

Coding Criteria for Potential Rorschach Grandiosity and Narcissism Variables

University of Toledo Psychological Assessment Lab

Gregory J. Meyer, Emanuela S. Gritti, David P. Marino, and Larson E. Sholander

Last Updated January 11, 2021

Introduction:

This manual provides coding guidelines for 11 variables thought to be associated with grandiosity and narcissistic qualities: Omnipotence, Idealization, Personal Knowledge Justification, Expanded Personal Reference, Elevated Mood States, Narcissistic Devaluation, Narcissistic Deflation, Narcissistic Denial, Exhibitionism, Magic, and Reflection. The manual provides a general definition of each variable as well as coding guidelines and example responses. Many of the variables described here have roots in the Rorschach literature already (Omnipotence, Idealization, Elevated Mood States, Personal Knowledge Justification, Exhibitionism, Magic, and Reflection) though the others are new (Expanded Personal Reference, Narcissistic Devaluation, Narcissistic Deflation, and Narcissistic Denial). We may continue to update this coding manual.

Omnipotence (OMP)

Omnipotence coding draws heavily on the criteria developed for the Rorschach Defense Scales (Cooper & Arnow, 1986; Cooper, Perry, & Arnow, 1988). As a defense, omnipotence is seen when a person claims to have or acts as if s/he has unrealistic powers, specialness, influence, or inflated worth in an effort to deal with fears of powerlessness and worthlessness, which are disavowed or denied. As noted by Cooper and Arnow (p. 14), "This may take the form of a conviction that the individual has the right to expect gratification and homage from others or to be somehow treated as a special person. Omnipotence often involves an idealization of the self in which there is an unconscious conviction that one deserves to be lauded by others and treated as privileged." To the original Omnipotence criteria developed by Cooper and Arnow, we have added an aggrandizing form of intellectualization that draws on some of their coding criteria for the Intellectualization defense. In addition, we extended the code to instances in which the person asserts that the task is easy, that the response is obvious, that he or she is doing well, or that the percept looks the way it does because of personal wishes or feelings.

Scoring Criteria (*Italic font indicates our additions or elaborations to Cooper & Arnow*)

- 1) *During either the Response Phase or Clarification Phase*, the individual describes himself or herself with blatant and excessively positive terms. This may take one or several forms.
 - a) Individual makes laudatory remarks to special abilities. References may be made to the self as having special test-taking abilities or special capabilities outside of the testing situation.
 - i) "I think you are going to hear some very distinctive responses. My vocabulary [sic] is such that it will only be truly understandable by the next century."
 - ii) "That looks like a seahorse. Due to my keen sensibilities I can discern that to be an especially pretty seahorse. It might not look like that to many others, however."
 - iii) "I saw some interesting things on that card; that was really quite clever of me. I've always been told I'm quite clever."
 - iv) "I could go on with this all night."
 - v) *"Yes actually it's hard to find me scared of something."*
 - b) Individual sees himself in the actual blot (i.e. percept includes the self) or his possessions and this is elaborated with *positive or* aggrandizing remarks.
 - i) "That looks like me when I was dressed up to go to the prom. I was the prettiest girl at the prom that night."

- ii) *"This looks just like my tongue; this is my tongue... I wonder if this card was modeled after my tongue."*
- 2) In describing the percept the person uses the word "we" in referring to himself as the perceiver. Schafer (1954, p. 241) refers to this as the "editorial we." *It is also known as the "royal we."* In a related manner, code instances when the respondent uses "us" when referring to him or herself as the perceiver. In English, the contraction "let's" often is a contraction for "let me" rather than "let us," such that the phrase "let's see" often is short for "let me see" rather than "let us see." Given this ambiguity, code "let us" but not "let's." The respondent should use this "we" or "us" terminology spontaneously, and thus, coding relevant language typically emerges in the response phase or the initial part of the clarification phase after the response has been read back by the examiner. Finally, it should be clear that the respondent is not making an inclusive reference to the examiner.
- a) *"Here we see a person." (Note: The respondent is not showing the card to the examiner.)*
- b) *"We will say it looks like a snake assuming we are asked to see such things."*
- c) *"Let us move forward to the next card."*
- d) *"Let us find something that's not so disgusting."*
- e) *Below Threshold:*
- i) *This is a big giant from outer space and we're looking upward towards him, from below. (In this context, we assume the "we" is indicating that the two are looking at the card together or collaboratively)*
- 3) The individual "lectures" the examiner on how to improve his testing technique.
- a) *"You might do better doing the pictures first (points to location sheet) and from these you could easily write down what I saw."*
- b) *"You would be able to keep up with me better if you learned shorthand."*
- 4) The individual gives the examiner permission to write something down or to ask various questions, etc., or directs the examiner to do certain things
- a) *"You can write down that I said I was tired of this."*
- b) *"Here's a good one; listen to this."*
- c) *"Just go ahead and ask if you need me to explain that."*
- d) *"Don't write that down." (stated in an assertive way, not anxiously or with embarrassment)*
- 5) The person tells the examiner how to improve the inkblots or what should or should not be included in the inkblot.
- a) *"This card would work better if you moved this section up to the top."*
- b) *"If I was making these cards, I would do it different. There's ways they could be improved."*
- c) *"This is the gray matter of the brain. It resembles the picture in the book I have that have the same shape. Actually the picture [inkblot] should be a little bit different; these points don't make any sense."*
- d) *"It's two bears, but the red should absolutely not be there. It's misguided; a picture of bears should not include these red parts."*
- 6) The individual demonstrates a kind of haughtiness in relation to the examiner with an arrogantly superior and disdainful attitude.
- a) *"I think I've spelled that idea out sufficiently."*
- b) *"If you can't see that now, I don't think I can help you out."*
- 7) The person asserts that the task is easy, asserts that the response is obvious without specification, that he or she is doing well, or that the percept looks the way it does because of personal wishes or feelings. Code the latter for declarations and assertions, not for anxious or hesitant statements. In

addition, the word “obviously” does not automatically indicate OMP. Do not code OMP when the term is identifying an obvious critical bit or key feature as part of a logically explained rationale following a question.

- a) “Oh, here’s an easy one.”
 - b) “Oh yeah, I got a great one here.”
 - c) “I’m impressed that I found that one.” (referring to the response object)
 - d) “I said it looks like a bat because it just does. It’s obvious.”
 - e) “A penis. Definitely that’s what the artist intended.”
 - f) “A woman’s body – it’s obvious, anyone could see it.”
 - g) “Why does it look like a tunnel? Well, because that is what I had in mind.”
 - h) “A landscape.” CP: “I don’t know, it just has the feel of a landscape, that’s all.”
 - i) “A flower.” CP: “Because I want it to be. Flowers always give me a good feeling, so that’s why.”
 - j) Below Threshold:
 - i) “A landscape.” CP: “I don’t know; I guess it has the feel of a landscape. I’m not sure what else to say; it just looks that way to me.”
 - ii) “A flower.” CP: “I’m not sure; maybe flowers are on my mind or something. They do give me a good feeling. Do you see it?”
 - iii) “I said it looks like a bat because ... well, the wings, obviously, and the head and ears here.”
 - iv) “(What about it makes it look like blood?) Oh, red obviously, and it’s dripping down.”
- 8) The person takes “ownership” of a response object by claiming it as a possession. This criterion differs from 1)-b) in that the person is not saying they are seeing one of their actual possessions in the inkblot. Rather, they are identifying an object and then figuratively taking ownership of it by claiming it as a possession.
- a) After describing coyotes in the D7 area of Card I during the response phase, the clarification phase includes: “These are my coyote sentinels on either side.”
 - b) After seeing a boat in the card and without claiming to own a boat, “There’s our boat traveling through the water.”
- 9) The person shows intellectualized and polished verbiage in an attempt to show her alleged knowledge and erudition. This may take the form of presenting the response in an overly technical, scientific, literate, or intellectual way (from Intellectualization: Lerner & Lerner, 1980) or there is an exaggerated striving for aesthetic, historical, or scientific specificity in the content (Schafer, 1954). This includes instances in which technical jargon is used to describe the response such as the naming of animal genera, geologic periods, culturally atypical gods, uncommon anatomy, specific human tribes, or various historical figures: *To qualify the verbalization needs to sound clearly technical, educated, or specialized and not available to common knowledge.*
- a) “Two tragic Kafkaesque figures.”
 - b) “A lateral trilobite from the Cenozoic period.”
 - c) “Here are two homo sapiens with conical craniums and extended gluteals.”
 - d) “Enlongated cylindroids.”
 - e) “Myelinated axons with the typical dendritic branching”
 - f) “Two Theyyam Gods, really look like them, but probably you don’t even know what I am talking about; but they are exactly like them”
 - g) Below Threshold: Terminology that is reasonably part of common knowledge
 - i) “A power station”
 - ii) “A microscope”
 - iii) “A human heart”
 - iv) “The Virgin Mary”

Idealization (IDL)

Idealization coding relies heavily on the Primitive Idealization criteria developed for the Rorschach Defense Scales (Cooper & Arnow, 1986; Cooper, Perry, & Arnow, 1988), which in turn incorporate the Idealization coding criteria developed for the Lerner Defense Scales (Lerner & Lerner, 1980). These criteria also subsume the Grandiosity Content proposed by Berg (1990). As a defense, idealization occurs when a person identifies with unrealistic, all good or powerful objects. As Cooper and Arnow (p. 15) note, "The defensive aim of this aggrandizement of objects is to ensure the individual's protection against 'bad' objects; objects are made so powerful that they cannot be destroyed or harmed by one's own aggression or by that projected onto other objects. Another aim is to vicariously share in the power and greatness of the idealized objects as gratification of one's own narcissistic needs." To Cooper and Arnow's original criteria, we added an element from their Hypomanic Denial coding in which inkblot features are aggrandized, even when the content itself is not.

One of the most challenging aspects of coding Idealization concerns powerful objects. The aim is to code for objects that are powerful in an aggrandized way, as great, strong, larger-than-life, important, heroic, magnificent, or grand, but not to code for objects that are powerful in a dangerous way, as intimidating, feared, malevolent, or aggressive. The intent here is to code for objects aligned with the grandiosity of narcissism rather than the callousness of psychopathy. However, deciphering the line between these can be challenging. In general, objects qualify for the Idealization code when respondents describe them with adjectives suggesting superiority, greatness, excellence, power, largeness, importance, fame, impressiveness, magnificence, specialness, virtuousness, or beauty. In general, objects do not qualify for the Idealization code when respondents describe them with adjectives suggesting threat, danger, maliciousness, aggressiveness, malevolence, or harm. Similarly, if one aggrandized object occurs in a response with a malevolent object the response would not receive an IDL code unless the aggrandizing object was overpowering or overcoming the malevolent object.

Scoring Criteria (*Italic font indicates our additions or elaborations to Cooper & Arnow*)

1) Human, Human-Like, Animal, and Animal-Like Figures

- a) Human figures and animals are described in blatant and excessively positive terms.
 - i) "Two handsome, muscular Russians doing that famous dance."
 - ii) "A seahorse, a beautiful animal in all its splendor and beauty."
 - iii) *"Two fancy women in an argument"*
 - iv) *"A giant [powerful] butterfly"*
 - v) *"A heroic [huge] puppy"*
 - vi) *"A massive [gigantic] guy"*
 - vii) *"A towering figure"*
 - viii) *Below Threshold: "A big elephant," "Crab with a big claw," "Ants are crawling around and they are all happy" [code EMS instead], "Bigfoot [or Yeti]," "Godzilla"; objects that are imposing but dangerous, threatening, or damaged in some way*
- b) Parts of human or animal figures are described in blatant and extreme positive terms, *or object subcomponents are oversized and clearly enhance the object.*
 - i) (Card I) "It looks like a gorgeous female body, so supple, perhaps a ballet dancer."
 - ii) (Card X) "A rippling, muscular arm."
 - iii) (Card III) *"I also see what looks to be a pair of kidneys, for the center red blotches. ... I find the body to be very beautiful; it's a masterpiece if you will."*
 - iv) *"An elk [moose] with huge antlers."*
 - v) *"A bat [rabbit] that has giant ears."*
 - vi) *"Here's a kangaroo with giant legs."*

- vii) *Below Threshold: "It looks like a heavy leg, maybe from a horse."; "A person [caterpillar] with giant feet."*
- c) Human figures or positively described distortions of human form are perceived. This would include officials, figures of fame or strength, athletic superstars (Lerner & Lerner, 1980).
 - i) "Charles de Gaulle."
 - ii) "An astronaut, one of those fellows who landed on the moon."
 - iii) "Jesus Christ."
 - iv) *"Like a rock star; here's his guitar too."*
 - v) *Warrior; General; Knight; Ninja [powerful, aggrandized figures despite links to aggression]*
 - vi) *King; Queen*
 - vii) *Angel*
 - viii) *Below Threshold: "A trumpet player"; "soldier"; "policeman"; "evil queen"; "angel with horns"; "two monks"; "priests"; "Two karate guys"*
- d) Specific great or spectacular animal percepts.
 - i) (Card VIII) "It looks like Mighty Mouse."
 - ii) (Card VIII) "It looks like Rin Tin Tin."
 - iii) *Pegasus; Thunderbird;*
 - iv) *Below Threshold: "A deer or moose with antlers."; "Mickey Mouse"; "Dragon"; "Griffin"; "Minotaur"; "Gargoyle" is typically seen as frightening so it is not coded unless its positive qualities are noted*
- e) Percepts that involve an enhancement of the human form. This rating would include statues of famous figures, giants, supermen, angels, idols, mythological figures, and deities (Lerner & Lerner, 1980).
 - i) "A bust of Queen Victoria."
 - ii) "Powerful beings from another planet ruling over these other creatures."
 - iii) "A bust of Jesus Christ."
 - iv) *"Iron Man," "Wizard," "Super Hero," "Batman"*
 - v) *"Superman's feet"*
 - vi) *"Santa Claus," "Mermaid"*
 - vii) *"Fairy"*
 - viii) *Below Threshold: "The Batman logo"; "The Terminator"; "Looks like a monster to me" (a monster would generally be below threshold, unless the emphasis was on aggrandized qualities over threat potential); Devil, Warlock (enhancement needs to be positive); Troll, Elf, Dwarf, Cupid, or other unelaborated mythological figure not aggrandized or embellished.*

2) Inanimate Objects

- a) Objects described in blatant and excessively positive terms.
 - i) *"A mighty baseball bat."*
 - ii) *"An ornately decorated chair."*
 - iii) *"Beautiful pastel colors"*
 - iv) *"Fancy old dress"*
 - v) *"Giant sunglasses"*
 - vi) *Below Threshold: "A pretty flower"; "It's nice; a nice scene" (Unelaborated use of the words "pretty" or "nice" fall below threshold.)*
- b) Objects that are possessions or part of the apparel or tools of figures of adoration, or strength.
 - i) "A crown, a king's crown."
 - ii) "A crest of royalty."
 - iii) "A castle"
 - iv) *"Chandelier"*
 - v) *Precious stones (e.g., "a diamond," "rubies," "a giant emerald") and metals (e.g., "gold," "a silver pot," "a platinum earring") or "jewels"*

- vi) *“Trophy” or “Medal of Honor”*
 - vii) *“Coat of arms”*
 - viii) *“Chalice”*
 - ix) *“The Holy Shroud”*
 - x) *Aggrandized objects of strength on the border of not being coded due to threat potential:*
 - (1) *“Indian War Bonnet”*
 - (2) *“A Samurai’s sword”*
 - (3) *(Card IV) “A helmet with downturned horns and a nose guard...curves and point at the top look like a decorated and fearsome top.”*
 - (4) *(Card VI) “A decorated shield with a sword on top of it; a coat of arms”*
 - xi) *Below Threshold: “The dress of a can-can dancer”; “a crest of some sort, maybe a school crest that has lions”; “A tomahawk/sword/gun”;*
- c) *Objects that are themselves considered spectacular, magnificent, or venerated as figures of adoration or strength*
- i) *“It’s like the Golden Gate Bridge”*
 - ii) *“A basilica, like the Duomo in Florence”*
 - iii) *“The statue of Christ the Redeemer in Rio”*
 - iv) *“A totem pole, decorated with feathers, sitting on a hill”*
 - v) *“A beautiful painting with colors that provide peace, serenity, and joy”*
 - vi) *“The Star of David”*
 - vii) *“The Statue of Liberty”*
 - viii) *“An Aztec pyramid”*
 - ix) *“A massive starship”*
 - x) *Below Threshold: “A totem pole” (unelaborated), “A fancy building of some sort,” “Abstract art,” unelaborated “Eiffel Tower” to D11 of Card X, unelaborated “Star... the way it’s shaped”; unelaborated spaceship or rocket; “battleship,” “warship,” “jet fighter,” or “modern bomber” (i.e., objects designed for combat); “Mayan ruins” (any object in “ruins” would not qualify, even if once spectacular); objects associated with reverence more than adoration or strength (e.g., Synagogue, Chinese Temple; unelaborated church with a big cross); “Mayan (or Aztec, and the like) building” unless the percept was elaborated in some ornamental manner.*
- d) *Percepts involving spectacular natural phenomena*
- i) *(Card IX) “It looks like the Grand Canyon.”*
 - ii) *(Card X) “A nebula. Different cloud formations which would represent different stages of formation of planets and the solar system.”*
 - iii) *(Card VI) “An aerial view of a giant canyon with a river flowing down it”*
 - iv) *(Card VIII) “A rainbow... all the different colors”*
 - v) *Below Threshold: unelaborated “coral”*

3) Behaviors Towards the Examiner or Testing Procedures

- a) *The individual refers to the examiner, testing procedure, or testing materials in blatantly positive terms.*
 - i) *“You really know how to listen – I wish the other Doctors did as well.”*
 - ii) *“These tests were really amazing – you must have learned so much about me. I know you could help me.”*
- b) *Laudatory remarks toward the tester that appear to serve the function of the individual sharing in the greatness of the idealized tester.*
 - i) *“It’s easy and more productive for me this time around in taking the test. You’re so much more intelligent and sensitive seeming than the other psychologist.”*
- c) *Idealized comments about the inkblot. In these responses, the content itself does not qualify for IDL but the respondent describes the idealized and positive quality of the inkblot image.*

- i) (Card I, side D) *“Witches. They are very well drawn witches.”*
- ii) (Card III) *“Two people fighting. How cleverly conceived and artistically laid out.”*

Multi-object Responses. When one object in a response meets criteria for IDL but another does not (e.g., *“two crabs holding emeralds”*), code IDL so long as the other object is relatively benign or neutral. Do not code IDL if the overall percept conveys a sense of danger or malevolence (e.g., *“bloody ghosts flying around a castle”*).

Personal Knowledge Justification (PER)

(From the R-PAS Manual; Meyer, Viglione, Mihura, Erard, & Erdberg [2011]; pp. 131-132; copyrighted material)

“Personal Knowledge Justification (PER) responses occur when the respondent refers to personal knowledge or experience to justify or bolster a response. Most often the source of knowledge is private and not a source of information that the examiner also shares. Some examples of PER phrasing follow:

- “It’s a tulip. I know they look just like that; we grow them in the backyard.”* PER
- “It looks like a boomerang... Because I’ve used them before and that’s what they look like.”* PER
- “It’s obviously boogers. I know because I have boys.”* PER
- “A fighter airplane. This is not the version they fly today. To get it, you’d have to have studied the difference between the modern and classic fighter plane as I have.”* PER

The requirement that a PER justify or bolster a response is not always easily discernible in response verbiage and behavior. PER is interpreted as representing assertions of personal knowledge to defend one’s self-image in a way that can be perceived as self-centered, boastful, and annoying. It also involves a sense of insecurity, as if one’s descriptions are being challenged. In essence one codes the implied assertion that *“I’m seeing it that way because I have personally seen, heard, touched, tasted, smelled, or otherwise had experience with it.”*

Do not code PER. PERs are not coded when the respondent is clearly just sharing his or her experience with the examiner and trying to make a personal connection. In and of themselves, statements about personal attitudes, interests, likes, and dislikes do not qualify as PER. Thus, one would not code PER for *“The colors are so beautiful that I think of flowers. I like a lot of flowers. I particularly like chrysanthemums.”* Also, do not code PER for simple asides like, *“I must be getting hungry.”* Respondents must clearly be using their personal experience to justify the percept that they described. Examiners generally would not code reference to what the respondent considers to be common knowledge or public facts (e.g., *“It looks like that old-style hair-do they used to wear,”* *“It looks like the dragon from Harry Potter; did you see that movie?”*) unless it is clearly being used as a response justification based on personal knowledge (e.g., *“That looks like Alfred Hitchcock’s head. I’ve seen all of his movies and that looks like him,”* *“Looks like a map of Ireland. I was looking at a map of it just last week.”*).

For similar reasons, simple statements about the test response process or the respondent’s performance, such as, *“I’m seeing a lot of masks,”* *“I’m really nervous about what the test will reveal about me,”* or *“I saw this the last time I took this test”* are not coded PER. Also, statements like *“It’s facing me,”* or *“I’m too scared, I don’t want to look at it any more”* are not PER because the personal comments do not use personal experience to support or justify the response looking the way it does.

Do code PER. Some subtle examples that do cross the threshold are the following, *“It looks just like one of my daughter’s finger-paintings,”* or *“It looks just like my beagle, Trixie.”* Here, even though the respondents do not sound very defensive, they could have said *“a finger-painting”* or even *“a child’s finger-painting”* in the first example or *“a beagle”* in the second example, but instead they offered

personal experience in support of the percepts in a way that made the percepts less vulnerable to dispute or challenge. After all, the examiner – like most other people – is not in a position to say the percept is faulty or flawed because it does not look like her daughter’s finger-painting or the respondent’s beagle.”

Expanded Personal Reference (EPR)

This code reflects an expanded version of the traditional PER coding category. It encompasses seeing oneself in the card (e.g., “That looks like the back of my throat.”), putting oneself into the response in some way (e.g., “It’s like I’m lying on the ground looking up at this giant standing over me.”), linking oneself to the percept (e.g., “It’s a rose. They’re my favorite flower.”), expressing personal feelings about the percept (e.g., “I feel sad about this one; it looks like an animal got hurt.”), and referencing one’s personal experiences related to the percept even if they do not directly justify the percept (e.g., “it looks like pizza. I’d like one right now because I’m hungry.”). The core phenomenon being coded is the notion that “everything relates to me.” This code is almost always accompanied by the first person pronouns “I,” “me,” or “my.”

However, not all uses of a first person pronoun qualify for an EPR code. Do not code references to personal inadequacy or inability (e.g., “I’m not very good at this,” “I’m not very creative”), anxiousness about task performance or evaluation (e.g., “I hope that doesn’t make me sound crazy”; “I’m seeing a lot of animals; is that normal?”), uncertainty about the nature of a percept (e.g., “I’m thinking it’s an alligator but I don’t know the difference between an alligator and a crocodile...”; “A butterfly with funny wings, I’ve never seen one quite like this before”), and comments about the approximate nature of a percept (e.g., “I want to say a heart again. I keep getting images of it but it is not quite complete.”). In addition, do not code the simple self-references that occur when respondents describe what the percept looks like to them (e.g., “To me this looks like...,” “I would say this looks like...”), ask the examiner questions about appropriate task behavior (e.g., “Is it okay if I turn it?,” “Do I have to use the whole thing?”), or indicate when they are finished (e.g., “That’s all I see in that one,” “I know you’d like me to see two or three, but that’s really all I can make out of it.”).

Although it is a subtle difference, if the respondent refers to his or her decision making process in an externalized way where parts of the self are described as autonomous rather than referring to the self as a cohesive agent, code EPR. For instance, code “Because of the curve, my eyes decided these were hands,” but do not code “Because of the curve, I was thinking these were hands.” Similarly, code “My brain decided these are elves,” but do not code “To me these are elves.” Finally, code “A moth; it’s gray like my head pictures moths to be,” but do not code “A moth; it’s gray like I picture moths to be.”

Another subtle distinction has to do with statements about perspective or vantage point. If the respondent places him or herself into the percept, code the response for EPR. However, if the respondent is communicating to the examiner about how to understand the perspective being described, do not code EPR. Thus, code EPR for, “These look like islands in the ocean, like I am [flying/hovering/in the sky] above them” but do not code EPR for, “These look like islands in the ocean, like [I’m looking from above/I’m seeing it from an aerial perspective/you’re looking at a map].” Similarly, code EPR for, “It’s far off in the distance, like I’m here peering at it through the mist” but do not code EPR for, “It’s far off in the distance, like I’m/you’re seeing through a mist.”

Coding EPR also can be complicated when it occurs in the context of circumstantial rambling responses where the respondent’s ideation strays from the Rorschach task onto other topics. Not infrequently, these other topics can be accompanied by personal stories and remembrances. These kinds of derailments away from the task are not coded EPR. However, confusing and loose communications are still coded for EPR if they meet the basic criteria where the respondent links him or herself to the

percept, puts him or herself into the card or into the response in some way, expresses personal feelings about the percept, or references personal experiences related to the percept in ways that do not directly justify the percept. Thus, the following clarification in response to a percept of a jaw with teeth on Card IV is not coded for EPR because the derailed communication about the self does not relate to the percept: "Right here, Louisiana. They got surfing down there, in Mississippi but that's not the way I want the government to think of me. I don't want to get into a cult. Two or three main drives in the computer, I racked up a phone card, a computer energy card, type that in there and randomly ask questions I don't talk to any crazy people on it but still I'm using a code for it, looking at some of the stuff there's China, Brazil, Canada and Niagara." EPR is coded in the following response to Card I, with the relevant text supporting the code in italic font: "It looks like a tarantula on a leaf that I seen on a commercial the other day [PER would be coded here]. And it goes around like that it has these big ol' eye things and this is right there and the reflection makes it look like, the spider and the hair has a face to it and two on each side and long sticks and they are maybe five inches or it looks like a tarantula and uh a with a hand grip wrench or it looks like there's a uh could be coming over a leaf like a leaf in front of it *and it's peeking around at me.* I don't know if this is a study where you need to bring a third or fourth person but this is more intimacy. Yeah it would be a tarantula with the white spots here and the bulb blocked by the leaf. *I get real scared when I see stuff like that.* Can I turn it upside down?" Similarly, EPR is coded in the following clarification for a dragon seen on Card I, with the supporting communication in italic font: "Yeah, see his ears, his eyes and his teeth, and uh... the reason why I see that is because the devil is an ancient serpent, a fiery red and green seven-headed dragon, *that is a serpent (points to card) and that reminded me of him. He is always around me, but he is not bothering me, he is always talking to me telling me to call the sheriff and help me get out of here, but....*"

A final set of distinctions has to do with personal reactions. When the respondent expresses feelings about the percept, the key coding question is whether the reactions are about "it," the object being seen, or "I," the personal feelings and reactions of the perceiver about the object being seen. Code EPR for "This gives me a feeling of an unorganized mess" but do not code EPR for "It's an unorganized mess." Similarly, code EPR for "Internal anatomy... it looks like a medical student made it up; [it's obnoxious to me / I find it obnoxious]" but do not code EPR for "Internal anatomy... it looks like a medical student made it up; [it's obnoxious / it looks obnoxious]." In addition, at times people have reactions to the cards themselves rather than to a percept. This probably occurs most often on Card VIII when people express surprise or pleasure at the fact that the card is so colorful. These spontaneous reactions to the stimuli seem different from the reactions people have to their own responses. Code EPR for the latter, personal reactions to one's productions, but not to the former, reactions to the card in the absence of a response.

Note: If the person actually sees him or herself in the card in a positive or aggrandizing way, code OMP rather than EPR, and if the person is clearly using personal experience to justify why they are seeing the percept, code PER rather than EPR. In addition, if two distinct response verbalizations qualify for more than one code, then assign both codes (e.g., "They look like the kind of penguins I've seen at our zoo [PER]... I feel bad for them [EPR]; they have their heads down like they're sad or dejected.")

General Examples:

- 1) *"The colors are so beautiful that I think of flowers. I like a lot of flowers."*
- 2) *"That looks like ice cream. I must be getting hungry." (Stated with assurance not embarrassment, anxiousness, or muttered to self.)*
- 3) *"It looks pretty much like a heart. Like that Valentine I saw in your waiting room."*
- 4) *"That looks like pain, you know? It reminds me of a bad headache I had earlier today."*
- 5) *"Two people lifting a heavy basket. I hurt my back one time lifting something heavy."*
- 6) *"Looks like an old woman. Kind of reminds me of my mother."*
- 7) *"Sort of looks like a rabbit here. My father was a hunter; we went rabbit hunting once."*

- 8) "A pretty sunset. That's my favorite time of day."
- 9) "That's my anger" (Here the person is seeing himself in the inkblot, but it is not embellished in a positive or aggrandizing way so it does not qualify for OMP.)
- 10) "That's like a boomerang. If I was holding it, I'd hold it right here (demonstrates)."
- 11) "This one looks like a dog. We always had dogs when I was a kid and I still do now."
- 12) "Two black bears. They're my favorite kind of bear."
- 13) "A pretty yellow flower. That might be the best shade of yellow I've ever seen."
- 14) "Two eyes. It looks like they're watching me."
- 15) "A mask. Like if I was wearing it, I'd be looking out of the eye holes here."
- 16) "A monster. I watch a lot of horror movies." (Stated with assurance not embarrassment, anxiousness, or muttered to self.)
- 17) "Looks like the space shuttle. If I were in there, I'd be driving it."
- 18) "Very nice colorful clothes. I always dress up in colors, and the walls of my house are all red and blue."
- 19) "I don't like this. I don't know why I can't say it reminds me of anything but it's sinister or something happening."
- 20) "I see a lot of similarity between these two women. She has more wash than the other. I'd take away symbolism from that. I think things of a symbolic nature register real high with me because I think that should say something."
- 21) "Lungs, kidneys. I'm disappointed I don't see a heart."
- 22) "It reminds me of what I think I might see if I looked under a microscope." (Had the respondent said "It reminds me of what you/someone might see if you/they looked under a microscope" this would not be coded.)
- 23) "Two lions. I'm just such an animal person; I see them everywhere."
- 24) "A kind of bird, very tall, staring straight at me, it is very mad at me. Maybe going to kick something, maybe me."
- 25) "The lady doesn't have a head, but I don't care."

Elevated Mood States (EMS)

The Elevated Mood State variable combines one subcomponent of Pollyannish Denial (#1 below) and two subcomponents of Hypomanic Denial (#2 and #3 below) from the Cooper and Arnow (1986) Rorschach Defense Scales. What these criteria have in common is positive affective states identified in percepts or in the respondent him or herself.

Note that when applying the criteria below, if happy or uplifted characters are also doing something aggressive or destructive, coding can be complicated. If the characters experiencing the affect are unconflicted about what they are doing, code the response EMS. However, if the characters are ambivalent in their experiences or they are not aware of something adverse about to happen to them, do not code EMS. Similarly, if the respondent gives two alternative response options, one of which is EMS and one of which is not (e.g., "Two guys that either look like they're fighting or laughing really hard"), do not code EMS.

Scoring Criteria

(Italic font indicates our additions or elaborations to Cooper & Arnow. Currently, coding is dichotomous, as absent or present, though dimensional coding may be more optimal.)

- 1) Figures are described with an emphasis on fun, pleasure, pleasantness, happiness, and the like. Include figures engaged *together* in activities such as dancing, playing, or relaxing. These kinds of responses should convey the sense of a mildly euphoric affect state. *(This is in contrast to idealization, which refers to the exaggeration of an object's power, worth, or attractiveness rather*

than to its affect state.) *States of relaxation embody states of pleasantness or happiness, not calmness or sleepiness. Objects or figures that could be associated with fun, pleasure, relaxation, happiness, etc. (e.g., "A fireworks display," "A dancer," "A ballroom," "A pretty landscape") but that are not elaborated in a way to indicate the activity or experience of elevated mood is present are not coded. A person or animal smiling is just enough to qualify for the EMS code. However, if it is elaborated in a way to suggest sinister or malevolent intent, if it is diminished in some fashion (e.g., "it has a little smile"), or if it only emerges following a query in the CP, do not code EMS. A single person or animal spontaneously described as dancing also would be enough to qualify for an EMS code. Coding can be uncertain when respondents describe one or more characters as being in a choreographed dance (e.g., "two dancing bears," "like a Rockette kicking her leg up") or ceremonial type of dance (e.g., "people dancing around a fire, like in a ritual"). By default, assume the act of dancing embodies some fun, pleasure, happiness, etc., unless the respondent conveys the objects are engaging in a rote, mechanical, expected, or required activity (e.g., "circus bears, like when they have to dance like that").*

- a) (Card IV) "There is a boy having a lot of fun sitting on a water plug. I mean a fire plug. His feet are in opposite directions. His head is back. I think he is laughing." (Schafer, 1954, p.244).
- b) (Card IX) "Two girls dancing with very full skirts. Their hair is blowing back from their heads. They seem to be enjoying themselves, carefree."
- c) (Card VIII) "Two bears playing together around a tree."
- d) "Two people making love" or "Two people kissing." [Responses describing people involved in such activities qualify for EMS, so long as they appear consensual and pleasurable.]
- e) (Card II) "Two animals giving each other a High-5"
- f) (Card II) "Bears playing patty-cake"
- g) (Card III) "Two people playing drums" or "Two people playing in a band"
- h) (Card IV) "Someone playing hopscotch, jumping."
- i) **Below threshold:**
 - i) (Card II) "Two people sitting, doing the high-five or whatever."
 - ii) (Card VII) "Couple of rabbits laughing at each other." [Laughing with each other would qualify for an EMS code.]
 - iii) (Card III) "Sort of like a comical fat spider smiling, hanging on a web with a bowtie on... it's a mean spider, an insect or alien."
 - iv) (Card II) "Two people shaking hands, maybe kicking their legs together. ...Hands (D4), bumping legs (D3), hands giving high five, legs. Maybe devils."
 - v) (Card II) "Um, 2 clowns in a circus." CP: "This is their heads (D2) the red, eye and eye, their mouth. They're wearing tall dunce caps. They are slapping hands (D4) right here, giving high five. This is their stomach area here, midsection, they are kicking feet down here, some funny thing; their kicking feet explode."
 - vi) (Card III) "Oh I like that, that's nice, I like that... Looks like 2 people with spots from the animals but it's got a stomach to it. And they're women, girls, 2 girls, and they're good looking. And the neck of the animal, they're like a huge fish, they're holding a huge fish and there's a bottle of water and they're trying to crowd something in, but can't quite get it in. But the red colors make sense so they do it anyway smeared on, right? Makes sense with that spot, the picture there. Looks like they're trying to go to sleep. Looks like they're gonna rest their back. Red spots indicate they have a lot of energy left - and they have a head, neck, chest, legs, arms and feet, but it's like a painting and it's trying to do something like not to connect itself..." [This convoluted response indicates the girls 'have a lot of energy left.' However, this is not a clear element of the response and it appears negated by the statement that they are trying to go to sleep.]
 - vii) (Card III) "Red color to me, either a different color, or goes along with the color or its blood or skin. One's a man and one's a girl, fixing something, stirring, something, making love, trying to work, trying to go to bed, and take clothes off and put on floor. They like each

other. Or could be 2 women, and invisible spot is what red colors represent. They have a good imagination..." [Like the previous example, this convoluted and fluid response does not clearly reflect an elevated mood state, despite the reference to making love.]

- 2) *The respondent describes objects as having elevated, buoyant, or hypomanic mood states. This category is a step up in intensity from 1) because it goes beyond simple positive affect, happiness, enjoyment, or fun to more frank hypomania: e.g., increased energy, increased self-esteem, gregariousness, overenthusiasm, restlessness, triumphant attitude or stance. Although rarer, also code instances when objects in the response do not have these states but the respondent expresses these kinds of associations to the object(s) seen in the card.*
- a) (Card III) "Two very confident looking people."
 - b) (Card IV) "A man so full of energy he doesn't know where to go first."
 - c) (Card VII) "Two dancers. They look so happy that they couldn't sit still if they wanted to."
 - d) (Card X) "This person has just had a great idea and he's telling this one."
 - e) (Card III) "Two people dancing to exhaustion."
 - f) (Card X) "A party! Just an explosion of color, energy, and excitement."
 - g) (Card X) "Huh! A party, a lot of stuff, a lot of activity going on. Energy. Life. A lot of activity, a lot of things going on."
 - h) (Card III) "An orchestra leader who is passionate about it...The red is the passion."
 - i) (Card V) RP: "Rio de Janeiro, Mardi Gras parade." CP: "(ERR) R: Girls dressed with feathers, capes partying down the street, legs (D9), headdress (Dd34), face, big wings (D4), grand, show stopper, Las Vegas showgirl, basic proportion of a woman, Mardi Gras, and portraying self like she could fly." [In this response, the parade and girls partying down the street are associations to the figure perceived, though not actually seen in the card.]
- 3) *The respondent expresses feelings of positive, elevated, or euphoric mood. This would include overt reference to feeling happy, cheerful, self-confident, etc., as well as behavioral expressions of positive affect including talking excitedly, loud and lighthearted exclamations, and cheerful laughter. However, do not code EMS simply for laughter on its own, because laughter can be a sign of embarrassment, nervousness, or another emotion unrelated to positive affect. To code laughter the expression must clearly be cheerful, pleasant, enjoyable, playful, or fun.*
- a) (Prior to Card I) "I know I'm going to enjoy this because I'm in such a good mood."
 - b) (Card X) "I'm glad to see this one. It makes me feel good. It's just how I feel – full of light and sunshine."
 - c) (Card III) "A raccoon (stated excitedly)! Ok that might be a raccoon. What else do I see?"
 - d) (Card I, R1) "An inkblot (laughs). I'd say a locust, or some kind of flying insect." [Unless the examiner noted as a nervous or uncomfortable laugh, it is most likely an attempt to be funny by stating the obvious.]
 - e) (Card IV) "I never did these before – it's kind of exciting. Oh, this is a good one. Looks like a giant skin from a giant monster, really huge." [Saying "this is a good one" also qualifies this response for the Pleasant or Appealing Expressions code.]
 - f) (Card IV) "I don't know, oh, bigfoot when he just woke up in the a.m. hee hee. Yes, I do believe in bigfoot."
 - g) (Card IV) "Bird. Laid on his back, head (D3), wings (D4), don't ask me where his feet (D6) are, I don't know, looks like comical, wants someone to scratch his belly (scratches card and laughs)."

Narcissistic Devaluation (NDV)

Narcissistic devaluation is coded in instances when narcissistically invested or embellished objects (e.g., grand, idealized, valuable, attractive, appealing, important, magical, magnificent, elegant, special) or otherwise positive and appealing objects are also devalued, dismissed, or denigrated. In essence an

object of beauty or strength is tarnished or described in pejorative, critical ways. This includes instances when otherwise positive or appealing objects have disfiguring or disturbing attributes added (e.g., *“a sexy woman but she has the head of a gorilla”*). Thus, one would not code *“an ugly dog,”* but one would code *“a stupid giant.”* The “ugly dog” captures a negative image, but it does not relate specifically to narcissistic dynamics because a dog on its own is not a clearly positive or appealing object. On the other hand, the “stupid giant” is a more specific devaluation of a larger than life object. Simple amalgams of incongruous object features (e.g., *“a raccoon head with chicken wings,” “two people with the heads of a chicken,” “a weird bat with a slug mouth”*) are not coded. Similarly, conflicting imagery in a percept that is generally malevolent, dangerous, or aversive would not be coded (e.g., RP: *“A beautiful costume with two ugly blue spiders on it.”* CP: *“It looks like a monster, see here’s the head and the legs here; the spiders are part of the costume. He’s like evil and he wants spiders over him.”*).

One of the challenges with the NDV code is differentiating narcissistic devaluation from general devaluation, where any object can be denigrated or devalued. For narcissistic devaluation it is important that the object being devalued or denigrated is positive or appealing. This is fairly easy to do when the objects are embellished as special or important in some way. It is less easy to do when the objects are not. The standard here is to think of what most people would consider positive and appealing rather than neutral or mixed. On the Rorschach some of the more common generally positive or appealing images are flowers and butterflies, as most people like them and find them pleasant. (The common giants, angels, and wizards qualify because they possess special or enhanced attributes). However, other commonly seen objects do not carry general appeal or specialness, including a person, bear, bat, pelt, crab, or tree. These affectively mixed or neutral objects would not be assigned an NDV code unless they were invested or embellished in some fashion.

General Examples:

- 1) *“An ugly flower.”*
- 2) *“This here looks like a flat-chested princess.”*
- 3) *“A fancy woman with breasts, high-heeled shoes, and a bird’s beak for a mouth.”*
- 4) *“A disgusting-looking piece of modern architecture.”*
- 5) *“It looks like a wizard wearing a dunce cap.”*
- 6) *“Like some royal guy with a red robe and silver crown holding ridiculous looking blue pom-poms.”*
- 7) (Card IV) *“It looks like a man who everybody thinks is great but I think he stinks.”*
- 8) *“A graceful manta ray with some ugly tumor down here.”*
- 9) *“An aristocratic looking old woman with sagging aboriginal breasts.”*
- 10) *“(RP:) JFK in profile. (CP:) I see the chin, mouth, nose, the shape of the hair – I guess I’m thinking of him after the assassination with the back of his head blown off.”*
- 11) Below Threshold:
 - a) *“A humpback”*
 - b) *“A disgusting picture; just looks like chaos.”*

Narcissistic Deflation (NDF)

Narcissistic Deflation captures instances when objects are missing a key part of their identity (e.g., *“A bird without wings”*), possess deflated or impotent parts (e.g., *“A giant with tiny limp arms”*), or are described as being in the process of dying, decaying, deteriorating, or eroding. The idea here is to code imagery of inadequacy, ineptitude and incompleteness. In many respects, this code captures instances when a sentient object would likely feel ashamed of itself if it were on display, such as *“a deer with broken antlers.”* Objects that have clearly been aggressed upon (e.g., *“a guy with his head blown off”*) would not be coded.

Note: To help differentiate NDV and NDF, recognize that Deflation aims to code shame and impotence rather than denigration or disgust. Interpretively, with NDF we assume the perceiver identifies with the percept more directly than in the distancing disgust-like reaction that is presumed with devaluation. Also, assigning an NDF code does not rule out also assigning an IDL code (e.g., *“An angel with broken wings”*).

General Examples:

- 1) *“A bird without wings.”*
- 2) *“A woman, but she’s lacking breasts”*
- 3) *“A body without a backbone.”*
- 4) *“A headless person.”*
- 5) *“King Kong but without arms.”*
- 6) *“A teapot without its spout.”*
- 7) *“A snail that lost his shell.”*
- 8) *“Like a mountain peak, but the ridges are eroding away.”*
- 9) *“Two busts; here is the neck, bent forward like an old lady that has osteoporosis.”*
- 10) *“It looks like a cedar tree. Like what you would see on the flag of Lebanon... sort of a tree that has been cut down; it has lost a lot of its mass.”*
- 11) *“A tree that lost its leaves”*
- 12) *“I’m seeing a tower in the distance, a castle, on top of a mountain... The castle is precarious... it looks like it could tip off of the mountain. Everything around it has been worn away or destroyed.”*
- 13) *“A deer without his antlers.”*
- 14) *“Upside down butterfly (does not turn the card). CP: Here is the little antennas, wings, the tail; the wings are not complete, it seems big parts are missing.”*
- 15) *“A very large scary monster; like you’re looking up and its towering above you... it has these flimsy arms. They are kind of... there’s a contradiction there. They don’t fit the object. You’d expect the monster to have stronger arms. Maybe, I don’t know, maybe it’s weaker than it appears.”*
- 16) *“I see a stem that got broken off; it’s small and it’s supposed to be big.”*
- 17) *“A melting iceberg with faded colors”*
- 18) *Below Threshold:*
 - a) *“A bear without a tail”*
 - b) *“A cat that’s been run over and flattened by a truck or something”*
 - c) *“A fall leaf with a hole in it”*
 - d) *A bloody, injured bird that needs urgent care.”*

Narcissistic Denial (NDN)

Narcissistic Denial (NDN) captures instances in which the individual implicitly aims to preserve a positive or inflated perception by denying or minimizing the impact of perceptions connected to themes of weakness, vulnerability, fragileness, inferiority, or unattractiveness. This definition includes depression and dysphoric states but not aggressive, dangerous, or malicious qualities

Scoring Criteria

- 1) *A percept of weakness, vulnerability, fragileness, inferiority, or unattractiveness is negated or its significance is actively diminished:*
 - a) *“This person is not desperate”*
 - b) *“This animal has not been abandoned”*
 - c) *“This is not an ugly butterfly”*

- d) *"It looks like a girl crying. She is not really crying, probably she is just acting."*
 - e) *"This person is bleeding but doesn't feel any pain."*
- 2) *A percept or response clearly presents features of weakness, vulnerability, fragileness, inferiority, or unattractiveness but is also described or further elaborated in contradictory positive terms:*
- a) *"(on an achromatic card) This is all black... it's a dark and gloomy thing... But actually black is the combination of all the colors so in fact it doesn't upset me but is also pretty cool."*
 - b) *"This man is old and sick but he also looks very rich and powerful."*
 - c) *"A nice broken dress."*
- 3) *Material in the response connected to weakness, vulnerability, fragileness, inferiority, or unattractiveness is minimized by resorting to humor or by placing the imagery in a funny or lighthearted context:*
- a) *"This is a very sad and desperate face, maybe she is screaming. But actually her features are so contracted that it is kind of comic and hilarious looking."*
 - b) *"That's the dead body of a woman. But not scary or sad; it's kind of funny, like from the Corpse Bride movie."*

NDN is different from criterion A of OMP (e.g., *"Yes actually it's hard to find me scared of something"*) because NDN is coded for features of the percept while OMP is coded for references to the individual him or herself.

Exhibitionism (EXH)

Wagner (1965, p. 523) originally defined exhibitionistic responses that were limited to humans engaged in movement; "An exhibitionistic M was operationally defined as a human movement response which involved an activity performed for the benefit of an audience (e.g., skating, dancing, playing an instrument) and/or an exhibitionistic enhancement of the individual through costuming, adornment, or other external trappings (e.g., 'dressed in costume for a ball', 'decked out in his Sunday best', 'wearing tight treading pants')." Note that the last three examples could entail objects that do not qualify for a human movement code. Our expanded coding encompasses non-M responses consisting of objects that are designed for display to an audience or actually on display to an audience, such as "a symphony conductor," "a movie star," "a can-can dancer," "a rock star," "A showgirl with a large dress. It looks like a swallow tail dress," "two Japanese showgirls," "a peacock; here's his tail feathers," or "A ballerina." We also code mirroring responses where the audience and the object are the same, such as "a weightlifter checking himself out in the mirror" or "a bear doing dance moves in front of a window or mirror; he can see himself."

As indicated by the last example, coding is not limited to human objects, such that percepts of "A show dog strutting his stuff," "Big blackbirds taking a bow," or "Bears doing a choreographed dance" would qualify. Even inanimate objects could qualify if they are clearly on display or for display. So "a carved bust sitting on a pedestal" or "a beautiful painting ready for hanging on a museum wall" would qualify, though a simple picture, painting, or sculpture would not.

"Clowns" qualify for EXH only if clearly in a context of being on display or for show, rather than scary; a "clown face" generally would not qualify. A "mask" on its own (e.g., "Looks like a tribal mask of some sort.") generally would not qualify because it is designed to hide rather than exhibit the wearer. However, a mask would be coded if it was elaborated in a way that indicated it was for a performance or a party (e.g., "An elaborate mask, like one made to wear at Carnival").

Characters described as engaging in an activity that may or may not be for display to an audience (e.g., “dancing,” “skating,” “playing drums,” “fighting,” “wrestling”) would not be coded unless the context clearly indicated or implied it was for the benefit of an audience. However, characters described as being in costume would be coded by default because costumes are for the benefit of an audience (e.g., “A woman wearing a costume; she’s got like butterfly wings and frilly antenna on her head.”).

Costumes and dresses that clearly are designed for display are coded even if they are not being worn, such as “a bustier dress; it is very beautiful but has to be saved for parties and special occasions” or a “feminine dress, the dress of a can-can dancer.” Code tuxedo if it is specified in a way that suggests it is for a special occasion for the wearer (e.g., a wedding tuxedo), but not for the tuxedo of a waiter or maître de, or an unspecified tuxedo.

Magic (MAG)

This code was first articulated by Homann (2013) in her study of omnipotence. It encompasses Magical Figures and also Objects Associated with Magic. Magical Figures include wizards, witches, magicians, sorcerers, genies, *witch doctors*, *exorcists*, *shamans*, or other figures engaged in magic, telepathy, *mind-reading*, *sorcery*, or *casting spells*. *Spirits (including ghosts, demons, sprites, and fairies)*, *gnomes (including trolls, elves, and goblins)*, and *mythical beings (including dragons and unicorns)* are not coded unless they are attributed magical abilities. Objects Associated with Magic include all the clothing, buildings, *utensils*, or objects associated with any of the objects coded above (*witch’s hat*, *wizard’s cape*, *witch’s broom*, *sorcerer’s wand*, *amulet*, *magic bottle*, magical object) or specifically identified as having magical or supernatural power. *Note that MAG does not differentiate between malevolent and benevolent objects.*

Reflection (r)

(From the R-PAS Manual; Meyer et al. [2011]; pp. 110-111; copyrighted material)

Reflection is coded when a response contains an object and its symmetrically-identified mirror image or reflection; e.g., “a bear stepping across rocks and water; here’s his reflection in the water (to the W of Card VIII)” or “a woman looking at herself in the mirror (D9, Card III).” When a Reflection is coded, a Pair is not coded for the same objects.

Some reflection codes directly involve the representation of a person or animal viewing itself in a reflective surface. Such responses might suggest a need for mirroring affirmation or a self-centered view in one’s processing, much like in the myth of Narcissus. It is not clear whether the common landscape reflections given with the card turned sideways involve a less obvious expression of the same phenomenon.

Reflection is coded when a response contains an object and its mirror image or reflection. The most common Reflection occurs when the respondent turns Card VIII sideways and reports a reflection of a landscape scene. This response may or may not include the animal at D1 reflected in the water. Other examples of Reflection responses include “a woman looking at herself in the mirror (D9, Card III)” or “a steamboat and its reflection (Card IV, sideways).” Like a Pair, a Reflection must be based on the symmetry of the card so that the response objects are identical and seen on opposite sides of the vertical midline; that is, the response object and its reflection are at the same location on the either side of the card (e.g., Card VIII, animal and its reflection at D1). Thus, with the card upright, a reflection is “horizontal” on the left and right but not “vertical” in the up and down plane, so that “a butterfly (Card III, D3) reflected in water (D7)” is not coded.

In many cases, Reflection responses are quite obvious, for example “*a person and her reflection*” to the two D9’s on Card III. In some cases, however, the words, “reflection” or “mirror,” may simply refer to the symmetry of the blot. When one is not sure whether there is a Reflection (e.g., “*a person and a mirror image; yeah two of them*”), one should require that the reflective surface (e.g., water or mirror, etc.) be mentioned if the coding ambiguity is not spontaneously eliminated in other ways. **When Reflection is coded, a Pair is never coded.**

Reflection Subtypes

Because the R-PAS manual (Meyer et al., 2011) indicates that Reflection is sensitive to card orientation, with many more given when the card is seen in the sideways orientation, the authors suggested interpretation may be more valid when the response process is more clearly affirming of narcissistic mirroring. To evaluate this, reflection subtypes can be created for research. The five that have been used by us in previous research (e.g., Gritti, Marino, Lang, & Meyer, 2018) are Reflections with a sentient object present (*r-Sentient*), with a human being present (*r-Human*), with the card in the upright orientation (*r-Upright*), with an object looking at itself reflected (*r-Looking*), and both with the card in the upright orientation and with an object looking at itself reflected (*r-UpLook*).