



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Card pull effects of the Thematic Apperception Test using the Social Cognition and Object Relations-Global Rating Method on complex psychiatric sample

Jeremy M. Ridenour¹  | Katie C. Lewis¹ | Caleb J. Siefert² | Seth R. Pitman¹ | Daniel Knauss¹ | Michelle B. Stein³ 

¹Erikson Institute for Education and Research, Austen Riggs Center, Stockbridge, Massachusetts, USA

²Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of Michigan-Dearborn, Dearborn, Michigan, USA

³Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Correspondence

Jeremy Ridenour, Erikson Institute for Education and Research, Austen Riggs Center, 25 Main Street, Stockbridge MA 01262, USA.
Email: jeremy.ridenour@austenriggs.net

Abstract

In recent years, there has been growing interest in examining the stimulus pull effects on respondent narratives to the Thematic Apperception Test (Murray, 1943) using standardized coding methods such as the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale-Global Rating Method (SCORS-G; Stein, Hilsenroth, Slavin-Mulford, & Pinsker, 2011; Westen, 1995). The present study expands on prior work by examining sources of variance in SCORS-G dimensions and card pull effect patterns in an adult clinical sample characterized by high psychiatric comorbidity and clinical severity. A sample of 158 adult psychiatric patients in long-term residential treatment provided narratives to 10 TAT cards (five of which have not previously been studied for pull effects). Cards 2 and 7BM pulled for significantly more adaptive narratives (positive pull), whereas Card 13MF pulled for more pathological stories (negative pull). Like prior studies, variance in cognitive dimensions of the SCORS-G was most explained by person effects, whereas the largest source of variance for all other dimensions was best explained by a combination of the card and the person effects on the narrative. Finally, exploratory analyses of card pull effects within different gender groups were conducted. The implications of these findings for performance-based future studies and possible clinical applications of card pull findings are discussed.

KEYWORDS

card pull, gender effects, performance-based assessment, SCORS-G, TAT

1 | INTRODUCTION

The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT; Murray, 1943) is one of the most commonly used performance-based measures of personality in clinical practice (Mihura, Roy, & Graceffo, 2017), often being used in conjunction with empirically supported scoring systems assessing social cognition, object relations (Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014) and defense mechanisms (Cramer, 1991). Murray (1943) intentionally sought to include cards within the TAT that differed with regard to evocative thematic content. Nonetheless, early

theorists (e.g., Rapaport, 1952) argued that performance-based tests like the TAT act as a neutral field onto which respondents "project" aspects of their inner world. Contemporary personality research has, however, increasingly shown that respondents' narratives are influenced by a range of factors, including the properties of the card. The purpose of this paper is to build on prior research in this area by examining card pull effects and factors influencing narratives in a clinical sample to determine if findings from prior work hold in a sample characterized by high psychiatric comorbidity. This can assist clinicians working within these populations in determining if findings

from studies involving outpatient and nonclinical samples have implications for their work.

2 | THE TAT AND THE SCORS-G

The Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale–Global Rating Method (SCORS-G; Stein & Slavin-Mulford, 2018; Westen, 1995) is a clinically oriented rating system that assesses social cognition and relational schemas across eight dimensions; it represents one of the most popular current scoring methods for the TAT (Mihura et al., 2017; Stein & Siefert, 2018). The eight dimensions are complexity of mental state representation (COM), clarity of logic underlying social causality (SC), the quality of the relationships (AFF), investment in relationships (EIR) investment in moral standards (EIM), management of aggression (AGG), self-esteem (SE) and identity coherence (ICS). Previous studies have investigated the factor structure of the SCORS-G (Bram, 2014; Lewis et al., 2016; Siefert et al., 2018; Stein, Slavin-Mulford, Sinclair, Siefert, & Blais, 2012). Whereas some studies have found support for a three-factor model (Stein et al., 2012): cognitive dimensions (COM and SC), other-relational (AFF, EIR, EIM, AGG) and a self-relational component (SE and ICS), other studies (Bram, 2014; Lewis et al., 2016) have yielded support for a two-factor model: cognitive (COM and SC) and affective-relational (AFF, EIM, EIR, AGG, SE and ICS). Siefert et al. (2018) found that both a two- and three-factor model produced good-to-adequate fit for the SCORS-G, although they recommend the two-factor model, which will be used for this study. To date, three studies have evaluated TAT card pull effects using the SCORS-G system. These studies have shown that person factors (e.g., the psychological characteristics of the individual), card factors (e.g., features of the stimulus) and the interaction between the two contribute to variance in SCORS-G ratings in both adults and children (Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014). Findings have suggested that variance in scales assessing cognitive dimensions of relational schemas are best explained by person factors whereas variance in affective-relational elements is better explained by card by person interactions.

3 | THE SCORS-G AND CARD PULL ON THE TAT

The phenomenon of “card pull” refers to the ways in which the visual properties of test stimuli (such as the images on the TAT cards) may evoke particular perceptual and affective responses, independent (at least partially) of the psychological characteristics of the examinee (Peterson & Schilling, 1983). From a clinical standpoint, identifying card pull effects serves to increase validity and accuracy of test interpretation by establishing whether examinee scores represent a “typical” versus atypical response (Kelly, 1999). Knowledge that a given TAT card often “pulls” for aggressive narrative themes, for example, may temper interpretations that assign an undue degree of importance to aggression for that particular card.

Key Practitioner Message

- Different TAT cards exert different “card pull” as assessed by the SCORS-G rating system, with Card 2 exhibiting the most consistent pull for adaptive narratives and 13MF showing the most consistent pull for more pathological ones within the study card set.
- The cognitive dimensions of the SCORS-G (complexity of mental states and understanding of social causality within the narrative) are more strongly influence by individual narrator characteristics, whereas other affective-relational dimensions are affected more by the stimulus properties of the cards.
- Within male and female participant groups, different patterns of pull effects emerged for different cards, suggesting that clinicians should consider the gender of examinees when selecting TAT card sets in order to minimize the potential of introducing bias.

Stein et al. (2014) first used the SCORS-G to identify sources of variance in ratings and examine card pull. Using a sample of adult outpatients, they identified several cards showing significant pull effects across the eight SCORS-G dimensions. Card 2, for example, pulled for more adaptive narratives (i.e., higher dimension ratings) across several SCORS-G dimensions, Cards 3BM and 13MF pulled for more pathological narratives, Card 1 was neutral across all dimensions and Card 12M was also neutral across all dimensions except for a positive pull for EIR.

Since Stein and colleagues initial study, other investigators have reported similar findings in different populations using diverse card sets. Siefert et al. (2016) replicated several of these findings using a nonclinical undergraduate sample: Card 2 once again was found to pull for more adaptive ratings (e.g., AFF, EIR, SE and ICS), whereas Card 3BM pulled for more maladaptive ratings. Siefert et al. (2016) found that the interaction between person by card effects accounted for the greatest proportion of variance for affective-relational dimensions whereas cognitive dimensions were more influenced by person factors. Auletta et al. (2018) extended work in this area by replicating findings in a nonclinical sample of children (between ages 7 and 13). Their card set included four TAT cards (Cards 1, 2, 3BM and 4) that had been used in earlier card pull studies (Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), as well as two cards that had not previously been examined (Cards 8BM and 16). They similarly found large proportions of person-level variance in cognitive dimensions (i.e., 40% for COM and 49% for SC), although in contrast to earlier studies, person by card interactions produced the largest variance estimates for all SCORS-G dimensions. O’Gorman, Cobb, Galtieri, and Kurtz (2020) have extended this work and applied the SCORS-G to the Picture Story Exercise card set (Smith, Atkinson, McClelland, & Veroff,

1992). The pattern of findings in terms of variance remained consistent with earlier studies: person effects explained as much variance in the cognitive dimensions as did person by card interactions. For the affective-relational SCORS-G dimensions, person by card interactions accounted for the largest amount of variance. Findings from these card pull studies can aid clinicians when they select cards from the TAT set and also guide interpretations. For instance, if on Card 2, a patient told a story about a depressed young woman who was thinking about leaving school after failing her exam, this would be considered unusual given that Card 2 tends to pull for more globally positive ratings, especially on the identity scale (i.e., the stories tend to focus on a young woman who is balancing her educational aspirations with family responsibilities).

4 | THE CURRENT STUDY

Previous TAT card pull studies have largely replicated findings across diverse samples. Findings have been most consistent in terms of identifying sources of variance: cognitive dimensions of the SCORS-G system have repeatedly shown higher person-level variance component estimates, indicating these dimensions are influenced primarily by the capacity of the individual participant. In other words, when participants generate a story on the TAT, the relative intricacy of the characters' mental states and soundness of the underlying social logic of the narrative are likely to be consistent within individual participants across the card set, regardless of the individual card content. In contrast, for the affective-relational dimensions, person by card interactions have produced consistently larger variance component estimates, suggesting that these dimensions (e.g., emotional investment in relationships) speak more to the individual participant's characteristic responsiveness (person) to specific kinds of emotional stimuli (card), or their context-specific relational and emotional adaptations. At this point, however, only one study has utilized a clinical sample (comprising mainly of psychiatric outpatients) to evaluate pull effects (Stein et al., 2014). It is possible these findings may not replicate in clinical samples characterized by higher clinical severity (Buer Christensen et al., 2020).

Our goal in the current study was to determine whether previous findings would replicate to a large clinical adult sample characterized by high psychiatric comorbidity and clinical severity, in which the precision of personality assessment findings may carry more significant impact on treatment planning and monitoring of change over the course of treatment. We examined pull effects using a TAT card set that overlapped with cards used in prior studies while also examining additional commonly used cards not previously evaluated (i.e., Cards 7BM, 18GF, 12F and 5; Aronow, Weiss, & Reznikoff, 2001; Bellak & Abrams, 1997; Cramer, 2017). An additional card (Picasso's La Vie), which was part of an earlier TAT card set (Morgan, 2003), was also evaluated, as it was included in the standard card set used at the data collection site and is still in use in other clinical settings. Finally, given that certain cards in the TAT are intended to be administered to participants based on gender (Murray, 1943), we were interested in

exploring whether patterns of pull effects would differ within different gender groups; this is the first study to our knowledge to examine within-gender patterns of TAT card pull effects using the SCORS-G system.

Based on prior studies, we hypothesized that variance in cognitive SCORS-G dimensions would be best explained by person effects whereas the majority of variance in the affective-relational dimensions would be explained by interactions between person and card effects. Consistent with the findings of Stein et al. (2014), we hypothesized that Card 2 would pull for more adaptive ratings, 13MF would pull for more pathological ratings and 12M would demonstrate neutral pull effects across SCORS-G dimensions and on the global dimension. Our expectations for patterns of pull effect within men and women were left exploratory.

5 | METHOD

5.1 | Participants

The sample was comprised of 158 adult psychiatric patients enrolled in long-term residential treatment in the northeastern part of the United States. All patients admitted to the treatment centre between 2015 and 2017 who had complete TAT data in their medical records were included (data from only two patients were omitted based on this criteria). Permission to access subject medical records to obtain demographic information and psychological testing data for the current study was granted by the treatment centre's Institutional Review Board. The final sample consisted of 87 female patients (M age = 32.90, SD = 13.89) and 71 male patients (M age = 33.46, SD = 12.50), two of which identified as transgender men. The sample identified predominantly as European American (92.4%) and single (74.1%); 77.2% of participants reported at least one inpatient hospitalization. The most common principal diagnoses were depressive disorder (24.7%), unspecified/other specified personality disorder (23.4%), borderline personality disorder (17.7%), bipolar disorder (8.2%) and schizophrenia spectrum and other psychotic disorders (7.0%). On average, each patient carried 3.9 DSM-5 diagnoses (SD = 1.6); 79% of participants carried at least one personality disorder diagnosis. Clinical diagnoses were assigned to participants by the psychiatrist and psychotherapist during the first 6 weeks of treatment using the Longitudinal, Expert, All Data (LEAD) diagnostic standard (Pilkonis, Heape, Ruddy, & Serrao, 1991; Spitzer, 1983).

5.2 | Procedures

All patients were administered a battery of psychological tests that included the TAT within the first 5 weeks of treatment as a part of routine clinical practice. All TAT narratives were recorded and transcribed verbatim and rated according to the SCORS-G training manual (Stein et al., 2011). All variance component analyses were conducted

in SPSS Version 23 (IBM). Variance component analyses were conducted in accordance with Generalizability Theory (Brennan, 2001; Shavelson & Webb, 1991). This approach employs a two-facet (in which 51 participants were rated by all raters and completed all cards) random model with ANOVA (Type I) estimation (Brennan, 2001; Shavelson & Webb, 1991). This yields variance component estimates at the person level (p), rater level (r), and card level (c), as well as all two-way interactions (e.g., pr , pc and cr). The remaining residual variance is composed of error and the three-way interaction between person, rater and card.

5.3 | Measures

The TAT was administered in accordance with the procedures and guidelines outlined by Murray (1943). TAT cards were administered in the following sequence: 1, 5, 14, Picasso's La Vie ("Picasso Card"), 13MF, 12M, 2 and 18GF to all 158 subjects. Finally, Card 12F was only administered to female patients ($n = 87$) and 7BM only to male patients ($n = 71$). The SCORS-G rating method (Stein & Slavin-Mulford, 2018; Stein et al., 2011) is a rating system applied to narrative material that assesses facets of object relations and social cognition. The system is composed of eight dimensions scored on a 7-point rating scale, with lower scores indicating more pathological responses and higher scores indicating more adaptive responses (see Table 1 for scale descriptions). Multiple dimensions have a default score: AFF (4), EIR (2), EIM (4), AGG (4), SE (4) and ICS (5), if the specific narrative does not contain content deemed relevant to that dimension. For instance, if the story does not mention the emotional state of the characters, it would be given a '4' (default score) on AFF for lack of affective content. A global score representing overall adaptation and maturity of object representations is calculated by averaging dimension scores across all eight SCORS-G dimensions (Siefert et al., 2016). Previous empirical studies have identified significant associations between SCORS-G dimensions and clinical constructs related to personality psychopathology, interpersonal functioning, suicidality and change over the course of clinical treatment (see Stein & Slavin-Mulford, 2018, for a review). For the present study, two undergraduate psychology students were trained as raters for the SCORS-G under the supervision of a psychologist with considerable clinical and research experience with the TAT and SCORS-G rating system. Raters were blind to all identifying information and participant diagnoses. Raters completed a nine session training seminar utilizing the training manual and practice protocols outlines by Stein et al. (2011). At the end of the nine sessions, raters had met the desired reliability goal of intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) > 0.60 for all eight SCORS-G dimensions both with the expert protocol ratings provided by Stein et al. (2011) as well as with each other. Raters then corated a subset of 51 TAT protocols from the current study to establish interrater reliability; ICC values were calculated every 10–15 protocols to identify and address rater drift as needed and raters met periodically to discuss and resolve coding issues. The remaining study protocols were divided randomly between the two raters.

TABLE 1 Description of the SCORS-G dimensions

Dimension	Abbreviation	Description
Complexity of representations of people	COM	The mental boundaries and complexity of mental states of self and other
Affective quality of representations	AFF	The affective quality of relational experiences and expectations
Emotional investment in relationships	EIR	The emotional sharing and reciprocity in relationship
Emotional investment in values and moral standards	EIM	The investment in conventional moral standards
Understanding of social causality	SC	The capacity to realistically understand and predict the correlates and consequences of social behaviours
Experience and management of aggressive impulses	AGG	The capacity for adaptive expression and management of aggression
Self-esteem	SE	Realistic self-appraisal and sense of self-worth
Identity and coherence of self	ICS	The stability and coherence of self-concept

6 | RESULTS

6.1 | Descriptive statistics and reliability

Means, standard deviations and interrater reliability coefficients are listed in Tables 2 and 3. ICC estimates were calculated using SPSS Version 23, using a two-way random-effects (2, 1) model with absolute agreement (see Table 2). Specific dimension ICC values for corated protocols ranged from 0.58 (SC) to 0.82 (EIM) with an overall mean of 0.68 across the eight SCORS-G dimensions, suggesting moderate-to-good levels of interrater reliability (cf. Cicchetti, 1994).

Variance component analyses for the eight SCORS-G dimensions for all corated protocols ($n = 51$) are reported in Table 4. Raters accounted for a small percentage of the variance (ranging from 1% to 9%). Interactions between rater and card ($r \times c$) and rater and participant ($r \times p$) generally contributed little variance. Consistent with past studies (Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), the majority of the variance for COM and SC was accounted for by person effects (32% and 27%, respectively). For the affective-relational dimensions, person by card interactions accounted for the largest proportion of variance, ranging from 26% for ICS to 58% for EIM.

TABLE 2 Mean SCORS-G dimension scores and reliability coefficients

	M	SD	ICC (2.1)
COM	2.92	0.61	0.64
AFF	3.38	1.26	0.80
EIR	2.74	0.90	0.71
EIM	3.67	0.83	0.82
SC	2.95	0.81	0.58
AGG	3.54	0.78	0.67
SE	3.69	0.78	0.60
ICS	4.50	0.94	0.59
Global	3.43	0.52	

Note. Potential scores range from 1 (more pathological) to 7 (more adaptive) for each dimension and global score. ICC (2,1) = Two-way random effects model with absolute agreement.

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

6.2 | Results by individual TAT cards

Following the procedure outlined by Siefert et al. (2016, p. 602), we evaluated card pull by computing two types of z scores: between participant and within participant (see Tables 5 and 6 for general results and Tables 7–10 for results by gender). To calculate between-participant z scores, an individual subject's raw score on a given dimension and card was subtracted from the overall sample mean and then divided by the overall sample's standard deviation. After

calculating the z score for each participant's score on each card, these scores were then averaged to compute a z score for all dimensions for each cards. These z scores were then averaged across participants, and a series of one-sample z tests were conducted ($M = 0$, $SD = 1$). For the within-participants approach, a subject's raw score on each card (e.g., COM on Card 10) was converted to a z score by subtracting the subject's dimensional mean score across the entire card set (e.g., COM mean score across all cards) from that score and then dividing that result by the subject's standard deviation across each cards (e.g., COM SD across all cards). Because we were interested in studying pull more generally (vs. examining how each card compared to every other individual card), we used a series of one-sample z tests. In this approach, each card's average between-participant score is compared to the mean for the sample (i.e., zero) to determine if the score is significantly higher or lower relative to the set average for that dimension. This approach was also repeated using the average within-participant z scores for each card. Given the multiple comparisons ($n = 90$), a Bonferroni correction was used to reduce Type 1 error (significance level set at $0.05/90 = 0.00056$). A card was determined to exert 'pull' if it reached significance for both the between-participant and within-participant comparison. Inclusion of both types of analyses reduces the risk that differences, especially at the between-participant level, are due to a small number of outliers.

Card 1: A young boy is contemplating a violin which rests on a table in front of him (Murray, 1943).

Card 1 showed a positive pull on the cognitive dimensions of COM and SC, carrying the highest mean scores for the entire sample on these dimensions. Card 1 was found to have a negative card pull for EIR, a negative trend for AGG and SE and a positive trend for AFF. There was a significant positive pull in female subjects for SC, a

TABLE 3 Means and Standard Deviations of SCORS-G dimensions and global score by card

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	3.12 (.54)	3.75 (.90)	2.45 (.63)	3.89 (.39)	3.18 (.81)	3.44 (.64)	3.54 (.83)	4.44 (.88)	3.48 (.40)
5	2.95 (.50)	3.48 (1.00)	2.68 (.76)	3.77 (.58)	2.88 (.74)	3.63 (.60)	3.80 (.56)	4.69 (.66)	3.48 (.40)
14	2.81 (.63)	3.78 (1.14)	2.23 (.60)	3.76 (.60)	2.81 (.74)	3.72 (.64)	3.90 (.97)	4.62 (1.06)	3.45 (.49)
Pic	2.96 (.59)	3.19 (.84)	2.95 (.58)	3.39 (.84)	2.79 (.73)	3.50 (.57)	3.59 (.63)	4.42 (.80)	3.35 (.36)
13MF	2.94 (.58)	2.58 (1.25)	2.80 (1.00)	3.27 (1.10)	2.85 (.70)	3.28 (.96)	3.28 (.75)	4.04 (.99)	3.13 (.57)
12M	2.75 (.61)	3.51 (1.40)	2.98 (.85)	3.69 (.82)	2.88 (.77)	3.65 (.72)	3.84 (.63)	4.71 (.69)	3.50 (.50)
2	2.95 (.73)	3.82 (.94)	2.98 (.76)	3.91 (.41)	3.10 (.96)	3.79 (.41)	3.90 (.73)	4.83 (.92)	3.66 (.43)
18GF	2.95 (.62)	2.75 (1.46)	3.07 (1.21)	3.37 (1.23)	2.95 (.84)	3.29 (1.13)	3.56 (.73)	4.14 (1.04)	3.26 (.7)
12F	2.77 (.65)	3.56 (1.22)	2.91 (.87)	3.65 (.80)	2.96 (.86)	3.75 (.59)	3.99 (.85)	4.65 (.89)	3.53 (.52)
7BM	2.84 (.63)	3.98 (1.21)	3.37 (.82)	3.72 (.72)	3.03 (.81)	3.75 (.50)	3.89 (.78)	4.71 (.86)	3.66 (.45)

Note. Potential scores range from 1 (more pathological) to 7 (more adaptive) for each dimension and global score. Cards 1–18GF were administered to all 158 subjects. Global score was calculated by averaging all eight dimensions into a single score. Card 12F was only administered to female subjects ($n = 87$). Card 7BM was only administered to male subjects ($n = 71$).

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, Global Rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

TABLE 4 Variance component estimates for the SCORS-G dimensions

	df	MS	s ²	%	df	MS	s ²	%	df	MS	s ²	%	df	MS	s ²	%
	COM				AFF				EIR				EIM			
Person (P)	50	3.87	0.16	32%	50	4.00	0.11	7%	50	2.30	0.07	8%	50	1.48	0.03	6%
Rater (R)	1	5.04	0.01	2%	1	1.83	0	<1%	1	39.74	0.09	9%	1	0.01	0	<1%
Card (C)	8	0.51	0.00	<1%	8	23.79	0.20	14%	8	11.96	0.10	12%	8	4.03	0.03	5%
P × C	400	0.33	0.08	15%	400	1.75	0.67	46%	400	0.95	0.33	36%	400	0.85	0.34	58%
R × C	8	0.28	0.00	<1%	8	1.81	0.03	2%	8	0.70	0.01	1%	8	0.19	0.00	<1%
P × R	50	0.87	0.08	16%	50	0.75	0.04	3%	50	0.41	0.01	1%	50	0.15	0	<1%
P × R × C, E	400	0.18	0.18	35%	400	0.41	0.41	28%	400	0.30	0.30	33%	400	0.18	0.18	30%
	SC				AGG				SE				ICS			
Person (P)	50	5.83	0.22	27%	50	1.02	0.01	1%	50	2.66	0.11	14%	50	3.63	0.14	15%
Rater (R)	1	18.98	0.04	5%	1	8.44	0.02	3%	1	1.96	0.00	<1%	1	26.51	0.05	6%
Card (C)	8	1.69	0.01	1%	8	2.87	0.02	4%	8	8.61	0.08	10%	8	6.96	0.05	5%
P × C	400	0.47	0.12	15%	400	0.68	0.24	46%	400	0.78	0.22	29%	400	0.89	0.25	26%
R × C	8	0.91	0.01	2%	8	0.25	0.00	<1%	8	0.54	0.00	1%	8	1.41	0.02	2%
P × R	50	1.72	0.17	21%	50	0.44	0.03	5%	50	0.48	0.02	2%	50	0.68	0.03	3%
P × R × C, E	400	0.23	0.23	30%	400	0.21	0.21	41%	400	0.34	0.34	44%	400	0.40	0.40	43%

Abbreviations: df, degrees of freedom; e, error; MS, mean squares; s², variance component estimate based on this sample; %, proportion of variance attributed to this source.

TABLE 5 Mean z scores (between-participant) by SCORS-G dimension

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.33*	0.27	-0.37*	0.32*	0.32*	-0.19	-0.23	-0.11	0.08
5	0.07	0.06	-0.15	0.13	-0.07	0.08	0.12	0.19	0.10
14	-0.18	0.33*	-0.66*	0.12	-0.16	0.22	0.27*	0.17	0.06
Pic	0.11	-0.15	0.17	-0.28*	-0.18	-0.06	-0.11	-0.07	-0.13
13MF	0.04	-0.68*	0.00	-0.48*	-0.10	-0.39*	-0.58*	-0.49*	-0.59*
12M	-0.26	0.08	0.18	0.07	-0.08	0.14	0.17	0.22	0.13
2	0.04	0.34*	0.20	0.35*	0.20	0.33*	0.26	0.34*	0.44*
18GF	0.04	-0.49*	0.27	-0.31*	0.00	-0.35*	-0.15	-0.38*	-0.32*
12F	-0.26	0.13	0.09	0.01	0.04	0.23	0.37*	0.20	0.18
7BM	-0.06	0.47*	0.64*	0.08	0.14	0.23	0.30	0.21	0.45*

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Pic, Picasso card; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

*Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 90 comparisons at 0.05 level.

positive trend for COM and a negative trend for SE. There was a significant negative pull in male subjects for EIR.

Card 5: A middle-aged woman is standing on the threshold a half-opened door looking into a room (Murray, 1943).

Card 5 was the only card with no pull or trends across any dimension, either within male or female gender groups specifically or for the sample as a whole.

Card 14: The silhouette of a man (or woman) against a bright window. The rest of the picture is totally black (Murray, 1943).

Across the sample as a whole, Card 14 demonstrated a positive pull effect for AFF, positive trends for AGG and SE and a significant negative pull for EIR. Similar to Cards 1 and 5, Card 14 features a single character, which may have contributed to lower EIR ratings. There were no notable differences within either gender group.

TABLE 6 Mean z scores (within-participant) by SCORS-G dimension

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.38*	0.28*	-0.41*	0.25	0.44*	-0.35*	-0.35*	-0.26	-0.02
5	0.06	0.05	-0.17	0.09	-0.12	0.04	0.15	0.10	0.06
14	-0.20	0.39*	-0.80*	0.13	-0.21	0.29*	0.26	0.08	0.08
Pic	0.13	-0.17	0.20	-0.38*	-0.21	-0.14	-0.08	0.15	-0.17
13MF	0.04	-0.77*	0.07	-0.48*	-0.09	-0.39*	-0.62*	-0.45*	-0.70*
12M	-0.34*	0.08	0.23	0.05	-0.15	0.20	0.24	0.03	0.18
2	0.01	0.35*	0.23	0.32*	0.24	0.30*	0.24	0.28*	0.46*
18GF	0.05	-0.51*	0.32*	-0.19	0.01	-0.18	-0.18	-0.11	-0.25
12F	-0.31	0.11	0.04	0.06	-0.07	0.28	0.40*	0.29	0.19
7BM	-0.02	0.55*	0.67*	0.11	0.31	0.15	0.22	0.18	0.61*

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; Pic, Picasso card; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

*Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 90 comparisons at 0.05 level.

TABLE 7 Mean z scores (between-participant) for female subjects by SCORS-G dimension

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.35	0.30	-0.25	0.31	0.37*	-0.18	-0.29	-0.09	0.07
5	0.14	0.09	-0.04	0.20	0.00	0.03	0.11	0.20	0.09
14	-0.23	0.32	-0.65*	0.12	-0.21	0.23	0.26	0.13	0.01
Pic	0.14	-0.17	0.17	-0.27	-0.18	-0.08	-0.08	-0.02	-0.07
13MF	0.02	-0.74*	0.07	-0.47*	-0.09	-0.24	-0.67*	-0.61*	-0.37*
12M	-0.26	0.18	0.16	0.12	-0.13	0.18	0.21	0.32	0.11
2	-0.05	0.34	0.19	0.32	0.22	0.30	0.28	0.32	0.25
18GF	0.02	-0.49*	0.22	-0.32	0.06	-0.49*	-0.14	-0.45*	-0.22
12F	-0.32	0.05	0.02	-0.05	-0.07	0.18	0.31	0.17	0.04

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; Pic, Picasso card; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

*Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 81 comparisons at 0.05 level.

TABLE 8 Mean z scores (within-participant) for female subjects by SCORS-G dimension

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.43*	0.33	-0.27	0.24	0.59*	-0.38*	-0.39*	-0.23	0.07
5	0.16	0.09	-0.01	0.10	-0.02	-0.07	0.11	0.19	0.11
14	-0.26	0.38*	-0.76*	0.11	-0.32	0.28	0.27	0.19	0.06
Pic	0.17	-0.16	0.21	-0.29	-0.25	-0.12	0.01	0.00	-0.12
13MF	0.02	-0.80*	0.14	-0.43*	-0.10	-0.25	-0.72*	-0.67*	-0.72*
12M	-0.34	0.20	0.22	0.07	-0.21	0.23	0.25	0.38*	0.26
2	-0.08	0.38*	0.20	0.35	0.30	0.31	0.29	0.33	0.46*
18GF	-0.01	-0.49*	0.22	-0.21	0.08	-0.28	-0.19	-0.47*	-0.30
12F	-0.34	0.07	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.27	0.40*	0.30	0.17

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; Pic, Picasso card; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem.

*Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 81 comparisons at 0.05 level.

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.27	0.22	-0.54*	0.34	0.21	-0.20	-0.19	-0.14	-0.01
5	-0.08	-0.04	-0.30	0.05	-0.17	0.11	0.10	0.16	-0.02
14	-0.11	0.36	-0.67*	0.13	-0.07	0.22	0.27	0.18	0.09
Pic	0.01	-0.16	0.18	-0.27	-0.17	-0.02	-0.17	-0.15	-0.17
13MF	0.05	-0.62*	-0.10	-0.49*	-0.09	-0.59*	-0.46*	-0.37	-0.60*
12M	-0.28	-0.08	0.18	0.00	-0.01	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.03
2	0.15	0.30	0.23	0.33	0.15	0.30	0.18	0.29	0.41*
18GF	0.03	-0.47*	0.35	-0.27	-0.07	-0.11	-0.16	-0.28	-0.24
7BM	-0.02	0.51*	0.67*	0.12	0.23	0.20	0.31	0.20	0.50*

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; Pic, Picasso card; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem. *Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 81 comparisons at 0.05 level.

TABLE 9 Mean z-scores (between-participant) for male subjects by SCORS-G dimension

Card	COM	AFF	EIR	EIM	SC	AGG	SE	ICS	Global
1	0.27	0.24	-0.61*	0.27	0.24	-0.30	-0.26	-0.29	-0.14
5	-0.09	-0.04	-0.37	0.07	-0.25	0.15	0.20	0.24	-0.03
14	-0.13	0.41*	-0.81*	0.16	-0.07	0.31	0.25	0.21	0.11
Pic	0.04	-0.19	0.21	-0.46*	-0.16	-0.18	-0.16	-0.16	-0.24
13MF	0.06	-0.70*	-0.03	-0.53*	-0.07	-0.57*	-0.49*	-0.39	-0.67*
12M	-0.36	-0.08	0.22	0.02	-0.07	0.16	0.23	0.14	0.07
2	0.15	0.32	0.27	0.23	0.16	0.26	0.16	0.29	0.42
18GF	0.08	-0.51*	0.44*	-0.14	-0.08	0.00	-0.16	-0.24	-0.13
7BM	-0.02	0.55*	0.67*	0.11	0.31	0.15	0.22	0.18	0.61*

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; Global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; Pic, Picasso card; SC = understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem. *Suggests significant at 0.0006 level based on Bonferroni correction with 81 comparisons at 0.05 level.

TABLE 10 Mean z scores (within-participant) for male subjects by SCORS-G dimension

TABLE 11 Comparison of current findings with prior studies

Card	Stein et al. (2014)	Siefert et al. (2016)	Auletta et al. (2018)	Current
Sample	Clinical Adult	Undergraduate Adult	Nonclinical Children	Clinical Adult
1	N	+EIR; -SE	+COM, SC, SE, global	+COM, SC; -EIR
2	+AFF, EIR, EIM, ICS, global	+AFF, EIR, SE, ICS, global	+ICS	+AFF, EIM, AGG, ICS, global
12M	+EIR	n/a	n/a	N
13MF	-AFF, EIM, AGG, SE, ICS, global	n/a	n/a	-AFF, EIM, AGG, SE, ICS, global
14	+AFF, EIM	+AFF, SC, AGG -EIR	n/a	+AFF -EIR

Abbreviations: AFF, affective quality of representations; AGG, experience and management of aggressive impulses; COM, complexity of representation of people; EIM, emotional investment in values and moral standards; EIR, emotional investment in relationships; global, global rating (composite score); ICS, identity and coherence of self; N, neutral (no card pull effects on any SCORS-G dimension); n/a, card not included in study; SC, understanding of social causality; SE, self-esteem; +, positive pull effect (more adaptive ratings); -, negative pull effects (more pathological ratings).

Picasso Card: Two nude standing figures of a young man and woman. The woman rests her head on the man's shoulder. Beside them stands a draped woman with a baby in her arms (Morgan, 2003).

The Picasso Card was largely neutral across SCORS-G dimensions, with the exception of a significant negative pull for EIM across the entire sample. It also received the lowest mean dimension score

on SC (compared to all other cards) for the entire sample though this did not reach significance in terms of pull effects. There were no significant pull effects unique to either male or female subjects though male subjects did show a negative trend for EIM.

Card 13MF: A young man is standing with downcast head buried in his arm. Behind him is the figure of a woman lying in bed (Murray, 1943).

For the sample as a whole, Card 13MF showed the most frequent negative pull effects across dimensions, including negative pull for AFF, EIM, AGG, SE, ICS and the global score. These pull effects were consistent within both gender groups, although the AGG dimension was not significant within female subjects. In response to Card 13MF, men and women both produced narratives that were lower in AFF, EIM and SE relative to their group average dimension scores across cards.

Card 12M: A young man is lying on a couch with his eyes closed. Leaning over him is the gaunt form of an elderly man, his hand stretched out above the face of the reclining figure (Murray, 1943).

Like Card 5, Card 12M did not exhibit any significant pull effects. There was a negative trend for COM for the entire sample (showing the lowest mean dimension score across all cards). Within female subjects, there was a positive trend for ICS.

Card 2: County scene: in the foreground is a young woman with books in her hand; in the background a man is working in the fields and an older woman is looking on (Murray, 1943).

Card 2 showed a positive pull effect across the whole sample for the global score. There were also significant positive pull effects across the whole sample for AFF, EIM, AGG and ICS, consistent with past findings (see Table 11). Within male subjects, a positive pull effect emerged for the global score, whereas within female subjects, a positive trend for AFF and the global score was found.

Card 18GF: A woman has her hands squeezed around the throat of another woman whom she appears to be pushing backwards across the bannister of a stairway (Murray, 1943).

Across the sample as a whole, Card 18GF showed significant negative pull effects for AFF and negative trends for EIM, AGG, ICS and the global score. There was additionally a positive trend for EIR. Within female subjects, a negative trend for AGG emerged, whereas within male subjects, a positive trend for EIR was found.

Card 12F: The portrait of a young woman. A weird old woman with a shawl over her head is grimacing in the background (Murray, 1943).

Card 12F was generally neutral in terms of pull effects, with the exception of a significant positive pull for SE. This card obtained the highest mean SE ratings for female subjects.

Card 7BM: A grey-haired man is looking a younger man who is sullenly staring into space (Murray, 1943).

Card 7BM showed positive pull effects for AFF, EIR and the global score. This card also had the highest mean dimension scores for AFF, EIR and the global score for male subjects.

A full comparison of significant findings from the current study with card pull effect patterns obtained in prior studies for overlapping cards is presented in 11.

7 | DISCUSSION

We had three primary aims for this study. First, we examined sources of variance in SCORS-G dimensions to ascertain if findings from non-clinical and outpatient adult samples would extend to an adult residential treatment clinical population. Whereas differences in magnitude of variance component estimates were observed, the overall pattern was largely consistent with prior work (Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014; see Table 11). Second, whereas five of the cards used in this study have been previously analysed for pull effects (Cards 1, 2, 12M, 13MF and 14), we aimed to expand on this existing literature by examining cards that have not previously been analysed but are nonetheless relatively common in use in clinical practice and research (Aronow et al., 2001; Bellak & Abrams, 1997; Cramer, 2017). Finally, we investigated card pull effects within different gender groups, a particularly important issue given that certain TAT cards (e.g., 12M or 18GF) were recommended for use by Murray (1943) based on the examinee's gender. The current findings are the first to our knowledge to provide insight into differences in card pull effects within different gender groups for the SCORS-G system.

Similar to past studies on the TAT and Picture Story Exercise (Auletta et al., 2018; O'Gorman et al., 2020; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), we found greater stability of variance at the person level for the cognitive variables and greater responsiveness to task (card x person effects) in affective-relational variables. Thus, even in a population with high levels of clinical severity and chronicity, people were still relatively consistent across cards in terms of how they described and represented mental states (COM) and organized the relational sequences and social logic of their narratives (SC). These features of narrative formation appear to be more 'trait-like' in nature and shaped less by the specific card content used to elicit narratives. In contrast, the affective-relational dimensions all varied more as a function of the interaction between persons and cards.

Regarding card pull, the three cards that exerted the strongest pull effects were 13MF (negative pull) and 2 (positive pulls) and 7BM (positive pull for male subjects). Card 13MF pulled for hostile, destructive themes, including intimate partner violence, murder, suicide and sexual assault. Our findings of a sweeping negative pull effect for this card replicate those of Stein et al. (2014), who also found that 13MF showed the greatest negative pull across all SCORS-G dimensions. In contrast, Card 2 elicited the highest ratings across all dimensions, especially for AFF, EIM, AGG and ICS. These findings are consistent

with past studies by that showed positive pull effects for Card 2 on AFF (Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), EIR (Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), EIM (Stein et al., 2014), SE (Siefert et al., 2016) and ICS (Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014). These findings suggest that particularly negative stories on Card 2 (e.g., a woman who is being forced into farm labour by her oppressive parents) could be considered highly unusual and might be representing someone who has difficulty imagining positive relational scenarios even when provided with neutral or positive stimuli. In contrast, a negative story on Card 13MF (e.g., a sexual encounter that turns abusive) should be considered typical given these convergent findings across studies. However, if a participant were to tell a love story between a man and woman (i.e., high scores for AFF and EIR), then it might raise questions about the possible avoidance of troublesome thoughts and feelings in response to a negative stimulus.

Findings for other cards were more variable and reflected both convergent and divergent results compared to prior studies. For example, Card 12M has been included in only one prior card pull study (Stein et al., 2014), which only found evidence of pull for higher EIR. Our study did not find positive pull on this dimension, though it did identify a negative trend for COM. Our study also found a negative pull for EIR on Card 1 in contrast to Siefert et al.'s (2016) findings, which found a positive pull for EIR. Given that our study included an adult clinical population marked by high rates of psychopathology (compared to the undergraduate sample in Siefert et al., 2016), it is possible that the image of boy alone with the violin conjured feelings of aloneness or activated experiences of caregivers' absence, pulling for lower EIR scores in our clinical sample. A nonclinical sample with presumably more positive internalized representations of others might have been more inclined to tell stories of teachers or parents who came to the child's aid and helped him with the violin (i.e., higher EIR scores).

As noted above, we explored pull effects in five new cards in the current study (5, Picasso, 18GF, 12F and 7BM). Card 5 did not exhibit significant card pull effects for any SCORS-G dimension, joining the ranks of other cards in prior card pull studies that have been identified as neutral or limited in terms of pull (e.g., Card 4 [Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014]; 13B [Siefert et al., 2016]; 16 [Auletta et al., 2018]). The Picasso Card similarly appeared to be mostly neutral in terms of card pull. The low overall SC dimension mean could be explained by the complicated social situation featured on the card, which often elicits complex sexual plots that can lead to breakdowns in thinking.

Card 18GF exerted a negative pull on AFF and a negative trend for EIM, AGG, ICS and the global score and a positive trend for EIR. Although Murray (1943) originally described the picture as featuring one woman choking another, our study found only a nonsignificant negative trend for AGG. Based on our qualitative analysis, the narratives often featured a dysphoric story of either loss or aggression (negative pull for AFF). At times, participants often told a story that featured a caregiver who was trying to support someone who was sick or ill (positive rating for EIR). Alternatively, the stories sometimes featured more explosive confrontations that often turned violent (negative ratings AFF, EIR, EIM, AGG, ICS and EIR).

Card 7BM (administered only to male subjects), believed to represent the subject's attitude towards authority (Rapaport, Gill, & Schafer, 1946), was a more positive card on the dimensions of AFF, EIR and the global score. This finding contrasts with early research on the TAT which found that examinees tend to generate stories on this card with a more neutral to sad affect tone (Eron, 1950). Card 12F, though only administered to female participants, also was largely neutral in terms of pull effects, with the exception of more adaptive ratings for SE. It is possible that this stimulus elicits more self-reflective stories that pull for aspirational narratives, given that the woman in the background is sometimes perceived as the woman in the foreground's future self.

This is the first study to our knowledge that has studied card pull effects within male and female subject groups. Although several studies have provided evidence that some characteristics of narratives vary as a function of person by card interactions, no prior study has sought to examine how pull may be exerted *within* groups with different demographic characteristics. Within male and female subject groups, certain TAT cards were characterized by different patterns of pull effects (e.g., Cards 1, 13MF, 2 and 18GF) and trends (e.g., Picasso Card and Card 12M). For Card 1 (a card that features a young boy with a violin), we found that women produced more complex narratives with intricate plots (positive pull for SC) and a positive trend for the complexity of the characters' mental states (COM) relative to their stories on other cards; this card also pulled for lower SE in female subjects compared to other cards in the protocol. In contrast, Card 1 showed negative pull effects for male subjects on the EIR dimension, suggesting that male subjects were less likely to evoke images of mutuality and caring between characters on this card compared to other cards in the protocol. It is possible that the male protagonist of Card 1 evoked feelings of aloneness (a feature that is rated lower on EIR) for male subjects, who might be more likely to identify with the young boy. Alternatively, it might be that men are more likely to identify with the boy and thus were less compelled to introduce additional characters. Together, these patterns of findings for Card 1 may suggest a pull for ruminative narratives focused on feelings of self-doubt in female examinees, whereas male examinees may be more likely to create stories about social isolation and feelings of loneliness.

There were some differences in patterns of aggressive content between men and women. Whereas Card 13MF pulled for narratives rated lower in AFF, EIM, SE and ICS within both gender groups, male subjects also showed a pull for lower AGG on this card compared to their stories on other cards. The man pictured in the card appears distraught and is depicted in a scene that raises the possibility that he may have actively engaged in violence or shameful activity. This may pull male respondents, who may implicitly identify with the character, to tell stories involving more poorly controlled impulses and aggression. The female in this card is in contrast depicted in a passive position (possibly as the victim of violence). Unlike men, women did not respond to this particular card with narratives rated higher in AGG; instead, women were more likely to generate narratives rated higher in AGG in response to Card 18GF compared to their narratives for other cards (though this was not the finding amongst men). One

hypothesis based on pull effect patterns for men and women on these cards may be that depictions of violence are more likely to pull for narratives involving poorly controlled aggression when the gender of the protagonist is the same as that of the respondent. Similarities in gender may increase a sense of evocativeness and ownership over the character's actions, leading to more disinhibited actions regulated less by reflective processes.

Cards 12F and 7BM, which have historically been administered only to women and men, respectively, at the residential treatment facility, differed in their card pull effect patterns. Within men, Card 7BM pulled for significantly more adaptive stories across several SCORS-G dimensions. Further, Card 7BM led men to produce narratives with themes of relationships, positive interactions and interpersonal communication more frequently than other cards in the protocol. The narratives of female subjects for Card 12F were rated as largely neutral, though the card evoked themes related to self-esteem more frequently than other cards in the protocol did.

8 | LIMITATIONS

There were several limitations in the present study. First, our study featured a high socioeconomic status and racially homogenous sample (92.4% European American), which, although representative of the population at the treatment facility, is not representative of broader clinical or community populations. That said, our findings mirror many results of earlier studies that featured more diverse samples (e.g., Siefert et al., 2016), especially on Cards 2 and 14 (in comparison to Siefert et al., 2016). Although we utilized subject self-identification of male and female gender for creating subgroups for analyses in our study, we recognize that relying upon traditional binary categories is not consistent with contemporary knowledge about gender and gender expression. Future studies should include a more nuanced assessment of gender identity and other potentially relevant intersectional dimensions and examine the relevance of these factors for TAT card pull effects. Finally, estimates for rater by person interaction effects accounted for 16% of the variance in COM and 21% of the variance in SC, whereas in prior studies (Auletta et al., 2018; Siefert et al., 2016; Stein et al., 2014), rater by person effects ranged only from <1% to 6% across all SCORS-G dimensions. One possible explanation for this finding is that rater agreement (i.e., ICCs) were lower in the current study for COM and SC relative to prior studies (e.g., ICC estimates ranged from 0.79 to 0.90 for Stein et al., 2014; 0.79 to 0.92 for Siefert et al., 2016; and 0.78 to 0.84 for Auletta et al., 2018). Although level of interrater agreement was acceptable in the current study (0.64 and 0.58 for COM and SC, respectively), lower agreement for these two dimensions may have contributed to larger variance component estimates for the rater by person interaction for these two subscales. Although the variance component results in the current study are consistent with those from prior studies regarding the cognitive SCORS-G dimensions, future studies with greater consistency in interrater agreement are needed to assess the replicability and robustness of this finding across diverse samples.

9 | CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The current study offers several new and potentially important findings to the existing TAT and SCORS-G literature, including general replication of pull effect patterns for previously studied cards in a more clinically severe population, novel findings on pull effects for cards not previously studied and findings suggesting differential pull effect patterns related to participant's gender. Future research should explore the impact of administration order on the respondents' narrative. For instance, in our study, Card 12M was found to have a negative trend for COM (i.e., characters' mental states were less elaborated) and was always administered after Card 13MF (the most pathological card in our sample). It is possible that, after telling a story with more disturbing content (13MF), that respondents might shut down and offer a blander, less sophisticated narrative. Future studies investigating the impact of the card order, cognitive fatigue and potential defensive processes across card sequence might deepen our understanding of respondents' stories and the SCORS-G system. Second, a major issue in TAT research is the wide variation in card set selections across sites, which are often chosen based on the traditions of the clinical site, clinician preferences and/or feasibility. We advocate for greater movement towards a universal "core" card set of four to five cards which would allow for clearer comparisons and more empirically grounded interpretation of findings across both clinical and research settings. Further, psychologists could select cards that are known to have adaptive (e.g., Card 2), neutral (e.g., Cards 12M or 5) and pathological (e.g., Card 13MF) pull effects, as it may provide the subject with a range of opportunities to craft narratives that demonstrate the relative rigidity or flexibility of their social cognitive capacities and object relations (Clemence & Lewis, 2018). If a subject consistently tells negatively valenced stories on cards that are known to pull for more neutral or adaptive SCORS-G ratings, it may highlight the degree of rigidity of the subject's negative relational schemas and their potential difficulty in shifting their interpersonal stance across interpersonal scenarios. Finally, future studies should seek to expand understanding of the impact of gender on participants' responses to different TAT cards, conducting direct comparisons of pull effects between (as opposed to within) gender groups and using a more dimensional approach to gender conceptualization and examining card pull effect patterns in individuals identifying as transgender, nonbinary and gender fluid.

The present study contributes additional evidence supporting the importance of considering card pull effects in the analysis and interpretation of SCORS-G ratings on the TAT. Our findings expand knowledge related to specific TAT cards as well as typical pull effect patterns within different gender groups. These findings provide knowledge that may improve the precision of clinical decision making during both card set selection and interpretation of individual participant results and point to future areas of research for further expanding knowledge of card pull effects and the SCORS-G.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to thank Anna Barnet and Alexandra Wong-Appel for their assistance in coding narrative data for the current study. Researchers interested in learning more about the data that support the findings of this study may contact the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to their containing information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

ORCID

Jeremy M. Ridenour  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1521-9075>

Michelle B. Stein  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4179-0817>

REFERENCES

- Aronow, E., Weiss, K. A., & Reznikoff, M. (2001). *A practical guide to the Thematic Apperception Test: The TAT in clinical practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Auletta, A. F., Cupellaro, S., Abbate, L., Aiello, E., Cornacchia, P., Norcia, C., & Sogos, C. (2018). SCORS-G and card pull effect of TAT stories: A study with a nonclinical sample of children. *Assessment, 1073*, 191, 118, 781, 014.
- Bellak, L., & Abrams, D. M. (1997). *The T.A.T., C.A.T., and S.A.T. in clinical use* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bram, A. D. (2014). Object relations, interpersonal functioning, and health in a nonclinical sample: Construct validation and norms for the TAT SCORS-G. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 31*(3), 314.
- Brennan, R. L. (2001). *Generalizability Theory*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Buer Christensen, T., Eikenaes, I., Hummelen, B., Pedersen, G., Nysæter, T.-E., Bender, D. S., ... Selvik, S. G. (2020). Level of personality functioning as a predictor of psychosocial functioning—Concurrent validity of criterion A. *Personality Disorders, Theory, Research, and Treatment, 11*(2), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000352>
- Cicchetti, D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment, 6*(4), 284–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.6.4.284>
- Clemence, A. J., & Lewis, K. (2018). Flexibility and rigidity in object relational functioning: Assessing change in suicidal ideation and global psychiatric functioning using the SCORS-G. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 100*(2), 135–144.
- Cramer, P. (1991). *The development of defense mechanisms: Theory, research and assessment*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Cramer, P. (2017). Defense mechanism card pull in TAT stories. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 99*(1), 15–24.
- Eron, L. D. (1950). A normative study of the Thematic Apperception Test. *Psychological Monographs, 64*(9), 1–47.
- Kelly, F. D. (1999). *The psychological assessment of abused and traumatized children*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lewis, K. C., Meehan, K. B., Cain, N. M., Wong, P. S., Clemence, A. J., Stevens, J., & Tillman, J. G. (2016). Impairments in object relations and chronicity of suicidal behavior in individuals with borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 30*(1), 19–34.
- Mihura, J. L., Roy, M., & Graceffo, R. A. (2017). Psychological assessment training in clinical psychology doctoral programs. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 99*(2), 153–164.
- Morgan, W. G. (2003). Origin and history of the “Series B” and “Series C” TAT pictures. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 81*(2), 133–148.
- Murray, H. (1943). *Thematic Apperception Test manual*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- O’Gorman, E. T., Cobb, H. R., Galtieri, L. R., & Kurtz, J. E. (2020). Stimulus characteristics in picture story exercise cards and their effects on the social cognition and object relations scale—global rating method. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 102*(2), 250–258.
- Peterson, C. A., & Schilling, K. M. (1983). Card pull in projective testing. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47*(3), 265–275.
- Pilkonis, P. A., Heape, C. L., Ruddy, J., & Serrao, P. (1991). Validity in the diagnosis of personality disorders: The use of the LEAD standard. *Psychological Assessment, 3*(1), 46–54.
- Rapaport, D. (1952). Projective techniques and the theory of thinking. *Journal of Projective Techniques, 16*(3), 269–275.
- Rapaport, D., Gill, M. M., & Schafer, R. (1946). *Diagnostic psychological testing*. Chicago, IL: Year Book.
- Shavelson, R. J., & Webb, N. M. (1991). *Generalizability theory: A primer*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Siefert, C. J., Stein, M. B., Slavin-Mulford, J., Sinclair, S. J., Haggerty, G., & Blais, M. A. (2016). Estimating the effects of Thematic Apperception Test card content on SCORS-G ratings: Replication with a nonclinical sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 98*(6), 598–607.
- Siefert, C. J., Stein, M. B., Slavin-Mulford, J., Sinclair, S. J., Haggerty, G., Sinclair, S. J., ... Blais, M. A. (2018). Exploring the factor structure of the Social Cognition and Object Relations—Global Rating Method: Support for two- and three- factor models. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 100*, 122–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1336716>
- Smith, C. P., Atkinson, J. W., McClelland, D. C., & Veroff, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spitzer, R. L. (1983). Psychiatric diagnosis: Are clinicians still necessary? *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 24*(5), 399–411.
- Stein, M., & Slavin-Mulford, J. (2018). *The Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale-Global Rating Method (SCORS-G): A comprehensive guide for clinicians and researchers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stein, M. B., Hilsenroth, M., Slavin-Mulford, J., & Pinsky, J. (2011). *Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale: Global Rating Method (SCORS-G)* (4th ed., Unpublished manuscript). Boston, MA: Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School.
- Stein, M. B., & Siefert, C. J. (2018). Introduction to the special section on the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale—Global Rating Method: From research to practice. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 100*(2), 117–121.
- Stein, M. B., Slavin-Mulford, J., Siefert, C. J., Sinclair, S. J., Renna, M., Malone, J., ... Blais, M. A. (2014). SCORS-G stimulus characteristics of select Thematic Apperception Test cards. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 96*(3), 339–349.
- Stein, M. B., Slavin-Mulford, J., Sinclair, S. J., Siefert, C. J., & Blais, M. A. (2012). Exploring the construct validity of the social cognition and object relations scale in a clinical sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*(5), 533–540.
- Westen, D. (1995). *Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale: Q-sort for projective stories (SCORS-Q)*. Unpublished manuscript. Cambridge, MA: Department of Psychiatry, The Cambridge Hospital and Harvard Medical School.

How to cite this article: Ridenour, J. M., Lewis, K. C., Siefert, C. J., Pitman, S. R., Knauss, D., & Stein, M. B. (2021). Card pull effects of the Thematic Apperception Test using the Social Cognition and Object Relations-Global Rating Method on complex psychiatric sample. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 28*(5), 1079–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2554>