Rorschach Comprehensive System Data for a Sample of 108 Normative Subjects From The Netherlands

QUERY SHEET

Q1: Au: Institution name or private practive for "Utrecht, The Netherlands" affiliation. Pls. complete.
Q2: Au: Add citation and ref. for Rorschach CS in abstract.
Q3: Au: Pls. confirm postal address is correct.
Q4: Au: % add to 101%. Ok? 89 + 6 + 6.
Q5: Au: 73%? 7 + 6 + 4 + 75 = 102.
Q6: Au: "22% did" is necessary.
Q7: Au: Date retrieved?

Journal of Personality Assessment, *89*(S1), 1–7

ISSN: 0022-3891 print/1532-7752 online
DOI: 10.1080/00223890701583002

Rorschach Comprehensive System Data for a Sample of 108 Normative Subjects From The Netherlands

CORINE DE RUITER,[1,2] WINEKE SMID,[3] AND HENRI VAN DER HOEVEN KLINIEK[3]

[1]*Department of Psychology, Maastricht University, The Netherlands*
[2]*Trimbos-institute, Netherlands Institute of Mental Health and Addiction, The Netherlands*
[3]*Utrecht, The Netherlands*

The current study is part of a two-wave normative data collection study with the Rorschach Comprehensive System (CS) in The Netherlands. The first data wave yielded 108 valid Rorschach protocols for which descriptive data on CS variables were calculated. Interrater reliability between two raters for 10 response segments on a subset of 24 protocols was good to excellent. The findings show that mean values for a number of important CS variables, such as EA, Egocentricity index, and WDA% in the Dutch sample are highly similar to those found in a recent U.S. study by Shaffer and colleagues (2007/this issue). On the other hand, the Dutch sample contains a higher percentage of subjects with positive scores on the DEPI and CDI, compared with the Shaffer et al. data, but to an even greater extent in comparison with Exner's (2001) nonpatient data. We argue, on the basis of findings from psychiatric epidemiology, that the exclusion of subjects with a history of mental disorder or mental health treatment from Rorschach normative data bases yields a dataset that is nonrepresentative of the general population.

Because normative reference data for the Rorschach Comprehensive System (CS) are lacking in the Netherlands, as well as in most other European countries, professionals who employ the Rorschach in clinical psychological assessment are using the data of an American group of nonpatients as a reference group (Exner, 2001). Normative data on Dutch subjects are indispensable, however, to allow empirically guided statements about subjects who are seen in Dutch clinical settings. Cross-cultural research with the Rorschach has shown that the American nonpatient data are not replicated in some European countries (e.g., Silva, Novo, & Prazeres, 1996), supporting the need for the collection of normative data even more.

In 1999, a research grant was obtained to collect data from a representative cross section of the Dutch population. The objective of the entire project is to obtain a total sample of 250 subjects that matches as much as possible the demographic characteristics of the Dutch population as reported by the Dutch Census Bureau (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 1999). Matching variables chosen were age, educational level, gender, country of origin, marital status, religion, and source of income. The data presented here comprise 108 subjects from the first of two data collection phases.

METHOD

Subjects

Basic sample description. The final sample of the current study included 108 adult subjects. The first data collection wave took place between September 1999 and December 2000, and 113 subjects were included in the study. Five subjects had to be removed: 3 had invalid Rorschach protocols ($R < 14$ and/or rejections to one or more cards) and 2 Rorschach protocols seemed invalid for other reasons. The first was a young man, who laughingly responded "rocket" to every card and created the impression of not taking the task seriously. The second subject was an elderly man who did not seem to have understood the test instructions, because he only gave rather abstract responses, informing the administrator what the cards made him feel like.

Basic demographic information.

Gender: Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. Sixty-nine percent of the sample were female, which is higher than the 52% that is expected on the basis of census data.

Age: The average age was 42 years ($SD = 14$), the youngest subject was 19, the oldest 90.

Ethnicity: Eighty-nine percent of the subjects are born in The Netherlands, 6% are born in Surinam, a former colony of The Netherlands, and 6% in other countries. Both parents of 72% of the subjects are born in The Netherlands; 6% have at least one parent born in Surinam; 5% have at least one parent born in Indonesia, also a former Dutch colony; and 17% have one or two parents born in other countries.

Primary Language: Information about subjects' primary language was not obtained, but all Rorschach administrations were conducted in the Dutch language.

Education: Seven percent of the sample only finished primary school (< 12 years of education); 21% had some kind of vocational training. Thirty-four percent finished high school, and 35% obtained a college degree (bachelor's and/or master's level).

Marital Status: Thirty-five percent of the subjects were single, and 54% were in a relationship (36% married, 18% common-law). Seven percent were divorced and 4% widowed.

Received May 31, 2006 Revised June 20, 2007
Address correspondence to Corine de Ruiter, Department of Psychology, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands; Email: Corine.deRuiter@psychology.unimaas.nl

TABLE 1.—Netherlands adult normative sample interrater reliability statistics ($N = 24$)

Variable	% Agreement	Iota (Kappa)
Whole Responses	.98	.85
Location & Space (2 variables)	.96	.91
DQ (+,o,v/+,v)	.93	.86
Determinants (11 variables)	.97	.82
FQ (None,+,o,u,−)	.84	.75
Pairs	.97	.94
Contents (27 variables)	.99	.88
P	.98	.96
Z Score	.94	.91
CS Special Scores (14 variables)	.98	.73

Economic Status: The modal family income in 2000, the year the data were gathered, was 60,000 Dutch guilders (1 guilder = U.S.$.46). Twenty-three percent of our subjects had a family income of less than 30,000; 37% had a family income between 30,000 and 60,000 Dutch guilders; 19% had a family income between 60,000 and 90,000; and 19% had a family income over 90,000 (2% could not or would not provide this information). This means that the current sample has a higher income, relative to the Dutch population.

Occupation: Seven percent of our subjects had no occupation, 6% were students, and 14% were homemakers (that is, 20% of the women, none of the men); the remaining 75% of the subjects had a paying job.

Student Status: Six percent of our sample consisted of university students.

Psychiatric characteristics of the sample

Lifetime History: Seventy-eight percent of the sample never received any psychological or psychiatric treatment or guidance, 22% did. Lifetime histories of medication use, psychiatric disorders, criminal arrests, and substance abuse were not obtained.

Current State: Fifteen percent of our subjects currently were receiving psychological or psychiatric treatment or guidance. Ten percent of the total sample were taking medication to treat a psychological or psychiatric problem, and 25% were taking medication to treat a physical problem. Information concerning current psychiatric diagnosis was not obtained.

Psychiatric Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria: Participants were not excluded on the basis of psychiatric/psychological status. As described above, however, two Rorschach protocols that seemed evidently "strange" were removed. In terms of psychiatric morbidity, our sample seemed largely comparable with findings from a large-scale epidemiological study into psychiatric disorders in the general population of The Netherlands (Bijl, van Zessen, & Ravelli, 1998). This study, conducted in 1996, comprised 7,076 representative subjects between the ages of 18 and 64 of whom 41% had a lifetime diagnosis of psychiatric disorder and 23% had a psychiatric diagnosis in the past 12 months (Vollebergh et al., 2003).

Participant Recruitment

Specific strategies to find and screen participants. Subjects were recruited through two strategies. Thirty percent of the sample was obtained though business companies and volunteer organizations, such as churches and sports associations. Seventy percent was recruited through advertisements in local newspapers of Utrecht, a city of 265,000 inhabitants at the center of The Netherlands. Prospective subjects were informed via a brochure about the aim of the normative study.

Compensation. At the end of the test session, the subject received a gift certificate of 35 Dutch guilders (equivalent to approximately U.S.$16) for his or her participation.

Feedback from the testing results. No individual feedback was provided to participants.

Exclusions based on background characteristics. Participants were not excluded based on background characteristics.

Other characteristics. None.

Examiners

Number of examiners and selection for the project. There were two examiners in the study, who also functioned as recruiters and conducted the logistic management of the project. They each worked halftime and were specifically recruited for the project.

Training and level of experience with CS administration. One had a Master's of Science degree in clinical psychology, and one had a bachelor's of science degree. in clinical psychology. Both of them had experience in psychological assessment before they started working on the project. They were trained in the CS through the Dutch Rorschach Society, which offers an introductory scoring and interpretation course each year. This course consists of 8 full days dispersed over a 3-month period, in which the administration, coding, and interpretation of the Rorschach according to the CS are taught.

Number of protocols each examiner contributed. One examiner (SL) contributed 64 Rorschach protocols, the other (AK) 44.

Analyses of examiner differences. An independent samples t test was used to examine differences between the two examiners for a number of relevant CS variables. There was a significant difference in terms of productivity (R) and effort (Zf) between Rorschach protocols administered by the two examiners. Rorschachs administered by AK were significantly longer [Mean R = 26.8 versus 22.2; $t(107) = 2.31$; Cohen's $d = 0.45$; $p < .05$] and demonstrated more effort at integration [Mean Zf = 13.1 versus 10.9; $t(107) = 2.51$; Cohen's $d = 0.49$; $p < .05$]. There were no differences between examiners' protocols on Lambda [$t(107) = 1.27$; $p = .21$], pureForm% [$t(107) = 1.07$; $p = .29$] and EA [$t(107) = 1.52$; $p = .13$].

Language(s) for test administration. All test administrations took place in the Dutch language.

CS Administration and Scoring Procedures

Site of testing and warmup procedures. Subjects were tested at a location convenient to them. This could be either in a testing room at the Dr. Henri van der Hoeven Kliniek, a forensic psychiatric hospital in Utrecht, The Netherlands, or at their home. First, each subject was administered a brief interview about a number of demographic features. Subsequently, the subject completed four self-report questionnaires: the Dutch version of the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg & Hillier, 1979; Koeter et al., 1987), the Social Support Questionnaire (*Sociale Steun Vragenlijst*; Van Sonderen, 1993), the Dutch version of the Launay-Slade Hallucination Scale (Bentall & Slade, 1985;Vollema & Geurtsen, 1993), and the Dutch version of the RAND–36 physical limitations scale (van der Zee & Sanderman, 1993). To test for color blindness, Ishihara's Design Charts for Colour-Blindness of Unlettered Persons were administered (Ishihara. 1980). Finally, the Rorschach Inkblot Method was administered according to the administration and inquiry rules of the CS (Exner, 2001).

Seating and procedures used to record responses. The Rorschach testing was conducted side by side, and responses were recorded by hand. Colored location sheets obtained from Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. were used to note blot locations.

Procedures to obtain $R > 13$ and/or to constrain High R. In accordance with CS administration rules, protocols with fewer than 14 responses or card rejections immediately were readministered. If this retesting again resulted in fewer than 14 responses or rejections, the protocol was excluded from the study. This occurred in three cases. We intervened with potentially lengthy protocols according to the *CS Workbook* administration rules. Nevertheless, one subject gave 79 responses.

Other tests administered with the rorschach. Each subject was administered four self-report questionnaires and a color blindness test prior to the Rorschach (see above for details).

Monitoring of test administration quality. A serious effort was made to monitor the quality of the administration and inquiry by the two examiners. First, they each conducted about five trial administrations, which were recorded on audiotape. Subsequently, the tape recordings and the verbatim notes taken during the administration were compared and checked for completeness. During the course of the data collection for the normative project, the Rorschach administrations of the two examiners were checked regularly by the first author (CdR), who provided feedback and supervision. To ensure completeness, the examiners transferred their written notes into typescript, using word processing computer software, as soon as possible after the actual administrations.

CS Scoring Procedures

Four different raters scored the Rorschach protocols in this study. Three raters (CdR, VdV, and PvdW) had between 5 and 10 years experience in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the Rorschach according to the CS; one rater (WS) had 2 years experience with the CS.

Protocol selection and examiners for scoring reliability. Interrater agreement was calculated on the basis of agreement between two independent raters for 24 randomly selected protocols. All four raters were included in the interrater reliability check. Coefficient iota, a chance corrected reliability coefficient for multivariate data that is equivalent to Cohen's kappa, was computed (Janson & Olsson, 2001).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents percentage agreement and iota (kappa) values for the 10 most important CS response segments. Iota values range between .73 (for the 14 CS special scores) and .96 for Popular responses, with a mean of .86, indicating excellent overall interrater agreement.

Table 2 provides descriptive demographic data for our sample along with data for a number of important ratios and indices of the CS. Table 3 gives descriptive statistics for all Rorschach CS variables.

DISCUSSION

Overall, interrater reliability in our study was good to excellent for most scoring segments, reaching an overall mean iota coefficient of .86. Our mean interrater reliability was exactly the same as the kappa of .86 reported in a large composite U.S. sample (total number of responses $= 4,761$; Meyer et al., 2002). In both studies, the kappa values for the Special Score were the lowest (.73 on 14 Special Score variables in the current study and .76 on 18 Special score variables in the Meyer et al. study.

We compared the basic demographics and Rorschach CS ratios, percentages, and special indices with those reported on an American nonpatient adult sample by Exner (2001) in the latest edition of *A Rorschach Workbook for the Comprehensive System*. In terms of demographic characteristics, our sample contained more individuals in a common law marriage, more subjects of middle and older age (mean age of the Dutch sample was 10.8 years older) and more individuals with a college education (i.e., 16+ years of education). With regard to a number of important CS indicators, meaningful deviations from the Exner reference data were found. First, within the Dutch normative sample, unfavorable response styles (i.e., ambitent and avoidant) were overrepresented compared with the more favorable response styles (introversive and extratensive). For instance, the percentage of Rorschach protocols with a high Lambda (avoidant) response style was 33 versus 10 in the Exner sample. In concordance with this, the percentage of protocols with a negative D score was also much higher in the Dutch normative sample (59% versus 13%). The Dutch subjects also produced more responses with minus or unusual, as opposed to ordinary or superior Form Quality. This deviance in a more disturbed direction also is reflected in the findings on a number of the clinical indices, in particular on the Coping Deficit Index and the Depression Index. The values for the Perceptual Thinking Index, Suicide-Constellation, Hypervigilance Index, and Obssessive Style Index however, were highly similar across the two samples.

An important issue in studies that attempt to provide normative descriptive data is the representativeness of its sample. Since the present dataset contains subjects only from the first data collection wave of a normative study that aims to include 250 subjects in total, the current sample is not expected to be

TABLE 2.—Frequencies for Demographic Variables and Selected Rorschach CS Ratios and Indices for Adults in The Netherlands ($N = 108$)

Demography Variables					
Marital Status		Age		Race	
Single 38	35%	18–25 8	7%	White .. 77	71%
Lives w/S.O 19	18%	26–35 26	24%	Black ... 7	7%
Married 39	36%	36–45 37	34%	Hispanic 0	0%
Separated 0	0%	46–55 20	19%	Asian ... 5	5%
Divorced 7	7%	56–65 8	7%	Other ... 0	0%
Widowed 4	4%	Over 65 9	8%	Unlisted 19	18%
		Education			
Sex		Under 12 8	7%		
Male 34	32%	12 Years 39	36%		
Female 74	69%	13-15 Yrs 21	19%		
		16+ Yrs 38	35%		
Ratio's, Percentages, and Special Indices					
Styles			Form Quality Deviations		
Introversive 22	20%	XA% > .89	23	21%	
Pervasive Introversive 22	20%	XA% < .70	13	12%	
Ambitent 8	35%	WDA% < .85	50	46%	
Extratensive 12	11%	WDA% < .75	15	14%	
Pervasive Extratensive 11	10%	X+% < .55	65	60%	
Avoidant 36	33%	Xu% > .20	84	78%	
		X-% > .20	35	32%	
D Scores			X-% > .30 7	7%	
D Score > 0 8	7%				
D Score = 0 36	33%	FC:CF+C RATIO			
D Score < 0 64	59%	FC > (CF + C) + 2	5	5%	
D Score < -1 40	37%	FC > (CF + C) + 1	12	11%	
		(CF + C) > FC + 1	10	9%	
Adj D Score > 0 12	11%	(CF + C) > FC + 2	13	12%	
Adj D Score = 0 55	51%				
Adj D Score < 0 41	38%				
Adj D Score < -1 22	20%	S-Constel Positive 2	2%		
		HVI Positive 8	7%		
Zd > +3.0 (Overincorp) .. 17	16%	OBS 2	2%		
Zd < −3.0 (Underincorp) 31	29%				
PTI = 5 0	0%	DEPI = 7 2	2%	CDI = 5	15 14%
PTI = 4 0	0%	DEPI = 6 10	9%	CDI= 4	28 26%
PTI = 3 3	3%	DEPI = 5 24	22%		
		Miscellaneous Variables			
R < 17 16	15%	(2AB + Art + Ay) > 5 16	15%		
R > 27 2	4%	Populars < 4 8	7%		
DQv > 2 14	13%	Populars > 7 18	17%		
S > 2 49	45%	COP = 0 39	36%		
Sum T = 0 57	53%	COP > 2 18	17%		
Sum T > 1 15	14%	AG = 0 71	66%		
3r + (2)/R < .33 40	37%	AG > 2 1	1%		
3r + (2)/R > .44 31	29%	MOR > 2 8	7%		
Fr + rF > 0 23	21%	Level2 SpSc > 0 12	11%		
Pure C > 0 46	43%	GHR > PHR 59	55%		
Pure C > 1 17	16%	Pure H < 2 42	39%		
Afr < .40 16	15%	Pure H = 0 10	9%		
Afr < .50 40	37%	p > a + 1 31	29%		
(FM + m) < Sum Shading 45	42%	Mp > Ma 46	43%		

completely representative (the second data collection phase has started in the spring of 2005). In the current sample, females were overrepresented, and our subjects were wealthier and better educated that the general Dutch population.

In terms of mental health problems, our sample seemed to compare reasonably well with findings from a large representative psychiatric epidemiological study in The Netherlands ($N = 7,076$; Bijl, 1998). In the latter study, 23% of the subjects fulfilled diagnostic criteria for a mental disorder during the past year; 20% had an affective or anxiety disorder. We found that 20% of our sample had received some type of mental health treatment during the past year. The current study thus should be considered as a normative study, in contrast to studies in which subjects receiving mental health services at the time of testing were excluded (Exner, 2001; Shaffer, Erdberg, & Haroian, 2007/this issue). One could argue that the latter study samples are in a way nonnormative, because they exclude persons from the general population who are suffering from (minor) mental disorders, or who have done so in the past. When comparing our values for Rorschach variables and ratios that are related to the presence of psychopathology, such as the PTI, DEPI, CDI, and Suicide-Constellation, with those found in other nonpatient (nonnormative) studies, however, we do not find great differences. For example, Shaffer et al. reported a somewhat higher

TABLE 3.—Descriptive statistics on Rorschach CS variables for adults in The Netherlands ($N = 108$)

Variable	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max	Freq	Median	Mode	Skew	Kurtosis
Age	42.51	14.35	19.00	90.00	108	40.50	37.00	0.88	0.79
Yrs Education	13.90	2.88	8.00	18.00	106	13.00	12.00	−0.14	−0.78
R	24.09	10.53	14.00	79.00	108	22.00	17.00	2.98	11.41
W	7.96	3.91	1.00	20.00	108	8.00	9.00	0.80	0.79
D	12.47	7.12	2.00	48.00	108	11.00	11.00	2.29	7.84
Dd	3.66	4.36	0.00	24.00	93	2.00	1.00	2.86	10.05
S	2.64	2.35	0.00	15.00	96	2.00	1.00	2.14	7.53
DQ+	5.82	3.23	0.00	16.00	105	5.00	5.00	0.74	0.52
DQo	17.15	9.64	6.00	69.00	108	16.00	16.00	2.89	11.18
DQv	0.92	1.15	0.00	6.00	57	1.00	0.00	1.62	3.47
DQv/+	0.20	0.45	0.00	2.00	20	0.00	0.00	2.11	3.81
FQx+	0.55	1.01	0.00	5.00	34	0.00	0.00	2.19	4.71
FQxo	11.31	3.93	3.00	26.00	108	11.00	11.00	0.95	2.24
FQxu	7.32	5.01	1.00	32.00	108	6.00	5.00	2.61	9.75
FQx-	4.26	3.84	0.00	23.00	103	3.00	1.00	2.28	7.17
FQxNone	0.66	0.93	0.00	4.00	44	0.00	0.00	1.31	1.02
MQ+	0.25	0.60	0.00	3.00	19	0.00	0.00	2.52	6.01
MQo	1.89	1.58	0.00	7.00	88	2.00	1.00	0.97	0.61
MQu	0.76	0.91	0.00	4.00	55	1.00	0.00	1.11	0.84
MQ-	0.44	0.77	0.00	3.00	34	0.00	0.00	1.85	2.99
MQNone	0.11	0.34	0.00	2.00	11	0.00	0.00	3.19	10.31
SQual-	0.79	1.05	0.00	5.00	52	0.00	0.00	1.57	2.58
M	3.45	2.44	0.00	11.00	101	3.00	3.00	1.05	1.19
FM	3.36	2.40	0.00	10.00	100	3.00	2.00	0.98	0.77
m	1.98	1.55	0.00	6.00	90	2.00	1.00	0.71	−0.08
FC	1.65	1.38	0.00	5.00	82	1.50	1.00	0.66	−0.16
CF	1.24	1.22	0.00	6.00	74	1.00	1.00	1.12	1.33
C	0.63	0.86	0.00	3.00	46	0.00	0.00	1.25	0.71
Cn	0.01	0.09	0.00	1.00	1	0.00	0.00	10.39	108.00
Sum Color	3.53	2.25	0.00	11.00	102	3.00	2.00	0.67	0.26
WSum C	3.01	2.12	0.00	11.50	102	2.50	2.00	1.05	1.67
FC′	1.54	1.53	0.00	9.00	79	1.00	1.00	1.60	4.54
C'F	0.19	0.44	0.00	2.00	19	0.00	0.00	2.22	4.37
C'	0.13	0.34	0.00	1.00	14	0.00	0.00	2.25	3.13
FT	0.51	0.85	0.00	5.00	40	0.00	0.00	2.44	8.46
TF	0.13	0.41	0.00	2.00	11	0.00	0.00	3.38	11.20
T	0.02	0.14	0.00	1.00	2	0.00	0.00	7.28	51.93
FV	0.54	0.91	0.00	5.00	39	0.00	0.00	2.26	6.40
VF	0.16	0.39	0.00	2.00	16	0.00	0.00	2.39	5.13
V	0.09	0.29	0.00	1.00	10	0.00	0.00	2.87	6.34
FY	1.49	1.86	0.00	13.00	76	1.00	1.00	2.89	13.24
YF	0.16	0.43	0.00	2.00	14	0.00	0.00	2.89	8.04
Y	0.09	0.40	0.00	3.00	7	0.00	0.00	5.28	31.43
Fr	0.20	0.57	0.00	4.00	16	0.00	0.00	3.87	18.99
rF	0.13	0.45	0.00	3.00	10	0.00	0.00	4.17	19.29
Sum C′	1.86	1.64	0.00	9.00	88	1.00	1.00	1.39	2.98
Sum T	0.67	0.90	0.00	5.00	51	0.00	0.00	1.90	5.41
Sum V	0.79	1.10	0.00	7.00	52	0.00	0.00	2.31	8.74
Sum Y	1.72	2.04	0.00	14.00	79	1.00	1.00	2.74	12.04
Sum Shading	5.04	3.75	0.00	25.00	105	4.00	4.00	2.02	7.40
Fr + rF	0.33	0.79	0.00	5.00	23	0.00	0.00	3.22	12.97
FD	0.86	1.05	0.00	5.00	57	1.00	0.00	1.36	1.78
F	10.37	7.80	0.00	55.00	107	9.00	11.00	3.44	16.38
(2)	8.02	3.96	1.00	22.00	108	7.50	5.00	0.90	1.62
3r + (2)/R	0.39	0.17	0.04	1.21	108	0.38	0.25	1.20	4.39
Lambda	0.89	0.78	0.00	5.50	108	0.66	1.00	3.10	13.60
PureF%	0.41	0.16	0.00	0.85	109	0.39	0.35	0.25	−0.00
FM + m	5.34	3.10	0.00	14.00	104	5.00	5.00	0.60	−0.20
EA	6.46	3.82	1.00	22.50	108	6.00	5.00	1.15	2.28
es	10.38	5.66	1.00	34.00	108	10.00	9.00	1.15	2.47
D Score	−1.26	1.70	−6.00	2.00	108	−1.00	0.00	−0.84	0.77
AdjD	−0.56	1.30	−6.00	3.00	108	0.00	0.00	−0.87	2.52
a (active)	4.50	3.13	0.00	15.00	102	4.00	3.00	0.82	0.48
p (passive)	4.35	2.63	0.00	15.00	105	4.00	4.00	1.20	2.23
Ma	1.81	1.72	0.00	8.00	79	1.50	0.00	1.13	1.34
Mp	1.67	1.47	0.00	7.00	85	1.00	1.00	1.15	1.49
Intellect	2.84	2.65	0.00	13.00	88	2.00	1.00	1.30	1.91
Zf	11.82	4.50	3.00	26.00	108	11.00	9.00	1.02	1.20
Zd	−0.84	4.48	−15.50	16.00	108	−0.50	−2.00	0.02	1.81

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 3.—Descriptive statistics on Rorschach CS variables for adults in The Netherlands ($N = 108$) *(Continued)*

Variable	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max	Freq	Median	Mode	Skew	Kurtosis
Blends	3.94	2.89	0.00	14.00	69	4.00	4.00	0.81	0.77
Blends/R	0.17	0.12	0.00	0.67	96	0.16	0.00	0.89	1.68
Col-Shd Blends	0.57	1.09	0.00	5.00	34	0.00	0.00	2.34	5.52
Afr	0.59	0.21	0.27	1.40	108	0.55	0.43	0.83	0.89
Populars	6.04	1.77	0.00	10.00	107	6.00	7.00	−0.40	0.61
XA%	0.81	0.10	0.52	1.00	108	0.80	0.94	−0.33	−0.21
WDA%	0.84	0.09	0.57	1.00	108	0.85	0.93	−0.50	0.07
X+%	0.52	0.14	0.20	0.88	108	0.51	0.50	0.22	−0.20
X-%	0.16	0.09	0.00	0.37	103	0.15	0.00	0.25	−0.73
Xu%	0.29	0.11	0.06	0.55	108	0.29	0.33	0.31	−0.41
Isolate/R	0.16	0.11	0.00	0.44	98	0.15	0.00	0.49	−0.25
H	2.04	1.37	0.00	7.00	98	2.00	2.00	0.92	1.18
(H)	1.40	1.27	0.00	5.00	77	1.00	1.00	0.75	−0.07
Hd	1.67	1.78	0.00	10.00	79	1.00	1.00	1.77	4.44
(Hd)	0.52	0.93	0.00	5.00	34	0.00	0.00	2.24	5.89
Hx	0.58	0.86	0.00	3.00	41	0.00	0.00	1.29	0.63
H+(H)+Hd+(Hd)	5.62	3.31	1.00	24.00	108	5.00	4.00	1.95	8.16
(H)+Hd+(Hd)	3.57	2.68	0.00	19.00	102	3.00	3.00	2.23	9.61
A	8.59	4.67	2.00	31.00	108	7.50	6.00	2.06	6.18
(A)	0.57	0.81	0.00	3.00	43	0.00	0.00	1.25	0.70
Ad	2.56	2.59	0.00	18.00	97	2.00	1.00	3.28	15.01
(Ad)	0.13	0.48	0.00	3.00	9	0.00	0.00	4.11	17.71
An	1.17	1.56	0.00	9.00	60	1.00	0.00	2.05	5.85
Art	1.53	1.52	0.00	6.00	74	1.00	0.00	0.88	−0.12
Ay	0.56	0.91	0.00	5.00	42	0.00	0.00	2.45	7.58
Bl	0.20	0.47	0.00	2.00	19	0.00	0.00	2.28	4.65
Bt	1.10	1.16	0.00	6.00	66	1.00	0.00	1.15	1.90
Cg	2.37	2.07	0.00	11.00	94	2.00	1.00	1.39	2.40
Cl	0.14	0.40	0.00	2.00	13	0.00	0.00	2.98	8.81
Ex	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00	5	0.00	0.00	4.38	17.50
Fi	0.21	0.55	0.00	3.00	17	0.00	0.00	2.87	8.55
Food	0.51	0.79	0.00	3.00	39	0.00	0.00	1.58	1.95
Ge	0.51	0.94	0.00	5.00	34	0.00	0.00	2.36	6.26
Hh	1.50	1.40	0.00	9.00	85	1.00	1.00	2.02	7.31
Ls	0.61	0.97	0.00	6.00	44	0.00	0.00	2.52	9.09
Na	0.60	0.80	0.00	3.00	47	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.69
Sc	1.18	1.29	0.00	6.00	68	1.00	0.00	1.32	1.77
Sx	0.34	0.67	0.00	3.00	26	0.00	0.00	1.91	2.82
Xy	0.11	0.44	0.00	3.00	8	0.00	0.00	4.60	22.95
Idio	1.19	1.32	0.00	6.00	67	1.00	0.00	1.22	1.16
An+Xy	1.27	1.68	0.00	9.00	62	1.00	0.00	1.92	4.48
DV	2.57	1.89	0.00	8.00	95	2.00	1.00	0.62	−0.04
INC1	0.63	0.82	0.00	4.00	50	0.00	0.00	1.41	2.29
DR1	1.12	1.35	0.00	5.00	59	1.00	0.00	1.17	0.57
FAB1	0.35	0.66	0.00	3.00	29	0.00	0.00	2.06	4.22
DV2	0.05	0.25	0.00	2.00	4	0.00	0.00	6.02	39.04
INC2	0.15	0.36	0.00	1.00	16	0.00	0.00	2.01	2.07
DR2	0.14	0.44	0.00	3.00	12	0.00	0.00	3.97	18.78
FAB2	0.10	0.33	0.00	2.00	10	0.00	0.00	3.41	12.03
ALOG	0.08	0.31	0.00	2.00	8	0.00	0.00	3.97	16.78
CONTAM	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00	5	0.00	0.00	4.38	17.50
Sum 6 Sp Sc	5.24	3.38	0.00	13.00	103	5.00	5.00	0.42	−0.71
Lvl2 Sp Sc	0.44	0.71	0.00	3.00	34	0.00	0.00	1.49	1.26
WSum6	11.57	9.33	0.00	40.00	103	9.00	8.00	1.01	0.60
AB	0.38	0.83	0.00	4.00	24	0.00	0.00	2.40	5.42
AG	0.45	0.73	0.00	4.00	37	0.00	0.00	1.86	4.47
COP	1.16	1.16	0.00	4.00	69	1.00	0.00	0.78	−0.37
CP	0.03	0.17	0.00	1.00	3	0.00	0.00	5.83	32.57
GHR	3.66	2.08	0.00	11.00	107	4.00	4.00	0.84	0.98
PHR	2.79	2.23	0.00	14.00	95	2.00	2.00	1.58	5.01
MOR	0.85	1.06	0.00	5.00	60	1.00	0.00	1.70	3.21
PER	1.69	1.83	0.00	11.00	79	1.00	1.00	2.01	6.21
PSV	0.26	0.72	0.00	5.00	18	0.00	0.00	3.94	19.66
PTI Total	.53	.80	0.00	3.00	39	0.00	0.00	1.40	1.08
DEPI Total	3.90	1.35	0.00	7.00	107	4.00	4.00	−0.25	0.15
CDI Total	2.93	1.38	0.00	5.00	105	3.00	4.00	−0.19	−0.87
S-Con Total	4.61	1.58	1.00	9.00	108	5.00	4.00	0.10	−0.49
HVI Total	2.73	1.70	0.00	7.00	104	2.00	2.00	0.68	−0.28
OBS Total (1–5)	1.15	0.97	0.00	4.00	78	1.00	1.00	0.57	−0.32

percentage of subjects with a PTI of 4 or 5 (6% versus 0% in our study) and a slightly higher percentage of positive S-CON's (4% versus 2%). For the DEPI (28% versus 33%) and the CDI (37% versus 40%), however, our subjects scored slightly higher.

Cross-cultural studies have shown some striking differences in terms of scores on a number of important Rorschach variables, such as Lambda, Affective ratio, T, X+%, and X–% (Shaffer & Erdberg, 1999). These differences have been attributed to differences in recruitment strategies, examiner characteristics and experience level, administration procedures, and, of course, to true cross-cultural differences. For instance, a higher number of high-Lambda protocols could be the result of inadequate warming-up procedures or incorrect inquiry when administering the test. In general, the total number of responses (R) and Lambda are considered variables indicative of response style characteristics; that is, a low R and a high Lambda signify a defensive and avoidant response style. The overall findings in our sample do not offer cause for concern in this regard: mean R = 24 (versus 20.5 in Shaffer et al., 2007/this issue) and mean Lambda = .89 (versus 1.11 in Shaffer et al.).

When comparing our data with those of Shaffer et al.'s (2007/this issue) nonpatient data, there are some striking similarities in mean values for some interpretively crucial Rorschach variables, such as the Egocentricity index (.39 versus .38 in Shaffer et al.), EA (6.46 versus 6.30), S (2.64 versus 2.44), XA% (.81 versus .76), WDA% (.84 versus .80), pure H (2.04 versus 2.71), and Populars (6.04 versus 5.37). There are also a number of variables, however, that demonstrate diverging findings: Afr (.59 versus .48), T (.67 versus .36), Sum of Shading determinants (5.04 versus 2.77), Sum of six Special scores (5.24 versus 2.92), and Weighted Sum of six Special scores (11.57 versus 7.57).

In conclusion, our study is the first to provide normative data for the Rorschach CS of a sample of subjects living in The Netherlands. In general, the subjects seem to have been actively engaged in the test administration, and their scores on a number of important CS variables resemble those of a U.S. sample (Shaffer et al., 2007/this issue). These data provide clinicians with the necessary reference data for use in interpretation of Rorschach findings, a requisite of the testing code of the Dutch Institute of Psychologists (Nederlands Institut van Psychologen [NIP], 2004).

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by a research grant from the Stichting tot Steun Vereniging Christelijke Verzorging van Geestes- en Zenuwziekten (Vereniging Bennekom; Bennekom Association). The Dr. Henri van der Hoeven Kliniek, center for forensic psychiatry, in Utrecht, The Netherlands, provided administrative and financial support.

Saskia Luyten and Astrid van Kessel served as examiners in the study. The assistance of Vivienne de Vogel and Pascalle van der Wolf in coding of Rorschach protocols is gratefully acknowledged. We thank Dr. Gregory Meyer for his assistance with calculation of iota values.

References

Bentall, R. P., & Slade, P. D. (1985). Reliability of a scale measuring disposition towards hallucination: A brief report. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6*, 527–529.

Bijl, R. V., van Zessen, G., & Ravelli, A. (1998). Prevalence of psychiatric disorder in the general population: Results of the Netherlands Mental Health Survey and Incidence Study (NEMESIS). *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 33*, 587–595.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (1999). *Statistisch Jaarboek 1999* [Statistical yearbook]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Author.

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

Goldberg, D. P., & Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the GHQ. *Psychological Medicine, 9*, 139–145.

Ishihara, M. (1980). *Ishihara's design charts for colour-blindness of unlettered persons*. Tokyo: Kanehara.

Jansson, H., & Olsson, U. (2001). A measure of agreement for interval or nominal multivariate observations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*, 277–289.

Koeter. M. W. J., Ormel, J,. van den Brink, W., et al. (1987). De waarde van de GHQ als toestandsmaat [The value of the GHQ as a state measure]. *Tijdschrift voor Psychiatrie, 29*, 667–679.

Meyer, G. J., Hildenroth, M. J., Baxter, D., Exner, J. E., Fowler, J. C., Piers, C. C., & Resnick, J. (2002). An examination of interrater reliability for scoring the Rorschach Comprehensive System in eight data sets. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 78*, 219–274.

Nederlands Instituut van Psychologen (NIP). (2004). *Algemene Standaard Testgebruik NIP* [General guideline for test use]. Retrieved, from www.psynip.nl

Shaffer, T. W., & Erdberg, P. (1999, July). *Symposium on normative studies of the Rorschach Comprehensive System*. Conducted at the 16th Congress of the International Society for Rorschach and Projective Methods, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Shaffer, T. W., Erdberg, P., & Haroian, J. (2007/this issue). Rorschach Comprehensive System data for a sample of 283 adult nonpatients from the United States. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 89*(Suppl. 1), SXXX–SXXX.

Silva, D., Novo, R., & Prazeres, N. (1996). The evolution of some Rorschach variables in Portuguese children. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 12*, 53–58.

van Sonderen, E. (1993). *Sociale Steun Lijst—Interacties* [Social support questionnaire—Interactions]. Noordelijk Centrum Gezondheidsvraagstukken: Universiteit Groningen.

van der Zee, K. I., & Sanderman. R. (1993). *RAND–36*. Noordelijk Centrum Gezondheidsvraagstukken: Universiteit Groningen.

Vollebergh, W. A. M., de Graaf, R., ten Have, M., Schoemaker, C., van Dorsselaer, S., Spijker, J., et al. (2003).*Psychische stoornissen in Nederland* [Mental disorders in The Netherlands]. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Trimbos-Institute.

Vollema, M. G., & Geurtsen, G. J. (1993). Positieve schizotypie [Positive schizotypy]. *Tijdschrift voor Psychiatrie, 8,* 540–549.