

PRE 998 PROJECTIVE ASSESSMENT

Fall, 2007

Karen D. Multon, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair

kmulton@ku.edu

Office Phone: 864-3577

Office Hours: By Appointment Only

COURSE GOAL: To integrate information about a person from one or more projective tests into a useful summary. This course will focus on the following tests:

Rorschach (Exner Comprehensive System)

Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)

House-Tree-Person (HTP)

Draw-A-Person (DAP)

You will be required to become at least minimally proficient at administering, scoring (if applicable), and interpreting each test (including consideration of multicultural and disability issues).

REQUIRED TEXTS AND MATERIALS:

Exner, J. (2001). A Rorschach workbook for the Comprehensive System (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Exner, J. (2002). A primer for Rorschach interpretation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wenck, L. S. (1990). House-Tree-Person drawings: An illustrated diagnostic handbook. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

MISSION OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The primary mission of the School of Education is to prepare leaders in education and human services fields. As stated in the School Code

Within the University, the School of Education serves Kansas, the nation, and the world by (1) preparing individuals to be leaders and practitioners in education and related human service fields, (2) expanding and deepening understanding of education as a fundamental human endeavor, and (3) helping society define and respond to its educational responsibilities and challenges.

The components that frame this mission for our initial and advanced programs are Research and Best Practice, Content Knowledge, and Professionalism. These interlocking themes build our Conceptual Framework.

In this advanced graduate-level course, students will learn the content knowledge of projective assessment techniques, interpretation, and report-writing skills based on both research and best practice. Ethical considerations and other professional issues (e.g., giving assessment feedback to the client) will also be addressed.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION:

Attendance will be noted because class participation is essential for your learning.

Excessive absence may result in lowering the final grade. Please be prompt.

Lectures: Active participation will be emphasized in this class. However, I will be giving lectures on proper test administration, scoring, interpretation, and report writing. I will also address reliability and validity issues, multicultural concerns, disability issues,

and ethical considerations.

Quizzes: Occasionally I may give a "pop" quiz. These will count for 20% of your grade. The lowest score on your quizzes will be dropped.

Homework: Homework will count for 10% of your grade. Most of the homework will be scoring Rorschach protocols or brief interpretations of the TAT and/or drawings. You need to make your best attempt to receive the credit for doing the homework (i.e., you do not have to have all the answers correct to receive maximum points).

Report #1: For the first testing report (worth 15% of your final grade), you must administer a Rorschach to a subject and obtain a brief history. After you administer the Rorschach, type it up, score it, and have your testing partner score it independently. Resolve your "scoring differences" by consulting with one of us before completing the structural summary. After you complete the summary, your partner is to "double-check" it and sign his/her name to the summary. If the summary does not have this signature, one point will be deducted from your report. Your typewritten report should be no longer than eight pages (double-spaced). Turn in both the report and the Rorschach in a manila folder. (Due date to be discussed in class.)

Report #2: The first testing report is worth 20% of your final grade. You must administer a Rorschach to another subject and obtain a brief history. After you administer the Rorschach, type it up, score it, and have your testing partner score it independently. Resolve your "scoring differences" by consulting with one of us before completing the structural summary. After you complete the summary, your partner is to "double-check" it and sign his/her name to the summary. If the summary does not have this signature, one point will be deducted from your report. Your typewritten report should be no longer than eight pages (double-spaced). Turn in both the report and the Rorschach in a manila folder. (Due date to be discussed in class.)

Presentation and Report #3: You will be required to administer the Rorschach, TAT, DAP, and HTP to yet another subject. You will also take a brief personal history of the subject. Again, the Rorschach scoring must be "double-checked" by your partner and he/she must sign it. If the summary does not have this signature, one point will be deducted. You must prepare a packet for each class member (including us, of course). The packet must contain a) a brief background summary of the person (the initial part of your report); b) the Rorschach responses (typed) and scoring; c) a structural summary; c) the Rorschach plates with the responses indicated; d) HTP drawings; e) DAP drawings; and f) TAT stories (typed). You may reduce the drawings. The packets must be distributed to the class the week before you present in class. Your presentation will give you a chance to get valuable feedback from all the class members (including us) which you can incorporate into your final report. The report will be worth 25% of your grade. The typewritten report should be no longer than twelve pages (double-spaced). Turn in two copies of the report and two copies of all protocols in a manila folder.

Preparation for Class Presentations: To prepare for the class presentations, review the materials for the presentation and list hypotheses. A copy must be turned in to me at the beginning of class and a copy must be given to the presenter. You will use the original to aid in your class participation. These hypotheses do not have to be typewritten if your handwriting is legible. These assignments will constitute 10% of your grade.

GRADING SUMMARY:

<u>Assignment</u>	<u>Possible Points</u>
Homework	10
Report #1	15
Quizzes	20
Report #2	20
Report #3	25
Preparation for Class Presentations	10
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	100

A + = 98-100 points	B+ = 87-89 points C+ = 77-79 points
A = 94-93 points	B = 83-86 points C = 73-76 points
A- = 90-93 points	B- = 80-82 points C- = 70-72
Below 70 is a failure	

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

1. Testing materials for this class are owned by the Department of Psychology and Research in Education. Materials and the responsibility for those materials will be shared by class members. If the materials are not returned, I will not turn in a course grade for that student. Materials that are lost or damaged must be paid for by the student(s) responsible.
2. If you have special needs as addressed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and need assistance, notify me immediately. Reasonable efforts will be made to accommodate your special needs.

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TEXTS FOR PROJECTIVES

A. General Reference

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4rd ed.). (DSM-IV). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association (1985). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: Author.
- Dana, R. H. (1993). Multicultural assessment perspectives for professional psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Millon, T. (1996). Disorders of personality: DSM-IV and Beyond. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Shapiro, D. (1965). Neurotic styles. New York: Basic Books.
- Tallent, N. (1993). Psychological report writing (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zuckerman, E. (1989). The clinician's thesaurus: A guidebook for writing psychological reports and other evaluations. Pittsburgh: The Three Wishes Press.

B. Projective Assessment

- Hurt, S. W., Reznikoff, M., & Clarkin, J. F. (1991). Psychological assessment, psychiatric diagnosis, and treatment planning. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.
- Lerner, P. M. (1991). Psychoanalytic theory and the Rorschach. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Ogdon, D. (1986). Psychodiagnostics and personality assessment: A handbook. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Wilson, S. (1995). Interpretive guide to the Rorschach. (5th ed.). Newport Beach, CA: Author.

General Evaluation Criteria for Graduate Coursework

Karen D. Multon, Ph.D.

While it is impossible to be completely objective in evaluating papers, testing reports, essay tests, etc., it is important for you to understand the general performance parameters I use to arrive at grades. Grades reflect my best judgement of the quality of your work. Included in this estimate are judgements relative to facts, the integration of class/reading material, the organization of responses and the quality of your writing. Below is a qualitative division of three general levels of performance.

EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD (A+ to A-)

All facts are correct and are clearly differentiated in terms of their importance high level of theoretical knowledge high evidence of preparation superior level of responsiveness to the question of issue at hand highly cogent and creative response excellent connectedness between/among concepts very high level understanding of material, especially similarities and differences in theoretical material organization of response reflects excellent differentiation between the major and minor points as they pertain to the question or theme of the paper very elegantly written response creative and clear presentation of material and personal judgements writing reflects high levels of knowledge and integration, as well as a superior level of understanding very articulate with respect to structure and content of language, reflecting excellent talent and achievement

GOOD TO AVERAGE (B+ to B-)

Major facts are correct some minor errors or omissions may be evident good level of theoretical knowledge good judgement in application of facts to the question or issue at hand the relatedness between/among crucial concepts is recognized basic elements of the response are meaningfully connected accurate perception of the intent of the question minor points follow and are used to support major points each point is clearly and adequately addressed (in accordance to its importance) some aspects of the question may be omitted or less than adequately covered theoretical knowledge and judgements are presented in a clear, direct and reasonably elegant manner writing clearly reflects an understanding of the thrust of the question evidence of articulateness and a good level of psychological writing, both in terms of content and structure.

BELOW AVERAGE TO VERY POOR (C+ to F)

Facts are virtually nonexistent or severely distorted little or no evidence of adequate preparation below average to poor recognition of relatedness of theoretical constructs basic elements of the response are not meaningfully connected no logical flow of information reflective of no (or minimal) thought about the material basic points, when made, are not in sequence and are not provided in sufficient detail, or, inappropriate facts are given in support for basic points evidence of misinterpretation of the question (or issue) at hand incoherent, rambling response writing is unclear and reflective of high levels of confusion poor sentence structure incomplete sentences writing does not convey accurate understanding of material.