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TAMMY L. HUGHES
Duquesne University
CARL B. GACONO
Private Practice, Austin, Texas
PATRICK F. OWEN
Kershaw County School District, Camden, South Carolina

In this article we examine the current status of Rorschach assessment. School psychologists are provided with an introduction to the Rorschach Inkblot Method (RIM), the types of information that the test provides, and guidelines for evaluating the RIM. We also address criticisms that have served to discourage the use of the RIM. When administered, coded, and interpreted within guidelines provided by Exner’s Comprehensive System, the Rorschach clearly meets ethical and professional standards for psychological test usage. The RIM can provide unique and important information concerning the emotional and social functioning of children and adolescents that aids in developing individualized educational programming including behavior intervention plans. © 2007 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

The Rorschach Inkblot Method (RIM) provides important information for understanding the emotional, social, and cognitive functioning (e.g., Exner, 2003; Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001; Weiner, Spielberger, & Abeles, 2002) of children and adolescents (Exner & Erdberg, 2005; Lunardi, 1999; Pierce & Penman, 1998; Sacket, 1998; Yalof, Abraham, Domingos, & Sacket, 2001). Although the Rorschach is frequently used by clinical psychologists (43%), less than 24% of school psychologists surveyed utilize the instrument (Stinnett, Havey, & Oehler-Stinnett, 1994).

The infrequent use of the RIM by school psychologists may be attributable to several causes. First, cognitive ability and academic achievement testing is the school psychologist’s most common evaluative role and children who have learning disabilities (particularly reading disabilities) constitute the highest percentage of those found to be eligible for special education services. In such cases the in-depth personality assessment provided by the RIM is rarely required. Because school psychology training assessment curriculum programs reflect this trend, adequate RIM training may not be widely available to school psychologists. Second, when school psychologists are requested to provide social-emotional assessments, evaluators rely almost exclusively on interviews, behavior rating scales, family and developmental histories, and classroom observations (Stinnett et al., 1994). This practice indicates a lack of consensus about the value of personality assessment, and of the Rorschach in particular. Third, school psychologists may be reluctant to use the Rorschach because of recent critiques in the professional literature (Gacono, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c; Gacono, Evans, & Viglione, 2002). Many of these critiques, however, have been found to lack scientific rigor, to contain unwarranted criticisms about the RIM’s psychometric properties, to assume erroneously that Rorschach interpretation must be wed to psychodynamic theory, or are based on a limited understanding of the way assessment works (Gacono, Loving, & Bodholdt, 2002).
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Finally, equating the RIM with other “projective” measures that lack established reliable scoring systems and normative data may contribute to its infrequent use by school psychologists. In fact, the RIM is a performance-based assessment measure that psychometrically compares quite favorably to self-report measures such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2; Meyer et al., 2001; Gacono, Evans, & Kaser-Boyd, in press).

In this article we (1) provide an introduction to the Rorschach and the rich data that it provides, (2) provide information concerning the Rorschach’s reliability and validity, (3) discuss legal and ethical guidelines pertaining to the use of the Rorschach, and (4) discuss how the use of Rorschach data can directly aid school psychologists in their roles of assessment and intervention in the schools.

**Description and Nature of the Rorschach**

In clinical practice the RIM is routinely utilized in child and adolescent evaluations. An overwhelming majority (90%) of clinical psychologists believe that clinical students should be competent in Rorschach administration and interpretation (Watkins, Campbell, Nieberding, & Hallmark, 1995). Rorschach assessment in schools, however, is not yet well established. This underutilization may, in part, stem from the school psychologist’s unfamiliarity with the test.

The RIM involves little projection. The RIM is essentially a problem-solving, perceptual-association task that provides information about the psychology underlying a person’s behavior through description and understanding of a person as an individual (Exner, 2003). It comprises 10 cards, each of which contains an ambiguous inkblot with varying achromatic and/or chromatic coloring. The RIM cards are administered in a standardized, sequential format by an examiner to a single subject. The administration of the RIM involves a free association phase followed by an inquiry phase. When handed a card during free association, the subject is asked, “What might this be?” The examinee’s responses are recorded verbatim during this phase. After all the cards have been presented, the tester asks “What made it look like that?” and “Where on the card [location]?” the subject sees the percept.

After RIM administration each response is scored (or coded) on several primary dimensions that address both perceptual aspects of the responses and the ways the responses are verbalized by the examinee. The scores (or codes) for each response are used to compute various ratios and frequencies, which, in turn, provide information about aspects of the individual’s cognitive, emotional, and social functioning. This process is comparable to other performance-based measures such as behavioral rating or adaptive behavior scales. For example, some students may have several elevated scales (compared to those of clinical and/or nonclinical groups) and others may have none. The elevated scales (or clusters) provide information for organizing and giving direction to understanding the person’s psychology.

In regard to its interpretive yield, the RIM, when administered and interpreted through the Comprehensive System (Exner, 2003), provides insight into the multidimensional aspects of a student’s personality and does so through eight primary clusters (Exner, 2001): (1) affect describes the degree to which emotion is a core element in decision making, the frequency and intensity of emotional states, the extent to which emotions are processed, the way they are modulated and whether unusual emotional sets are used for interpreting the environment; (2) capacity for control

---

1Unfortunately, large numbers of both undergraduate and graduate psychology students are first exposed to the Rorschach in academic settings where balanced critiques of the test are not offered; this practice has both created and perpetuated a negative view of the test and the impression of controversy (Gacono et al., 2002; Masling, 1997).
and stress tolerance describes the individual's capacity to form decisions and implement deliberate behaviors; (3) interpersonal perception and behavior relates to the way the individual perceives others and behaves in various interpersonal situations; (4) self-perception conveys the individual's self-image and degree of self-involvement; (5) situation related stress identifies the degree to which the individual is experiencing stress from current, specific events. Three clusters involve cognitive processing: (6) information processing describes the perceptual accuracy for the recorded response; (7) cognitive mediation describes the logic and conventionality of a response; and (8) ideation describes the cognitive output (e.g., synthesized and adequately organized or disorganized, distorted, poorly connected to reality, etc.). Although the actual “content” (e.g., I see a bat) of responses remains important, content is actually secondary to the structural components noted in these eight clusters (Rose, Kaser-Boyd, & Maloney, 2001).

**Constraining Myths**

Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the RIM also entails confronting erroneous beliefs that have been associated with its use. The first is that administering the test takes too much time. Although novice examiners typically take more time to administer and score the RIM than advanced examiners, unlike for many self-report measures, it is the skill level of the examiner rather than anything inherent in the test that determines administration and scoring time (Gacono, DeCato, Brabender, Goertzel, 1997). On average an experienced examiner takes about 90 minutes to administer and score a Rorschach including the inputting of raw data through scoring software (e.g., ROR-SCAN, Rorschach Interpretive Assistant Program).

A second concern also relates to the first concern: that the RIM is too expensive in terms of time-to-benefit ratio. The school psychologist must, however, carefully weigh the importance of RIM data (including information regarding the person's attitudes and behaviors while completing the test) when deciding on this cost-benefit issue. With experience, the RIM can be administered in an efficient manner. As part of a multimethod assessment strategy the value of the Rorschach is considerable. Although a single method of data collection (e.g., behavioral rating scales) may indeed be less time-intensive and cost-intensive at the outset, it may also lead to a narrow and limited understanding of the individual (Meyer et al., 2001; Myers & Winters, 2002), for which subsequent expanded and costly data collections may be required (Meyer et al., 2001). Performance-based measures, such as the RIM, add incrementally to self-report data (Gacono et al., 2002). Stricker and Gold (1999) stress the value of both nomothetic (normative) and idiographic (thematic) approaches to personality assessment and suggest that RIM information is more useful for understanding automatic processes (unconscious), longitudinal, and structural dimensions of functioning. Clearly, a thoughtful and comprehensive assessment can better serve the student and reduce assessment costs (Mattlar, 2004).

A third misconception is that a psychodynamic orientation is essential to RIM interpretation. This is absolutely false. Although the psychodynamic community did embrace the Rorschach at the time of its introduction in the United States (Costantino, Flanagan, & Malgady, 1995), Herman Rorschach did not base the test on a psychodynamic perspective. As mentioned, the Rorschach is a problem-solving perceptual-association test (Exner, 1993), and the majority of its interpretative postulates are derived from the way the child solves the problem of what the blot “could be.” Within this context, many theoretical interpretations are available to the examiner.²

²The exception is “radical behaviorism where personality is not acknowledged or if acknowledged is immeasurable” (Exner, 2003, p. 32).
Psychometric Properties of Exner’s Comprehensive System

Literature in all areas of social science assessment produces mixed findings (Wundt, 1893). Mixed results occur for many reasons including nonstandardized administrations, comparison of ill-defined populations, or comparison of groups that are not indicated for comparison. The RIM literature, as has all assessment research, has suffered these difficulties. Early research with the RIM yielded varied results from reliability and validity studies that were caused in part by the fact that there were five separate scoring systems used. In response to these problems some authors have questioned the utility of RIM (Dawes, 1994; Hunsley & Bailey, 1999; Wood, Nezworski, & Stejskal, 1996) and even with the substantive improvements of the Comprehensive System, others have given it only tempered support (Garb, Florio, & Grove, 1998).

Recent well-executed research studies, however, have provided substantial empirical support for the RIM and the Comprehensive System variables (Ganellen, 1996; Viglione, 1999; Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001; Weiner et al., 2002). On the basis of the most empirically supported features of the five existing scoring systems (Klopfer, Beck, Hertz, Piotrowski, and Rapoport-Schaefer) and an extensive review of over 20 years of empirical research with the test, the Comprehensive System has undergone three revisions; better defined scoring categories and numerous improvements of the system have resulted. The Comprehensive System workbook, now in its fifth edition, provides a normative base for children 6–17 years with comparative data from a sample of 1,390 nonpatient children and adolescents stratified for age, gender, race, geographic representation (i.e., urban, suburban, rural), and socioeconomic status (Exner, 1995, 2001).

Well-trained examiners can reliably score both high and low base rate variables of the Comprehensive System (Gacono et al., 2002; Meyer & Viglione, in press). Kappa (intrater reliability) and interclass correlation (ICC; agreement between repeated measures) studies are in the good (greater than .60) to excellent (greater than .75–.80s) range (Gacono et al., 2002; Garb, 1998; Meyer et al., 2002; Shrout & Fliess, 1979). Meta-analyses of interrater reliability studies also report excellent support with a mean estimated kappa of .86 (Meyer, 1997).

Validity studies show similar support for the test as recent original meta-analyses provide support for the RIM (Atkinson, 1988; Atkinson, Quarrington, Alp, & Cyr, 1986; Bornstein, 1996, 1999; Hiller, Rosenthal, Bornstein, Berry, & Brunell-Neuleib, 1999; Parker, Hanson, & Hunsley, 1988). Hiller and associates (1999), after correcting some of the problems in earlier meta-analyses, found that the RIM indices have an unweighted mean effect size of .29 as compared to those of the MMPI, which was found to have a mean effect size of .30; both findings are at the high end of the effect size range for personality tests. Consistently with the uses of both these instruments, the MMPI was found to have larger validity coefficients than the RIM for studies using psychiatric diagnoses and self-report measures as criterion variables, whereas the RIM had larger validity coefficients than the MMPI for studies using objective criterion variables (Exner, 2003). Meyer and Archer (2001) found validity to be similar among the RIM, MMPI, and IQ measures. Also, the RIM has been found to meet the standard for use in both clinical and research settings (Piotrowski, 1996; Piotrowski & Keller, 1989; Piotrowski, Sherry, & Keller, 1985).

The RIM is appropriate with minority populations. RIM variables tend not to show an ethnic bias. Research supporting these conclusions includes studies reporting no mean differences between racial or ethnic groups on RIM variables (Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001; Weiner et al., 2002), and principal-component analyses reveal no evidence of ethnic bias in the RIM’s internal structure (Meyer, 2002).

Although the psychometric properties of the RIM have been carefully discussed in the professional literature (Society for Personality Assessment, 2005), there continue to be vocal detractors who routinely attack the test. Although legitimate criticism and suggestions can and should be...
made concerning all personality measures, these criticisms should avoid presenting unbalanced, emotionally charged positions that lack scientific rigor. Critiques from Lilienfeld, Wood, and Garb (2001) and Wood, Nezworski, Lilienfeld, and Garb (2003), for example, have evaluated the RIM as if the test data are of the same variety as those obtained from a forced-choice measure, a process that is equivalent to comparing apples and oranges. Gacono and colleagues (2002) has also noted the ethical and moral language found in some of these writings, the tendency for some detractors to present contrasting evidence on the level of moral imperatives (Gacono et al., 2002, p. 35) or in the nature of legal briefs rather than joining in scientific debate (Gacono et al., in press; Weiner, 2001).

Rorschach information helps anticipate real life behaviors in children who have emotional or behavioral disorders, in that the content of the individual’s decision-making repertoire is reflected in the assessment data (Gacono & Meloy, 1994; Lunardi, 1999; Smith, Gacono, & Kaufman, 1997; Weber, Meloy, & Gacono, 1992). Empirical evidence indicates that the RIM’s contribution to the understanding of childhood difficulties is extensive, including understanding negative affectivity in children diagnosed as emotionally disturbed (Hughes, Miller, & Morine, 2005), differences in aggressive behaviors in psychopathic and nonpsychopathic conduct disordered children (Gacono & Meloy, 1994; Loving & Russel, 2000; Smith et al., 1997), the way childhood delinquency is related to adolescent and adulthood delinquency (Janson & Stattin, 2003), and the role of attachment and anxiety in conduct or dysthymic disordered adolescents (Weber et al., 1992). Rorschach information provides an idiographic understanding of children useful for developing individual education programs (Pierce & Penman, 1998; Socket, 1998) as well as information useful in the consideration of intervention outcomes (Stokes et al., 2003). Incremental validity links RIM data to intervention planning (Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001) and more socially valid interventions (Bihlar & Carlsson, 2000).

LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The legal and ethical use of tests in general and the RIM in particular has been addressed by a number of authors. McCann (1998), the Society for Personality Assessment (2005), and Gacono and coworkers (2002) have addressed the appropriate use of the RIM and its interpretation through Exner’s Comprehensive System and have found that the RIM allows the school psychologist to meet the most current ethical and legal standards. Test reliability and validity standards (Jacob & Hartshorne, 2003) are also addressed through the school psychologist’s multimethod evaluation practice. Familiarity with the current literature and cross-validation of findings, within a multi-method assessment model, can further serve to meet these goals.

School psychologists must have adequate training for all assessments (Jacob & Hartshorne, 2003), including the Rorschach. Rorschach assessment should only be used by practitioners who have received verifiable training, which should focus upon cautious, considered, and perhaps conservative interpretation of the data. Interpretation of the RIM should always be integrated with real world behavior.

The RIM is widely used in legal settings (Gacono et al., in press) and can also provide critical support for the school psychologist in court and/or school legal proceedings such as due process hearings. Evidence of admissibility in legal settings is noted in a 1996 survey, which revealed that of 7,934 recent federal and state court cases during which psychologists presented RIM testimony, in only one case was the testimony excluded (Weiner, Exner, & Sciara, 1996). When testimony was excluded, it was not because of the RIM’s psychometric properties but rather because of the psychologist’s use of the data. Similarly, Meloy, Hansen, and Weiner’s (1997) review of 247 federal, state, and military appellate court cases found that in only 26 cases was the RIM testimony challenged. Of those cases in which testimony was excluded, it was not because of the psychometric properties of the test but rather because of the psychologists’ interpretations (e.g., statements...
irrelevant to the legal issue before the court). When used appropriately, the RIM is both admissible (McCann, 1998) and well accepted for federal, state, military, and appellate court proceedings. In light of these findings, it is reasonable to conclude that the RIM is also appropriate for legal proceedings in schools (Yalof et al., 2001).

**Rorschach Assessment and Intervention Planning**

Once a test proves reliable and valid, the questions most relevant for the school psychologist become, What does this test contribute to assessment (Klieger, 2001) and how can it be helpful? For a child for whom emotional and/or social factors are contributing to and maintaining educational difficulties, RIM information can elucidate the processes of decision making that generate behavior. Particularly when viewed within the context of a student’s behavioral adjustment and family and developmental history, Rorschach assessment can provide information regarding multiple aspects of an individual's personality functioning and serve to identify effective interventions (Bihlar & Carlsson, 2000).

Rorschach data utilized as part of a multimethod assessment strategy inform the clinician’s understanding in several ways. First, RIM variables provide a context for understanding the information obtained from self-report measures. For example, several reasonable interventions could be considered for a child who is not completing school work (Miller, Tansy, & Hughes, 1998) and who also has an elevated “attitude toward school” subscale score on the Behavior Assessment System for Children—2 (BASC-2; Reynolds, & Kamphaus, 2004). The Rorschach may highlight, for example, that the child’s capacity for stress tolerance is being exceeded and is thus interfering with the child’s ability to implement deliberate behaviors. With this knowledge, interventions can be addressed to lowering the child’s level of stress.

Second, RIM assessment can provide an efficient way to collect a standardized behavior sample outside the interview (Viglione & Hilsenroth, 2001), a process often preferable to simply observing a student’s completing a questionnaire (Gacono et al., 2002), or obtaining parent or teacher opinions of the student’s behavior and emotional state. Behavioral observation during administration allows the examiner to determine how the child conceptualizes and approaches his or her environment and provides an opportunity to see at which point the student’s processing breaks down. This process is conceptually parallel to the practice commonly found in cognitive and neuropsychological assessment and analogous to the approach of performance-based assessment delineated by Teglasi (1998). Furthermore, it is this particular approach, absent in self-report measures, that adds incrementally to the assessment process. Self-report measures the way respondents see themselves or like to be seen by others, as opposed to the assessment of affect, behavior, or skill in situ provided through Rorschach assessment.

A third advantage of Rorschach assessment is that the ambiguous nature of the testing stimuli allows for multiple responses. In contrast to self-report measures, Rorschach variables are resistant to respondents’ efforts to minimize difficulties or present themselves in an overly positive light (Bornstein, Rossner, Hill, & Stepanian, 1994; Brems & Johnson, 1991; Ganellen, 1994; Harder, 1984; Shedler, Mayman, & Manis, 1993). This aspect of testing is particularly important because examinees do not have an obvious way to malinger or fake responses.

A fourth advantage relates to the way information from the test helps the psychologist target interventions. Pathogenic process is the understanding of the ways children within the same diagnostic category develop and maintain symptoms that originate from different backgrounds or circumstances (Exner, 2003; Shirk & Russell, 1996). For children to derive maximal benefit from treatment, intervention selection should be based on the child’s specific pathogenic process rather than a simple matching of the diagnosis to “name brand” therapies such as social skills training, cognitive restructuring, or behavior modification (Shirk & Russell, 1996). When looking at group
data, a therapy may have been shown to work (on average) with children who have a certain diagnosis. However, a review of the literature shows that what works best does so for a specific child if the treatment matches the child’s pathogenic process. Treating a child who has depressive symptoms through a cognitive intervention approach, for example, is most helpful if the child’s cognitions have developed and maintained the depressive symptomatology. It is by no means certain, however, that a child experiencing depressive symptoms will have cognitive influences directing the depression. Although self-defeating cognitions may indeed be noted, they may very well be secondary to the true origins of the depression. The school psychologist who limits assessment to self-report data may fail to recognize the complexity of the individual and thus limit the effectiveness of the interventions. Levant (2003) has also addressed this concern and suggests that paradoxically the effort to match treatment to diagnosis without first capturing the uniqueness of the child ultimately limits the potential of efforts to demonstrate that various interventions could be also be effective. Rorschach variables add to our understanding of the entire person, his or her motives, and provide nomothetically based information beyond what is available from diagnosis, self-report, and clinical interview (Gacono et al., 2002).

The practical applications of Rorschach assessment data are myriad. Questions pertaining to eligibility determinations and least restrictive environment can be aided by the use of Rorschach data. For example, changing a student’s special education service delivery model from a self-contained to a resource setting entails a number of considerations, not the least of which is an assessment of the child’s ability to handle increased stress levels and to maintain appropriate peer relationships. Rorschach data interpreted through the Comprehensive System (Exner, 2003) can provide important information about issues of control and stress tolerance, affective features and interpersonal perception, and so forth, which can assist the decision-making process.

Rorschach data could also be of assistance to IEP teams concerning where to place the emphasis in the development of school-based Behavior Plans. Identifying a child who is experiencing difficulty with his thinking in social interactions, for example, can guide interventions that target this issue. Impaired social cognition in an aggressively noncomplaint, excessively self-focused child will require a different type of intervention from that indicated for a child who has impaired social cognition who is emotionally distraught, and is experiencing cognitive disorganization and low self-esteem stemming from a feeling of emotional loss (Gacono & Hughes, 2004). Rorschach data help the school psychologist make these differentiations and provides insight into the unique psychological processes contributing to behaviors. This information can then be used directly to provide important feedback to the child, the child’s parents, teachers, and school administrators.

The school psychologist confronted with a “disruptive” child without a means to assess the child’s experience is clearly limited in his or her effectiveness. A recent experience of one of the authors (Patrick Owen) came from a distressed special education teacher; it involved determining “the reasons, causes and description of behavior” for an emotionally explosive student who is disrespectful of his teachers, disrupts his classroom, and threatens bodily harm to peers, all seemingly without remorse. The question “What sets him off?” is cardinal and one to which Rorschach data in combination with other assessment data could provide important answers concerning the child’s personality vulnerabilities. In the evaluation of this student, for example, a multimethod assessment strategy would be greatly enhanced by specific varieties of Rorschach data. Specifically, information about the student’s affective functioning, including openness to processing emotion and the ability to modulate emotion (complexity of determinants, affective ratio, degree and nature of color responses), along with his capacity for control and stress tolerance (use of form as a determinant, degree and nature of inanimate movement), perception of interpersonal relationships (human percepts, hypervigilance, active-passive and cooperative movement responses) while considering situation-related stress (use of shading determinants, movement and color determinants)
would inform the context of the behavior. This information describes the psychological experience that should be considered along with the child’s observed and reported behavior.

Perhaps no situation in which insight into a child’s behavior and its bearing on a child’s special education status is more important than that which arises during Manifestation Determinations. During these special IEP meetings questions are posed concerning a child’s disruptive behavior and its relationship (or lack of relationship) to the child’s identified disability. The degree to which, for example, a child misperceives events, confuses fantasy with reality, and is vulnerable to emotional arousing situations is important when an IEP team is addressing the issue of whether or not the student’s disability impairs his or her ability to control the behavior that is subject to disciplinary action. Consider, for example, a child who has an emotional disturbance who is involved in a physical altercation. The Rorschach can assess the cognitive processing style (extent of form dominated responses, complexity, accuracy and flexibility of thinking, and reality testing) along with the way the student manages emotionally charged situations (affective controls together with the nature and extent and emotional resources). Specifically, Rorschach can provide information about the nature of the relationship between emotional and cognitive processing for this child to help clarify the manifest behavioral dyscontrol. This information helps the team to clarify the ways the child’s identified emotional disturbance may or may not be related to the involvement in the physical altercation.

Rorschach assessment is a rich source from which to generate hypotheses regarding a child’s behavior. The RIM’s contribution to the understanding of an individual’s unique blend of difficulties, traits, and conflicts is invaluable to the assessment process. It provides types of information found in few, if any, assessment procedures (Exner, 2003). In a time when the behavioral management of children is increasingly giving way to psychopharmacological intervention, RIM assessment can serve to reorient professionals to the child’s individual psychology in order to target interventions to maximize educational gains. The nomothetic information and idiographic information derived via the RIM provide a way to capture the uniqueness of the individual (Exner, 2003).

Conclusions

The Rorschach and Exner’s Comprehensive System meet the current ethical and legal standards for tests (Jacob & Hartshorne, 2003; McCann, 1998; Society for Personality Assessment, 2005). The RIM is psychometrically stable and valid when used in the manner for which it was designed (Piotrowski, 1996; Piotrowski & Keller, 1989; Piotrowski, Sherry, & Keller, 1985). Rorschach information contributes substantially to guiding interventions for children whom school psychologists serve (Janson & Stattin, 2003; Lunardi, 1999; Pierce & Penman, 1998; Smith et al., 1997; Socket, 1998; Stokes et al., 2003; Weber et al., 1992).

It is not enough to know that a child evidences an exceptional characteristic, behavior disorder, or special education disability. Particularly with difficult, refractory cases, school psychologists need to understand the personality characteristics of the child and the way those characteristics impact the child’s social and emotional functioning in schools. Within a multimethod strategy, personality assessment in general (Gacono & Hughes, 2004), and the Rorschach in particular, provide important data for a thorough understanding of the child. The use of Rorschach data can clearly serve school psychologists effectively in their attempts to help children to become successful in school.
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