Draft RPAS Rationale for Variable Inclusion and Exclusion (Not for Citation)

We used three foundations for selecting and discriminating among the variables: 1) empirical support from the published literature, 2) behavioral representation and the phenomenology of the response process, and 3) parsimony and eliminating redundancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Scores</th>
<th>Cluster and Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 1</strong></td>
<td>Engagement and Cognitive Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Complexity</td>
<td>This composite variable has a strong foundation in the response process as demonstrating differentiation and integration in processing. As a single variable in its present form, it has no direct validity research with psychological complexity, flexibility, and adaptive capacity as criteria. However, there is a considerable indirect research support connecting its subcomponents in one form or another with age, education, intelligence, adaptation, and various other criteria associated with its interpretation. It has a very high correlation with the first factor on the test, so that it represents a relatively easily understandable marker for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responses</td>
<td>Abundant research has established the R is associated with engagement with the test and that it modifies the size and stability of many other scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Form%</td>
<td>Psychometrically in terms of its distribution, a superior choice over Lambda. Form % is an algebraic function of Lambda, so that the substantial research support for Lambda, applies to Form%. Thus, Form% is used instead of Lambda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Blend%</td>
<td>There is research support for the Blend % as an indicator of complexity and layering in emotional functioning. Such complexity may reflect either a personality trait or a reaction to situation stress. From a process perspective, it makes sense that the simultaneous use of multiple determinants is associated with complicated ways of reacting to experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Synthesis</td>
<td>This variable is a subcomponent of complexity. The representational basis of this score as a marker of complex and sophisticated thought is well supported in research. It is probably best to interpret this score in the context of Vagueness and other and complexity markers. The old DQ+ and v/+ was replaced in the RPAS with the simplified Synthesis code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 EA</td>
<td>Research has demonstrated that EA is a measure of psychological resources and adaptive capacity. In addition, it involves sophisticated and varied processing of inkblot stimuli, so it is included with the Complexity and Engagement variables. It does not appear to focus solely on cognitive or ideational processes as much some of the other complexity variables. It could potentially be improved by additional research evaluating moderators (e.g., excluding “spoiled” responses, like M-; weighing color in the opposite direction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 EA-es</td>
<td>Instead of being transformed to the D-Score, the EA-es score is computed as a simple difference. Because es is highly correlated with complexity, the difference is expected to be increasing negative as complexity increases. Accordingly, one would expect that complexity corrected norms will enhance validity, but research would be needed to establish this improvement. In addition, the response process and psychometric rationale for comparing the EA to es in a ratio is not clear. Research provided support for the D-Score as a measure of the internal capacity to cope with the day-to-day events of life if EA is high, though it does not so clearly support viewing es as a tax on drain on resources. Also, the transformation of the EA-es difference to the stepped D-Score was psychometrically problematic because it distorted the relationship between the two and sacrificed variance by artificially equalizing various EA-es scores. Thus, the EA-es relationship is now addressed as a simple difference instead of with the D-Score transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 EA with EA-es Score</td>
<td>Research supports the interpretation of a high EA combined with a positive EA-es difference as an internal capacity to cope with the day-to-day events of life. The EA-es difference is used rather than the D-Score because of its better psychometrics foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 M:C [M/(M+ WSumC)]</td>
<td>M:WSumC is used as the name of the variable rather than EB and the styles (Introversive, Ambident, Extrotritative). Research across international samples does not support the style and subtyping approach to interpreting M:WSumC. That is, research does not support the idea that it is preferable to have a fixed or defined introversive or extrotritative style rather than an undefined or flexible ambitient style. A critical component of the foundation for this subtyping approach is a purported negative correlation between M and WSumC, resulting in a bimodal distribution of the difference. However, research reveals that the M versus WSumC difference score forms a normal distribution, revealing that it is typical for people to fall in the mid range (i.e., to Ambident). Accordingly, the ratio should be interpreted dimensionally instead of with the Introversive and Extrativestyle cutoffs. More extreme standard scores suggest more extreme or inflexible ways of experiencing or coping. Low EA scores are mathematically more like to produce the Ambident style with M being approximately equal to WSumC. In this situation, problems in adaptation are inferred from low EA rather than the Ambident style. Thus, there is no foundation for interpreting nearly equal M-WSumC difference scores as inconsistent and vacillating coping as is done with the Ambident style. Indeed, the Ambident interpretation for high EA scores is not supported in the research literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 M</td>
<td>Research generally supports M as a measure of ideation, interpersonal cognition, and of related constructs such as intelligence, reasoning, and imagination. Emerging research associates it with mirror neuron activity (Giromini et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FC,CF+C [FC / (FC+CF+C)]</td>
<td>This ratio should be evaluated with a less narrow interpretation focused solely on affect and with more appreciation for it as a reflection of a general cognitive style of receptivity and responsivity to stimuli, which is consistent with its research and response process basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 EII-2/3</td>
<td>This variable is established both by research and by response phenomenology as a strong, dimensional measure of the severity of psychopathology and thought disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Thought and Perception Composite (TP-Comp)</td>
<td>The PTI has excellent research support as an indicator of perceptual and thinking problems that are most commonly seen in psychotic states. Here it is reformulated as a continuous variable, called the TP-Comp (Thought and Perception Composite). The TP-Comp has a correlation of .88 with the PTI, is more reliably scored and shows higher validity with relevant criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Level 2 Cog. Scores</td>
<td>Level 2 Cognitive Scores are supported by both research and response phenomenology as indicative of a significant breakdown in the integrity and coherence of thought processes and the intrusion of pre-operational cognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Not surprisingly, Level2 Cognitive Scores are supported by research as being more pathognomonic of serious thought disorder.

As noted above, the FQ-based summary scores overlap considerably. WDA%, X-%, and X+% have strong support. WDA% and X-% probably represent the best combination to measure perceptual judgment and reality testing. This variable has strong response process support as a measure of distortions and poor adaptation.

Research supports it as a measure of psychological health and reality testing. It is almost by definition a measure of conventionality and seeing things the way most people do.

The FQ-based summary scores are highly redundant of one another. They also have a strong research and response process foundation. As noted above, WDA% and X-% probably represent the best complementary scores to use and the best combination to measure perceptual judgment and reality testing.

This variable has a reasonable basis as a representational score for measuring highly conventional and widely accepted interpretations of the environment and sensitivity to obvious cues. It will eventually need some revision in that some Popular responses are actually less common than responses not included on the list. Also, it would be ideal to have a much more comprehensive way to measure conventionality and banality.

Stress and Distress

Response associates this variable with internal stress, particularly in the face of external stressors experienced as uncontrollable. The evidence supports SumY as related to helplessness, anxiety, distress, as might occur with acute stress or external stressors.

This combination of scores is supported as a measure of perturbation as might occur with acute or current stress.

The phenomenology of the response is consistent with depressogenic beliefs. Research supports this interpretation. Research supports the S-COn, an integer-based “step” variable, as an indicator of suicide risk and self-destructive behavior. One of its 17 variables was dropped from the index. To increase its reliability it was reformulated as a continuous, dimensional variable, S-Comp (Suicide Composite). The correlation between the S-CON and S-Comp is .85, with the S-Comp being more reliable.

Self and Other Representation

This variable is established both by research and by linguistic or verbal-associative response phenomenology as a strong, performance measure of dependency.

The literature provides negative findings linking all space responses with oppositionality, but there is older literature that supports this link for space reversal responses (i.e., where the white background becomes figure and the ink becomes backdrop in a classic figure-ground reversal). So for clinical use RPAS scoring separates the cognitively sophisticated complexity type space responses (i.e., where space is an attribute integrated with other blot regions) versus the space reversal response.

This ratio, one of a set of scores commonly used in Urist’s (1977) Mutuality of Autonomy scoring, has been supported by research to serve about equally well as a measure of the quality of object relations and as a measure of overall psychological health (Bombel, Mihura, & Meyer, 2009). Being based on quality of human representations, it also makes sense phenomenologically.

GHR and PHR have good research support as an overall measure of interpersonal competency and capacity for relatedness. Although PHR seems to increase artificially at very high levels of R (probably because of a ceiling effect based on the inherent limitations in the number of possible GHR responses), R-optimization is likely to resolve this problem. Response process would be consistent with GHR:PHR as a measure of understanding of others and relationships. Overall, research and responses process would suggest that GHR:PHR should be interpreted as a ratio.

Some research has differentiated between GHR and PHR, suggesting they are not opposite ends of one continuum but that GHR may be more associated with markers of positive functioning. However, findings are limited and not yet consistent. If a response is classified by the criteria at the end of the algorithm, interpretation should be cautious.

As noted with GHR, some research has differentiated between GHR and PHR, suggesting they are not opposite ends of one continuum but that PHR may be more associated with markers of serious psychopathology. If a response is classified by the criteria at the end of the algorithm interpretation should be cautious. PHRs are not subject to a ceiling and can be exceedingly high in longer records.

All the Extended Aggression scores have consistent positive validity findings in the literature. However, SM and AgPot are very low base rate variables and so do not add much to interpretation, so they are not included in the RPAS.

All the Extended Aggression scores have consistent positive validity findings in the literature. However, SM and AgPot are very low base rate variables and so do not add much to interpretation, so they are not included in the RPAS.

The phenomenology of the response is consistent with damaged or negative self-representations. Research supports this interpretation.

Research suggests that false negatives are a problem with HVI as a dichotomous index, but supports its positive predictive power. Although there is limited research on this variable, it has found support as a dimensional index. Given international normative data, the historical dichotomous coding over-emphasized T=0 by making it a necessary condition for a positive index. Accordingly, in RPAS it is reformulated as continuous, dimensional variable, the V-Comp (Vigilance Composite), which is more reliable than the HVI and correlated .85 with the HVI.

Although these scores can be consciously manipulated, they also provide a helpful reminder to look for personal strengths not just difficulties. This score overlaps considerably with MOAH.

The location variable array juxtaposes classes of competing variables and interpretations so as to allow meaningful normative and conceptual comparisons, particularly at the response process level.

Research on the frequency of location scores and response process considerations suggest some need for refinement of the standard interpretations of this ratio. W responses need to be considered in the context of specific cards. Many W responses
could be classified as common details (D) in the sense that they are common, easy, and conventional.

Interpretation should be qualified. Eventually, research needs to decouple Dd from other location scores in order to code the narrow and atypical focus of perception when it is present, regardless of how often it occurs in proportion to the frequency of W or D responses.

The literature provides negative findings linking the total number of Space responses of all kinds to oppositionality, but there is older literature supporting primary space responses (i.e., with figure-ground reversal), which is in any event closer to the experiential rationale for this variable. So for clinical use and future research we separate out the cognitively sophisticated complexity-type space responses (i.e., where space is an attribute integrated with other inked blot regions) versus the space response where figure and ground are reversed.

Vague percepts are not well studied in the literature. Theoretically, they are marked by their ignorance of form, which is associated with a capacity for deliberate control over one’s impulses and feelings and with a primitive form of perceptual experience in Heinz Werner’s developmental scheme. Phenomenologically, vague percepts seem to be associated with cognitive passivity or unmodulated receptivity to the environment or reactivity to internal experiences.

Although no research foundation is available for Prompts and Pulls, their response process foundation is clear. Prompts are a measure of lessened productivity, resourcefulness, and engagement with the task, or possibly of resistance to the task and uncooperative behavior.

Although no research foundation is available for Prompts and Pulls, their response process foundation is clear. Pulls are relatively rare in nonpatient samples. They can be associated with a striving to please the examiner, a capacity for productivity, achievement striving, and even to some extent testing the limits. They can also indicate difficulties with inhibition, grandiosity, or an inability to step back from the task suggesting poor boundaries.

Sideways responding is included as a summary measure that may serve as a moderator of interpretation for reflection responses (Horn et al., 2009). Subsequent research is needed to evaluate card rotation as a general index of personality characteristics.

The research literature does not support an association between Vista responses and depressive disorders, though it has shown associations with suicide risk. From a response process perspective, V is obviously related to perspective taking and to being able to consider multiple frames of reference in conjunction to each other. Little consideration has traditionally been given to the cognitive sophistication that is required to give a V response, and whether V responses have positive as well as negative prognostic significance.

Form Dimensional responses have not been clearly studied using criteria of introspective capacity. However, the existing research base does not provide promising support. As with V responses, FD responses are experientially related to perspective taking and integrating multiple frames of reference.

There is limited empirical support for this score (the former Afr.). Research and response process information would suggest that R8910% and color are not confined to emotionally-related processing, but also are related to a more general reactivity to robust, compelling, and vibrant stimuli. Also, some inconsistencies between its response process and calculation of the variable are observed: R8910% is overly elevated in cases with many simplistic responses to the last three cards, seen most frequently as multiple “Do Fo 2 A” codes to Card X. Conversely, it is underestimated in the people who give just one highly complex and detailed response to the last three cards but nevertheless seem to be classically affectively responsive (as measured by raw verbiage, emotionally randomized responses, and complexity rather than simply by the number of responses). This variable is also slightly affected by the R-Optimized administration procedure. For consistency with other RPAS variables the former Afr. variable is recast as a percentage of R as the R8910%. Nevertheless, in the RPAS, its interpretation is de-emphasized.

Research and response phenomenology does not support a simplistic equation of color with emotion. Response phenomenology suggests that it is more related to responsiveness to variety and environmental stimulation, which might encompass emotional components. Color has more import or research validity as an index of resources (EA) or of sensitivity and complexity (Lambda), such that articulating color features speaks to a cognitive resource in problem solving. (Though if color is scored predominantly for blood, fire, or explosion responses on Cards II, III, and IX, this would modify the interpretation.) To the extent that color scores have utility for affect they should be considered in the context of the relative balance of M and WSumC (i.e., environmentally responsive extravativeness vs. ideational introversion) and the relative balance of FC to CF+C.

Color does not equal emotion; pure C is more about openness and receptiveness to "unfiltered" experience, spontaneity, or overreacting to stimuli. It does not equate to emotional explosiveness and impulsivity. Interpretively, the Wv positively colored sunset type response should be differentiated from responses of blood associated with trauma and flooding.

There is limited research support for this ratio as an index of behavioral passivity. In addition, it requires multiple linking steps to infer behavioral equivalences with the coded response characteristics. In order to make more trustworthy inferences one needs to have many M responses and to discount close calls, where M just slightly outweighs Ma. Clinically, this index could be interpreted if the phenomenology of the responses are generally consistent with the direction of the scores and if the imbalance is notable (e.g., with standard scores < 85 or >115).

Although there are supportive research data, in the RPAS coding criteria are designed so that the response process is more consistent with the construct of intellectualization. For example, responses such as spilled paint are not coded as Art. In the future, other kinds of intellectualized descriptions should be considered to enhance coding, which suggests that intellectualization should probably be a thematic category rather than a scale based on existing content codes.

Inter-rater reliability research indicates that this variable is sometimes coded inconsistently, so that larger deviations from norms should be required to interpret it. In part this score is less reliable than the other FQ scores because it is often not coded by a positive decision but as a leftover category. The research findings to suggest that it assesses creativity or an unusual take on the environment are limited. FQ coding has been reconfigured in RPAS to align the scoring of response behavior with the construct of one having reasonably accurate but unusual or individualistic processing and perception.

Although there are supportive research data, in the RPAS coding criteria are designed so that the response process is more consistent with the construct of intellectualization. For example, responses such as spilled paint are not coded as Art. In the future, other kinds of intellectualized descriptions should be considered to enhance coding, which suggests that intellectualization should probably be a thematic category rather than a scale based on existing content codes.
Response processes suggest a strength interpretation as the generic interpretation of Vista. It is a cognitive feat to use shading to articulate a dimensional perspective with a two-dimensional space interpretation of V as a tax on resources is not always warranted. Response phenomenology suggests a more positive interpretation involving taking perspective or distance, having an evaluative perspective, and making fine distinctions. At the same time, because it is a shading response, it is presumed to be associated with painful or dysphoric affect. The conjunction of dysphoric affect, particularly in the context of depression, and close attentiveness or perspective-taking may turn a strength into a weakness. This in turn may account for the research link between V scores and suicidal risk.

Negative interpretation should be made cautiously; often the general "Lambda" interpretation of sensitivity to nuance and experience applies (i.e., articulating shading, texture, vista, and achromatic color is indicative of perceptual and conceptual sensitivity). Nonetheless, research supports SumShading as a measure of emotional distress, especially when using only the shading variables and not achromatic color. In general, for the future it will be important to more fully align scoring criteria for C' with the phenomenology of the real world process we are trying to capture by differentiating dark and gloomy percepts from coloring on objects.

Research has suggested an association with self-destructive features, but it has not been researched in not-at-risk populations with more positive or generic validity criteria. Response process phenomena would associate it with heightened sensitivity and possibly a spoiling of more positive, spontaneous reactions to strong and possibly enjoyable stimulation (color) by concern with inconsistencies and nuances. Phenomenologically the score could make sense as a measure of sensitivity to experiential nuances or of special attentiveness to dark and to diffuse and indefinite phenomena. The inference that color-shading blends reflects a mixed affective experiences is most reasonable when bright colors are tarnished in some fashion, and research by Fowler suggests findings are stronger when the blend is scored when shading occurs with color in a color area. More research is needed to tease these options apart but conservative interpretation would limit traditional inferences to responses of shading within color.

The literature provides largely negative evidence for C' as a marker of depression. It has not been studied against criteria for internalized distress or suppressions of natural emotional reactions as in metabolically biting one's tongue. From a response phenomenology perspective many of the responses are classifications of attributes (tuxedo, black stripes) rather than percepts involving a suggestion of darkness, gloom, dreariness, or blackness. For the future, it would be helpful to have research exploring whether scoring criteria targeting the latter constructs are more valid. At present inferences about internalized distress or inhibition should be avoided when C' is simply scored for black or white attributes.

This variable has been studied since Herman Rorschach (albeit with many different scoring criteria), but there is no clear support in the literature for the inference that it assesses unmet need states. That interpretation also is not supported by the phenomenology of the animal movement responses that are coded for this score. When considered in the array of movement scores, the response phenomenology of animal activity and traditional normative data may tie it with more immature ideational activity.

{[= An+B]+Ex+Fi+Sx+ Xy+AGM+MOR]: As a part of the EII, these contents have been associated with severity of psychopathology and thinking problems. Response process would suggest that they are related to the emergence of disturbing themes in consciousness.}

{[= B+Ex+Sx+ AGM+MOR]: There is evidence showing this scale can be intentionally manipulated or malingered in an effort to appear disturbed. It appears here with the very similar Critical Contents and Trauma Content Index to heighten awareness of these very different competing inferences.}

{[= An+B+Sx+ AGM+MOR/R]: There is reasonable research and response process support for this variable as a global measure of traumatic imagery. Although there is general support for this variable, an individual's traumatic imagery tends to be much more specific and idiographic than the more generalized imagery captured by the global TCI. Also, many of the contents included in this index can be present in a protocol for non-traumatic reasons. In addition, very similar variables are contained in the EII-3 Critical Contents and are thus associated with psychopathology and thinking disturbance. Also, the contents contained in it overlap considerably with the Dramatic Content score, which is an index of variables that can be intentionally manipulated or malingered in an effort to appear disturbed.}

Despite its very limited distribution, research indicates that this score works as a measure of psychopathology and thinking problems. This research does not associate it specifically to ideation or interpersonal perception criteria per se, whereas response phenomenology would associate it with both. The idea that it involves deliberate ideation (M) leading to distortion (FQ-), as in a classic thought disorder, is not supported.

This score has not really been studied. However, from a response phenomenology perspective, it logically suggests an interest in others.

There is some research support for the reflection variable, though evidence suggests it should be used with a modified interpretation that takes into account card rotation and response phenomenology. Response process considerations suggest that inferences about narcissistic-like or more positive self-centered traits are indicated to the extent that an aware object is viewing itself in a reflective surface and not when the response is simply a landscape reflection.

There has been little research on this variable and thus there is limited support for inferring interpersonal passivity. The RPAS a:p ratio interpretation is thus based more on instances when the phenomenology of the coded response features suggests a general mode of passivity vs. activity. Like with Ma:Mp, it is important to watch close calls when scoring and instances when the imbalance is not large. Clinically, interpretation should be more sturdy if the passivity evident in the phenomenology of the responses is generally consistent with the direction of the scores and if the imbalance is notable (e.g., with standard scores < 85 or >115).

This is a rather narrowly defined score and given its limited definition it misses aggressive content and creates distribution problems. It would be helpful to consider AG in conjunction with AgC and the other extended aggression scores. Aggressive responses are easily manipulated, but they have a foundation in scoring that is consistent with response phenomenology.
There is reasonable but not consistently strong research support of T as a measure of interpersonal interest, neediness, and tactile inclinations. Response process support in terms of suggestions of tactile comfort is also notable. Some recent research points to levels of T as possible markers of attachment style. However, the absence of T is common (if not normative), so that the RPAS makes important normative adjustments and "de-pathologizes" its interpretation. The traditional interpretation might be made more confidently when content is aligned at least indirectly with the phenomenology of the inference (soft, smooth).

Research has not adequately tested but does not support the traditional interpretation of this ratio of having perceptions of self and others based on real versus imaginary experience. Response process in the context of psychoanalytic theory and interpersonal schema offers support as a measure contrasting intact, more fully contextualized understandings and attributions of people to more narrow and simplistic ones. In that way, this ratio in the RPAS may offer some suggestion as to adaptability and realistic interpersonal and self perception. However, it needs to be integrated more fully with response features and card pull (e.g., a non-pure human response is better than a pure human response to the W of Card IV and VII). The HRV contains such corrections or adjustments for card pull.

This score has not really been studied. However, from a response phenomenology perspective it logically suggests an interest in others. Pure H has better evidence than All H that the index suggests quality of object representations.

This variable has some empirical support but in order to have coding capture the intended construct, we need to further differentiate types. The story telling type of personal response is very different from the defensive assertiveness type of personal response.

There are some positive findings in the literature but many studies where results should have been evident and were not. The idea that this score indicates the capacity for objective self-evaluation is not supported. In part this may be due to the phenomenology of the perspective-taking processes that are coded, which are not solely related to self-perception. Like vista, perspective-taking might be interpreted more negatively in cases of depression where self-views would have a negative affective coloring. Eventually the response coding criteria probably should be revised to be consistent with the phenomenology of stepping back and taking perspective, or at least to determine whether the percepts where a) one object is covering or obscuring another or b) a tall object is looming over the viewer actually reflect more subtle representations of this process.

There is little good research on this index, which also may be influenced by occupation. There are two interrelated concepts associated with this index that should be disentangled and tested -- somatic anxiousness and concerns about ones general sense of integrity/sense of vulnerability, re body image and psyche.

This is a low base rate score with no research to support it. Its coding is less reliable than many other scores. The scoring criteria are not fully consistent with the CP construct (e.g., they allow for any color, not necessarily a bright or pleasant substitute)--thus, the response process may be inconsistent with interpretation for a notable proportion of responses.

Evidence does not support this index as a marker of an interpersonally based depressive subtype. Evidence supports this as an index of limited coping resources and psychological deficits, which may have secondary consequences for interpersonal ineffectiveness. However, this construct is already handled well with the complexity and engagement variables, so that it is redundant and adds very little. It also contains variables that we are no longer calculating, because they lack validity themselves.

As a diagnostic indicator, it is clear that this index does not work well. It yields both too many false negatives and false positives. Generally speaking, Rorschach testing may yield personality descriptions that are helpful in diagnosis, but should not be used as a substitute for a thorough diagnostic workup. Further, most of the component index variables do not have a clear Response Process foundation. To assess implicit depressive experiences, it would be better to start from the ground up to devise a new index that is directly tied to manifestations of implicit dysphoria, such as representations of depression in imagery and lack of vitality and interest in the environment.

This index might work if FQ were adjusted to more realistic cut-offs, but there are no data to support any particular cut-off. It is virtually never elevated. A dimensional measure of obsessive style as a trait with more sensitivity would be desirable.

There is no research support for a:p as a measure of cognitive rigidity. The inference associated with the score also is not consistent with phenomenology of the process thought to underlie the response.

A very low base rate score that has not been researched. It is probably best to revert to Vague interpretation for these responses. M is still scored for responses that qualify by coding criteria.

There is good research support for this variable, but it is largely redundant with WSum6. WSum6 accounts for its variance and offers some additional predictive power.

There is no research base to support inferences associated with this type of content. At the response process level, the behavior is consistent with the interpretation of an inclination for fantasy-based or imaginative processing. More research needs to be done to establish it.

Almost no direct research support as a measure of dependency. Given the ROD incorporates Fd and has good research support it is used instead of Fd to assess dependency.

There are a couple of supportive studies but the scoring is too broad (e.g., isolation content with human content or even COP; a floral bouquet). The idea that a fixed quantity of contents can identify interpersonal experience also is not credible. Isolation content needs to be refined, used dimensionally, and researched further, so that scoring principles are consistent with the construct we aim to assess.

Although the response process for this variable corresponds to precision and conceptual differentiation, there is no research support for this low base-rate variable. Reliability sometimes suffers because the coding criteria are imprecise and examiners often forget to code it. Clinicians surveyed provided negative feedback about its value. Phenomenologically, it does not fit well with FQ, in that it is not essentially related to accuracy and conventionality of perception, but more closely related to differentiation and precision (albeit also to verbosity). As such, it could indicate adaptive, cognitive capacities; however, it probably applies...
equally to FQs percepts not just FQo percepts. Thus, revisions in how it is coded and in its placement in the coding structure, as well as new research are needed.

93 S-
This score works as a FQ variable but research does not tie it specifically to angry or hostile affect. The response process foundation for this variable is weak. It is also a low base rate variable.

94 XA%
There is fine support for this variable but it is essentially the complement of X-%. Thus, correlations with X-% approach unity (particularly after M-none is eliminated). Such redundancy is unnecessarily complicating and erroneously implies that it is somehow distinct.

95 PSV
Some research support but it blurs two distinct types of cognitive inflexibility and ignores other important perseverative phenomena. It would be more optimal to refine in line with Perry et al.’s perseveration scores.

96 W:M ratio
The construct this variable is supposed to assess is theoretically interesting, but the ratio has no research support and weak response process support. Its equation of number of W scores with aspiration to take on intellectual challenges ignores the very response process components among different types of W responses. Wv and generic Wo responses to the simple cards do not represent taking on a difficult challenge. The ratio also ignores the significance of other indicators of complexity and integration as measures of intellectual challenge. Likewise, on a research process level, M responses can be more or less impressive in terms of cognitive capacity, depending on other scores.

97 Zd
The literature provides negative findings, and the logic of the difference score is questionable. In addition, Beck’s foundation for the Z-estimates is questionable. Thus, the current values would need to be re-examined and recalibrated before further use. Given that it is a difference score, it is inherently unstable.

98 Zf
This variable is related to complexity and has good support as a measure of sophistication and effort in processing. However, Zf is a conceptually confounded variable because it can be elevated from W, Synthesis, or Space. Given the caveats associated with how to interpret W (i.e., that interpretation varies by card and by the number of objects in the W response) and given the caveats about how to interpret the old Space variable (i.e., it combines perceptual reversal of figure and ground and the integration of Space), it would be better to interpret W separate from Synthesis and separate from S, rather than to carry these interpretive complexities further into the Z variable. For the future we need to do a better job of refining card-specific weights for effortful synthesis and then documenting the incremental validity for the weighted composite over its individual elements.

99 es
Although there is some research supporting this variable independently as taxing to coping resources, results are superior when it is interpreted in terms of EA minus es. Accordingly, es is included in the RPAS only in conjunction with EA rather than on its own.

100 Adjusted D Score
The logic of the score itself is problematic and virtually impossible to test in research. Response process support is also unclear. The mathematical transformation of the EA-es difference to the D-score scale also reduces validity of the scores. A more parsimonious and computationally valid means of assessing the impact of stressful environmental demands on current functioning is to consider m+Y on their own without considering EA and D.

101 es > EA
This is now being computed as a dimensional difference score of EA minus es.

102 Adjusted es
Not needed because AdjD was dropped.

103 EB Per
EB style itself is now considered on a continuum (because the evidence does not support a pathological interpretation of ambience and because ambience does not appear to be as stable as previously believed) so this additional dichotomous classification is not needed.

104 FM+m
Until research supports combining FM with m, we should interpret impinging or distracting ideation by focusing on m alone.

105 Lambda
Although this variable has consistent research support, it has a problematic, highly skewed distribution, caused when the denominator approaches zero. Pure F% (F/R) should be used instead because of its superior distributional characteristics.

106 R with L
This is essentially equal to Complexity with a correlation in the .90 range so it is not interpreted separately.

107 Sum Shading
Shading, based on attentiveness to the variation in saturation of ink, particularly in the black and grey areas, has some response process foundation for distress, dysphoria, and sensitivity, but the research support is very weak. The response process and psychometric rationale for comparing these shading variables to FM+m in a ratio is not clear. Representing the Individual elements to complexity corrected standard scores is a more logical and psychometrically stable approach.

108 Egocentricity
This is the most studied CS variable with almost no empirical support as a measure of self-focus or self-esteem and related concepts. Response process support is limited, inasmuch as the phenomenological roots of seeing pairs remain obscure. Possibly, low pair identification may be indicative of depressive neglect and a "half-hearted" engagement with the task. Langer’s (2004) recent sophisticated analysis suggests that the components of the index should not be considered jointly. Although not interpreted itself, the index is retained as a part of the Suicide Composite.

109 Form
New learners have reported that this is one of the most difficult coding distinctions. It often necessitates additional inquiry questions and coding time. This additional cost is not rewarded with much of a benefit because the sum of these scores historically has not been interpreted. There is no direct research support for an interpretation of this variable.

110 Hh, Sc
These scores are not interpreted. A guiding principle of RPAS is that all coded scores should be interpretable.

111 Hx
It is rare, complicated to score and thus somewhat unreliable, and does not have a research foundation. Clinicians did not find it useful. More research is needed before its use can be justified.