathee, S. P. (2007). Rorschach responses of older Indians. *Somatic Inkblots Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 14*(1), 30–43.

Cheung, F. M. (1996). The assessment of psychopathology in Chinese societies. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *Handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 393–411). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ching, J., McDermott, J. J., Fukunaga, C., Yanagida, E., Mann, E., & Waldron, J. (1995). Perceptions of family values and roles among Japanese Americans: Clinical considerations. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*(2), 216–224.

Costantino, G. (1987). *TEMAS (tell-me-a-story): A multicultural thematic apperception test Picture Cards*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Costantino, G., Dana, R. H., & Malgady, R. G. (2007). *TEMAS (tell-me-a-story) assessment in multicultural societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Costantino, G., & Malgady, R. G. (2008). Tell-me-a-story (TEMAS). In S. Jenkins (Ed.), *A handbook of clinical scoring systems for thematic apperceptive techniques* (pp. 547–572). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dana, R. (2000). *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dana, R. H. (2005). *Multicultural assessment: Principles, applications, and examples*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

De Vos, G. A. (1954). A comparison of the personality differences in two generations of Japanese Americans by means of the Rorschach test. *Nagoya Journal of Medical Science, 17*, 153–265.

De Vos, G. A. (1955). A quantitative Rorschach assessment of maladjustment and rigidity in acculturating Japanese Americans. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 52*, 51–87.

De Vos, G. A. (1973). *Socialization for achievement: Essays on the cultural psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

De Vos, G. A. (1979). A Rorschach comparison of delinquent and nondelinquent Japanese family members. *The Journal of Psychological Anthropology, 2*(4), 425–441.

De Vos, G. A. (1983). Achievement motivation and intrafamily attitudes in immigrant Koreans. *The Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology, 6*(1), 25–71.

De Vos, G. A. (1996). Internalized achievement or external authority: Some cultural comparisons of responses to TAT card 1. *Rorschachiana, 21*(1), 91–126.

De Vos, G. A., & Kim, E.-Y. (2004). *Immigration and entrepreneurship: Culture, capital, and ethnic networks* (1st ed., pp. 205–241). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Ephraim, D. (2000). A psychocultural approach to TAT scoring and interpretation. In R. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment* (pp. 427–445). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Exner, J. (2001). *A Rorschach workbook for the comprehensive system* (5th ed.). Asheville, NC: Rorschach Workshops.

Exner, J. (2003). *The Rorschach: A comprehensive system* (Basic foundations 4th ed., Vol. 1). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Exner, J. (2007). A new U.S. adult nonpatient sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 89*(S1), S154–S158.

Hsu, F. L. K., Watrous, B., & Lord, E. M. (1961). Culture pattern and adolescent behavior. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 7*(1), 33–53.

Koestner, R., & McClelland, D. C. (1992). The affiliation motive. In C. P. Smith, J. W. Atkinson, D. C. McClelland, & J. Veroff (Eds.), *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis* (pp. 205–210). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Manickam, L. S. S., & Dubey, B. L. (2006). Rorschach Inkblot Test in India: Historical review and perspectives for future action. *Somatic Inkblot Series Journal of Projective Psychology and Mental Health, 12*, 61–78.

Matsumoto, M., Nobuko, S., Shirai, H., & Nakabayashi, M. (2007). Rorschach comprehensive system data for a sample of 190 Japanese nonpatient children at five ages. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 89*(S1), S103–S112.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1976). *The achievement motive*. Oxford, England: Irvington.

McGrath, R. E. (2008). The Rorschach in the context of performance-based personality assessment. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 90*(5), 465–475.

Meyer, G. J., & Eblin, J. J. (2012). An overview of the Rorschach Performance Assessment System (R-PAS). *Psychological Injury and Law, 5*, 107–121.

Meyer, G. J., Erdberg, P., & Shaffer, T. W. (2007). Toward international normative reference data for the comprehensive system. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 89*, S201–S216.

Meyer, G. J., & Kurtz, J. E. (2006). Advancing personality assessment terminology: Time to retire 'objective' and 'projective' as Personality test descriptors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*(3), 223–225. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8703_01.

Moon, T. I., & Cundick, B. P. (1983). Shifts and constancies in Rorschach responses as a function of culture and language. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47*(4), 345–349.

Murray, H. A. (1943). *Thematic apperception test manual*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nakamura, N., Fuchigami, Y., & Tsugawa, R. (2007). Rorschach comprehensive system data for a sample of 240 adult non-patients from Japan. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 89*(S1), S97–S102.

Nakamura, N., Sato, Y., Fujioka, J., Teramura, K., Kimura, N., & Kino, E. (1992). Japanese adolescents Rorschach nonpatient data by the comprehensive system. *Research-Aid Papers of the Yasuda Life Welfare Foundation, 28*(2), 70–75.

Okazaki, S. (1988). Psychological assessment of Asian Americans: Research agenda for cultural competency. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*(1), 54–70.

Pang, J., & Schultheiss, O. (2005). Assessing implicit motives in U.S. college students: Effects of picture type and position, gender and ethnicity, and cross-cultural comparisons. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 85*(3), 280–294.

Ryan, J. J., Dai, X.-Y., & Zheng, L. (1994). Psychological test usage in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 12*, 324–330.

Salili, F. (1996). Achievement motivation: A cross-cultural comparison of British and Chinese students. *Educational Psychology, 16*(3), 271–279.

Shimonaka, Y., & Nakazato, K. (1991). Aging and terminal changes in Rorschach responses among the Japanese elderly. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57*(1), 10–18.

Shweta, Bajpai, R. C., Sengar, K. S., Singh, A. R., & Desai, N. G. (2010). Rorschach profile of Indian adults. *SIS Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 17*(2), 180–186.

Sorai, K., & Ohnuki, K. (2008). The development of the Rorschach in Japan. *Rorschachiana, 29*, 38–63.

Takeuchi, M., & Scott, R. (1986). Educational productivity and Rorschach location responses of preschool Japanese and American children. *Psychology in the Schools, 23*, 368–373.

Taniguchi, M., De Vos, G., & Murakami, E. (1958). Identification of mother and father cards on the Rorschach by Japanese normal and delinquent adolescents. *Journal of Projective Techniques, 22*, 453–460.

Umina, T. F. (2006). The effect of acculturation on the Rorschach protocols of east Asian American college students (Order No. 3247317, Temple University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 105.

Viglione, D. J., Blume-Marcovici, A. C., Miller, H. L., Giromini, L., & Meyer, G. (2012). An inter-rater reliability study for the Rorschach Performance Assessment System. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*(6), 607–612. doi:10.1080/00223891.2012.684118.

Yamamoto, K., Kanbara, K., Mutsuura, H., Ban, I., Mizuno, Y., Abe, T., … Fukunaga, M. (2010). Psychological characteristics of Japanese patients with chronic pain assessed by the Rorschach test. *BioPsychoSocial Medicine*, *4*(20), 1–13.

Yang, C., Kuo, L., & Costantino, G. (2003). *Validity of Asian TEMAS in Taiwanese children: Preliminary data*. Paper presented at the European Congress of Psychology, Vienna, Austria.

Yu, E. (1980). Chinese collective orientation and need for achievement. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 26*(3), 184–189.