

Intelligence relationship and animal content in the zulligerink spot test (Z-Test)

Abstract

Introduction: This article sought to reformulate new important aspects of the Z-Test projective personality test on the concept of Animal Content having been misinterpreted, stating that a high amount of responses is not an indicator of intellectual poverty and lack of culture. The subjects with high school education and university education usually respond to animal content in large quantities, who refutes the initial idea.

Objective: The objective of this study is to confirm that the animal content is not an indicator of intellectual and cultural poverty, but a matter of preference and influence of the environment in the responses of each subject, since its frequency does not depend on the level of education.

Methods: We made a comparison of the results of the protocols of two hundred people (n=200) evaluated for the use and handling of firearms. The number of responses of Animal Content and the number of responses of the Determinants of Form and Precise Form were compared, indicators of emotional and intellectual aspects of those evaluated.

Results: The results show that the percentage of higher responses of Animal Content is higher in the responses of individuals with College (57.1%) and high school (38%) in relation to the responses of individuals with elementary education (35.7%). These same subjects presented Determinant Form and Precise Form in a high percentage college (95.9%) and high school (94.8%), which means presence of emotional and intellectual control and logical reasoning.

Conclusion: We conclude that the high amount of responses from Animal Content is present in subjects with High School and College education, which suggests not an intellectual or cultural poverty, but a preference of the subject and influences the environment.

Keywords: psychological assessment, personality testing, intelligence, Z-test, zulliger, handling firearms

Volume 6 Issue 3 - 2021

Gabriel Arruda Burani,¹ Thais Hora Paulino²
¹Researcher, Psychology Department, Faculdade Fleming de Cerquillo, Brazil

²Researcher, Psychology Department, Faculdade Fleming de Cerquillo, Brazil

Correspondence: Gabriel Arruda Burani, Professor of Psychology, researcher, Faculdade Fleming de Cerquillo, Av. Prefeito Antonio Souto 191, Cerquillo, São Paulo, Brazil, Email: gabriel.burani@docentefaculadecerquillo.com.br

Received: April 04, 2021 | **Published:** May 11, 2021

Abbreviations: Z-Test, zulliger test; A, animal content; F, determinant form; F+, determinant precise form; n, number of subjects

Introduction

Projective test is a popular psychological assessment resource in many areas of practice around the world. The precursor ink spot test was Rorschach,¹ followed by Hans Zulliger.¹ The Rorschach test consists of 10 ink spots where the subject responds to the evaluator "what does the stain look like?", giving indications of the traits and personality structure of the subject through the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the responses. Hans Zulliger, friend and disciple of Rorschach, followed his studies after the sudden death of his master and during the Second World War, he developed a faster and as profound technique as his predecessor: the Z-Test. The premise of the Z-Test is the same as that of the Rorschach, with only three ink spots. The measurement elements are the same in both tests, which makes scientific research in this segment close to each other.³

This article reviews the qualitative classification of a specific response category: animal content. These responses are characterized by the identification and verbalization of animals in one or more parts of the spots. They are commonly the most verbalized responses in a protocol by Rorschach¹ and Zulliger.^{2,4,5} In a protocol, the Form Determinant tends to be more frequent in relation to the other determinants.¹ The answer is thus classified when the main and central characteristic of the answer is in the form.⁵ These responses

give indicators of intellectual and emotional aspects in the personality structure; it is how the subject treats vital situations intellectually, and how mental control balances personality emotions.⁶ The Precise Form indicator (F +) indicates the ability to establish perceptual differentiation and logical reasoning.^{5,7}

This brief study seeks to understand the classic premises of animal content as an element of "lack of culture and intellectual poverty" commonly attributed by test measurement manuals, to then refute this idea based on the actual results of protocols, the number of responses and the schooling of the evaluated, relating to the determinants of answer Form and Precise Form.

Material and methods

Two hundreds protocols of psychological assessment of the personality of men and women were analyzed whose objectives are the handling of firearms, carried out compulsorily for government authorization. In Brazil, the use and handling of firearms is regulated by the Federal Police and the criteria are established by Normative Instruction 78/2014. This Normative Instruction determines the personality indicators that are necessary and prevent the handling of firearms. Among the criteria and materials used for this assessment is the assessment of personality, attention, memory and an interview. This study is part of the Doctoral thesis in Psychology "Um estudo dos símbolos e dos desejos com o Z-Teste e Questionário Desiderativo na avaliação psicológica da personalidade para uso e o porte de armas

de fogo no Brasil”. heldattheUniversidade de CienciasEmpresariales y Sociales, in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Research approved by the Ethics Committee in Brazil, CAAE: 42474920.4.0000.0123.

The subjects of this study were submitted to a complete psychological assessment for the handling of firearms, and the material chosen is used here specifically the protocols of the Zulliger's ink spot test (Z-Test). The measurement system used was by Vaz and Alchieri,⁵ which are based on the studies by Bruno Klopfer. For the classification of responses, the tables were used *Tabela 13.1 Resposta (R)*,⁵ *Tabela 14.1 Média de Forma (F+, F-, F+-)*,⁵ *Tabela 14.1 Forma Precisa (F+)*⁵ e *Tabela 26.1 Conteúdo Animal (A+Ad)*.⁵

For this study, a comparative analysis was carried out by the number of responses in the protocols and the scores reached regarding Determinants of Form, Precise Form and Animal Content. Quantitative

analysis of responses was performed according to Vaz and Alchieri⁵ and, but there was no qualitative analysis of each response issued by the subject. It is descriptive and exploratory research.

Results

The group of subjects (n=200) was composed of a 31 women and 169 men, aged 21 to 59 years, chosen at random, evaluated between March to December 2020. The Z-test was applied collectively during the psychological evaluation of each subject, with each spot projected on a 2m X 1.5m screen, with an overhead projector, for five minutes, and each and the subjects were able to record their responses on their own sheet, and this material was analyzed as a protocol according to Table 1. Any application and measurement strictly followed the standardization specifications of the test manual.

Table 1 Results of the Z-test protocols Determining Form (F), Precise Form (F+) and animal content (A)

Educational level	Subjects (n=200)	Classification (%)					
		Lower (A)	Medium (A)	Higher (A)	Lower (F/F+)	Medium (F/F+)	Higher (F/F+)
Elementary	14	35,7	28,6	35,7	-	78,6	21,4
High School	137	35	27,0	38	5,2	69,3	25,5
College	49	22,4	20,4	57,1	4,1	67,3	28,6

Source: The authors

Once the results were measured, the number of responses corresponding to a total of 1627 were selected, of which they are responses of Determinant Form (F) 1061, Determinant Form Precise (F+) 1016; and 706 are of animal content (A). The groups of responses of animal content were classified, according to their quantity and educational level.

Discussion

The results of Form and Precise Form are considered similar results because they come close in value, making their difference irrelevant. In this sense, the frequency of responses from subjects with elementary education in the lower classification was zero and medium and higher than 100%, in the high school education the lower classification was 5.2%, and medium and higher 94.8% and in the college education, the lowest classification was 4.1% and medium to superior 95.9%; in all schooling groups, more than 60% of the answers were obtained. Some authors consider that a greater presence of Animal content in a protocol, characterizes intellectual poverty,^{4,5,7} indicators that we totally reject, since the results show that the percentage of higher Animal Content responses is higher in the responses of individuals with college (57.1%) and high school (38%) in relation to the responses of individuals with elementary schooling (35.7%). Rorschach¹ defines that animal content is the most seen in a protocol, regardless of whether they are the result of protocols of more or less intelligent subjects.

Conclusion

This study brought indicators that the presence of animal content in Z-Test protocols should be considered as an element of greater frequency regarding the preferences of the evaluated, but not as indicators of intellectual poverty. The researchers' field experience suggests that a greater amount of these contents depends on the

environment in which the subject is inserted and his logical reasoning and not only on his education, which is corroborated by the presence of the Determinants Form and Precise Form in medium and higher with absolute values in the analyzed protocols. In this sense, the classic assumption that Animal Content collapses intellectual aspects of the subject is flawed.

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

There is no conflict of interest exists.

References

1. Rorschach H. Psicodiagnóstico. (8ª edição). São Paulo: Editora Mestre Jou. 1921.
2. Zulliger H, Salamon F. El teste de Zulliger – Um test individual y colectivo. Buenos Aires: Editorial Kapelusz. 1970.
3. Burani GA. Z-test: aportes psicoanalítico para la interpretación cualitativa. *Subjetividad y Procesos Cognitivos*. 2020;24(1):107–122.
4. Villemor-amaral AE, Primi R. Teste De Zulliger No Sistema Compreensivo Zsc-Forma Individual. 1ª Edição Revisada E Ampliada. São Paulo: Pearson E Casa Do Psicólogo. 2012.
5. Vaz CE, Alchieri JC. Z-Teste: coletivo e individual: técnica de Zulliger. (3ª edição). São Paulo: Hogrefe. 2016.
6. Klopfer B, Kelly D. Técnica del Psicodiagnóstico de Rorschach. (3ª Edición). Buenos Aires: Paidós. 1974.
7. Vaz CE. Z-Teste: Técnica de Zulliger Forma Coletiva. (2ª ed. Revisada). São Paulo: Casa do Psicólogo. 2002.