

**A NORMATIVE STUDY OF THE KINETIC FAMILY DRAWING
AND ITS CORRELATION WITH THE REMINISCENCE USE SCALE
ON PERSONS AGED 60 AND OLDER**

DEBRA LEE ALLEN DAVENPORT

A Normative Study of the Kinetic Family Drawing
and Its Correlation with the Reminiscence Use Scale
on Persons Aged 60 and Older

An Abstract
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Debra Lee Allen Davenport
April 1993

Abstract

This research presents the results of the correlational study between the Reminiscence Use Questionnaire and the Kinetic Family Drawings from a population in Northwest Tennessee aged 60 and above. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was computed for the data. Results suggested that verbal reminiscence was not correlated with the year labeled for the Kinetic Family Drawing. Normative data on the drawings are also presented. Normative data suggested that central placement in the drawing occurs in 50% of the drawings with 31% placement at the top. Placement of self on the left side of the family constellation occurred in 60% of the drawings. The common family activity was dining, which occurred in 40% of the drawings, with a sports theme present in 16%. Common symbols drawn were table, chairs, plates, houses, trees, and balls. These are not significantly different from those of younger populations. Implications for future research are presented.

A Normative Study of the Kinetic Family Drawing
and Its Correlation with the Reminiscence Use Scale
on Persons Aged 60 and Older

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University


In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Debra Lee Allen Davenport

April 1993

To Graduate and Research Council

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Debra Lee Davenport entitled "A Normative Study of the Kinetic Family Drawing and Its Correlation with the Reminiscence Use Scale on Persons Aged 60 and Older." I have examined the final copy of this paper for form and content and I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts with a major in Psychology.


Major Professor


Second Committee Member


Third Committee Member

Accepted for the
Graduate Council:


Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express appreciation to Dr. Susan Kupisch, Professor of Psychology, Austin Peay State University, for her guidance, assistance, and time during the entire study. I would like to thank Dr. Blair and Dr. Mabry for their suggestions and assistance.

I would also like to thank the senior citizens and church groups in Henry and Weakley Counties for their time, enthusiasm, questionnaires, and especially their drawings. Without the participation of these people, this study would not have been possible.

In additon, I want to extend my heartfelt thanks to my husband, James Davenport, for his patience, understanding, and support throughout my studies. Without his confidence in me and urging, this personal goal would not have been achieved. My parents warm encouragement has been greatly appreciated all my life and through all achievements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
III. METHOD.....	11
IV. RESULTS.....	14
V. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY.....	19
REFERENCES.....	24
APPENDIX	
A. CONSENT FORM.....	28
B. REMINISCENCE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	30
C. KINETIC FAMILY DRAWING TASK.....	32
D. REYNOLD'S GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING KINETIC FAMILY DRAWINGS.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table	PAGE
1. Frequency Distribution and Percentages of Drawings Containing Emotional Indicators.....	15
2. Family Figures: Types, Frequencies, and Total Number Included.....	16
3. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Drawings Containing Each Symbol.....	18

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Gerontology is a field of study in the United States increasing in importance. The average age of our population has increased due to medical advances and by the year 2000, 30.4 percent of the population will be aged 55 years and older (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). Between the years 1980 and 1989, the population aged 65 and over annually increased twice the overall national rate of growth.

More studies are needed about this segment of the population. Few psychological tests have been normed on the elderly in comparison to other segments of the population and few tests have been designed for them. As De Genova stated, "The later years do not have to be a time when mental health and life satisfaction are viewed as less important; rather, they can be a time for reflecting and revising relationships with important others" (1991, p. 166). It is difficult to find psychological instruments that are sensitive to the needs of the elderly (Hanley & Gilhooly, 1986, p. 90) possibly because the elderly are not a homogeneous group and access to this population for large scale testing is difficult.

One of the newest techniques for working with the aged is reminiscence. Reminiscence is now being used as a method of research, gaining rapport with the client, learning the patient's family history in interviews, and conducting therapy. It is being researched for not only its effects,

but for the styles or types of reminiscing used by the individuals.

Reminiscence is defined as a process or practice of thinking or telling about one's past experiences and will be used as such in this study. As different types of reminiscence are researched, some beneficial and others not, researchers will begin to address frequency of use, specify types of use, and the effects on the individual for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of reminiscence across populations.

Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981) constructed a Reminiscence Use Scale that groups reminiscence into three distinct uses and quantifies the frequency of use by an individual. The three uses measured are self regard/image enhancement, present-problem solving, and existential/self-understanding.

The use of drawings as a technique to obtain information about individuals and the way they express themselves was popularized by Goodenough in 1923 (cited in Koppitz, 1983). She felt that drawings were a universal language that had been used before written language. Hulse (1951) first introduced the family drawing technique. He believed that it reveals the individual's perception of the family constellation, concept of self, anxieties, and fantasies. Burns and Kaufman (1970) developed the Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) to obtain information about the individual's concepts about the family and actions between the members.

The instructions for the KFD include asking the individual to draw his/her whole family doing something. The hypothesis behind the introduction of action was that interpersonal relations, status, and interaction patterns of family members could be extracted.

Bergland (1982) and Zeiger (1976) have combined the life review process or reminiscence with art in the aged. Zeiger (1976) used art activities to facilitate memories of forgotten or repressed material in the elderly. She subscribed to Butler's life review process as being important to an aging individual. Bergland's (1982) use of the life review process in art therapy for geriatric patients was to aid the return of self-esteem and orientation to the present. Though these two studies have noted a use of art and reminiscence as being beneficial to the elderly, no normative studies were attempted nor correlations drawn between the two modalities. Research in the areas of children's drawings have been accomplished (Di Leo, 1983; Klepsch & Logie, 1982), but no norms were found for the family drawings of adults, the aged, or correlations with reminiscence use.

This study will attempt to correlate Romaniuk and Romaniuk's (1981) Reminiscence Use Scale with the Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD). It is hypothesized that if the subject scores high on the Reminiscence Use Scale their drawings will demonstrate a family structure representing their

past, e.g., family of origin during their youth. Likewise, if the subject scores lower on the Reminiscence Use Scale their family drawing will represent a more current lifestyle, e.g., older age and family with adult children. In addition, since there are no studies utilizing the KFD with the elderly, the need for normative data is apparent and the current study will contribute to this literature. A qualitative analysis of the drawings will also be evaluated.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Use of Reminiscence

Cumming and Henry (1961), the formulators of the 'disengagement theory,' viewed increased use of reminiscence as an indication of aging. Dobrof (1984) suggested that earlier literature associated reminiscence with negative connotations and signs of pathology. Butler (1963) was one of the first to arouse excitement about the therapeutical use of reminiscence by the elderly in his paper 'The Life Review: An Interpretation of Reminiscence in the Aged.' Butler disputed many of the earlier negative connotations associated with reminiscence. He proposed that reminiscence is a normal and therapeutic activity and is a process of coming to terms with one's life. Benefits are now being recognized by several researchers (Havighurst & Glasser, 1972). Benefits have been noted in the use of reminiscence with the psychotic elderly when traditional psychotherapy was unsuccessful (Lesser, Lazarus, Frankel, & Havasg, 1981). Another benefit is that the use of reminiscence in an institutional situation potentially helps the staff to see and appreciate their clients as individuals (Woods & Britton, 1985, p. 235), and reminiscence can be used to establish and maintain rapport.

Evaluation of reminiscence as a tool has been difficult. Types of reminiscence are being delineated such as in

Watt and Wong's taxonomy (1991). In research it is important that more uniform definitions for the type of reminiscence be used so that this tool can be assessed and generalized in its effectiveness to the larger populations (Watt & Wong, 1991).

Sherman & Peak (1991) and Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981) identified three types or patterns of reminiscence using the Reminiscence Use Scale. These three types are self-regard /image enhancement, present problem solving, and existential /self-understanding such as used in life review. The Reminiscence Use Scale as designed by Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981) measures frequency of reminiscence when the individual is alone or with others and also delineates the purpose or type used.

Sherman & Peak (1991) found subjects used Type I or self-regard/image enhancement reminiscence most often. When he analyzed the Ego Integrity Scale with the frequency of reminiscence there was no significant relationship, but there was a positive correlation between the Type I reminiscence to Affect-Balance scores. In an analysis of the literature on reminiscence, Haight (1991) found that out of ninety-seven published articles between 1960-1990, only seven report negative outcomes.

Use of Drawings

Figure drawing has been accepted and used by some researchers as a projection of the subject's attitudes toward

life and society in general, self-concept, body image, or any combination of these (Abt & Bellack, 1950, p. 260). Projective psychologists believe that figure drawings are not accidental, but are a determined behavior, whether a conscious expression or a disguised symbol of the unconscious (Abt & Bellack, 1950, p. 260). Goodenough (cited in Koppitz, 1983) developed a systematic scale for evaluation of the drawings of children. Harris (1963) revised the scale and evaluation technique. Koppitz analyzed drawings of children to provide norm tables for what was expected, common, not unusual, and exceptional or rare. With Koppitz's (1968) scoring system one can estimate a child's IQ from the human figure drawings. Machover (1949) generated a projective emphasis in the analyzing of human figure drawings. Buck (1948) used the drawings to determine the perceptions of the environment in his House-Tree-Person technique. He felt that the unconscious could be tapped from the tree drawing and the conscious views from the person drawing.

Hulse (1951) introduced the family drawing technique to acquire perceptions of the family, self-concept, and anxieties. The Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) technique was first introduced by Burns and Kaufman (1970). The KFD has been used repeatedly with children, but has been applied in very little research with adults. The KFD can show how an individual perceives one's self in a family setting, but users

are warned not to overinterpret symbols (Burns & Kaufman, 1972). A kinetic family drawing is one in which the individual is asked to draw a picture of everyone in the family including the subject doing something. The KFD is used to obtain information about the individual's concepts about the family and actions between the members. Reynolds (1978) introduced a quick reference for interpreting KFDs and identifying emotional indicators. Mostkoff and Lazarus (1983) objectified 20 criteria by which KFDs can be quantified and interpreted with test-retest reliabilities range from .46 to .90 for the variables. Interrater reliability ranged from .86 to 1.00, with a mean of .97.

Much has been studied about children's drawings. They have been used to measure developmental, intellectual, and interpersonal relationships and perceptions, but little has been applied to drawings of adults or the aged. Research in the area of adult human figure and family drawings include using drawings to differentiate between control groups and those suffering from mental illnesses such as depression (Wright and McIntyre, 1982) or child molesters from control groups (Johnston and Johnston, 1986).

Use of Reminiscence with Drawings

Reminiscence therapy or the life review process has been used in conjunction with art therapy and drawings in the aged (Bergland, 1982; Zeiger, 1976). Zeiger (1976) subscribed to Butler's life review process as being impor-

tant to an aging individual. She found that the use of art activities can facilitate memories of forgotten or repressed material in the elderly and further personality reorganization. Bergland's (1982) use of the life review process in art therapy for geriatric patients was to aid the return of self-esteem and orientation to the present. She encouraged verbal recall of patients' memories as they made art work. Bergland noted that often an increase in aesthetics in art work was comparative to positive behavioral changes and in areas of self-esteem. Though these two studies have noted a use of art and also reminiscence as being beneficial to the elderly, no normative studies of the drawings were attempted nor correlations drawn between the verbal and pictorial modalities.

There is a need for psychological research for techniques that will assist the elderly such as the use of drawings and scales that are specific to their needs. This study used the Reminiscence Use Scale by Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981) and the Kinetic Family Drawing by Burns and Kaufman (1970) since the validity and benefits of these are recognized, but it was unknown if a positive correlation existed between the two modalities.

The purpose of this present study is to correlate the Reminiscence Use Scale with the Kinetic Family Drawing, to supplement normative data in the KFD using this elderly population, and to provide a qualitative analysis of draw-

ings of the elderly. The drawings will be normed for size of figures, figures included, activities depicted, and placement.

The following hypotheses were constructed using the research literature.

1. There will be a positive correlation between the score of the Reminiscence Use Scale and the score assigned to the Kinetic Family Drawing for the year the drawing depicts.
2. Individuals who score a higher frequency of use on the Reminiscence Use Scale will depict drawings from their earlier years, such as their family of origin or early adult family pattern.
3. Individuals who score a lower frequency of use on the Reminiscence Use Scale will have drawings that depict their family situation within recent years.
4. The symbols and signs used in drawings by those aged 60 years and above will not differ from those of the younger population.

Subjects

The 32 subjects in this study were drawn from volunteers of senior centers, civic clubs, and church groups in Henry and Weakley Counties in the northwest area of Tennessee. They were 60 years of age and older. They ranged in age from 60 to 88 with the median age at 71.5 years. By their participation in the social groups it was assumed that they had the capacity to participate in this study. There were thirty female subjects and two males. They were Caucasian and presently living in the rural south. They had signed a consent form (Appendix A) that allowed them to withdraw from the study at any time.

Instruments

A Reminiscence Use Scale (Appendix B) adapted from Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981) was scored by adding up the yes answers to the questionnaire and the Likert points assigned to the last two frequency questions. The Reminiscence Use Scale consisted of 13 items describing a specific use or purpose for reminiscence and asked the participant if he or she had used it when thinking or talking about the past. The response categories include a Yes or No format. A "yes" response indicated a positive response to the item and counted as a score. The Likert scores assigned were five

points for the answer "almost always" to one point for "never."

A Kinetic Family Drawing as designed by Burns and Kaufman (1970) was placed on white paper 8 1/2" x 11" using number 2B pencils. The subject labeled the year their drawing represented and points were assigned according to five year intervals; one point was given for each preceding interval from the present.

Procedure

Upon introduction of the study, volunteers were asked to fill out a consent form (Appendix A). The Kinetic Family Drawing task (Appendix C) then was administered. Upon completion of the drawing the subject was asked to label who the individuals were, their ages, and the year of occurrence for the drawing. Subjects were then asked to complete the Reminiscence Use Scale (Appendix B) by Romaniuk and Romaniuk (1981). Drawings and questionnaires were anonymous with only gender and age noted. They were stapled together upon completion and collected from the group of those who continued to give consent.

Data Analysis

Scores were assigned to the drawings which reflect the number of years between the year assigned to the drawing by the subject and the present year, one point for each five years in the past. The scores for reminiscence were tallied by adding up each of the yes questions and the Likert points

assigned. Correlations were drawn between the scores of the Reminiscence Use Scale and the scores assigned to the KFD for the year the drawing depicts.

A qualitative analysis was performed by giving frequencies and percentages for common signs or symbols represented. Reynolds (1978) quick reference was used to interpret the drawings' emotional indicators (Appendix D). The drawings were examined to determine which actions, styles, and symbols were deemed most relevant in representing families of this population. Unique aspects of the drawings are discussed and incorporate types of figures included, types of activity, areas of omission, and areas of emphasis.

Results

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed for the data using the subject's reported year for the Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) and the Reminiscence Use Scale score. There was not a significant correlation between the labeled year of the KFD and the total scores in the Reminiscence Use Scale ($r=.1056, p>.05$). Those who report they reminisce in a verbal manner do not draw family representations from the past significantly more often. Subjects drew pictures with a present focus in 45% of the family depictions. The pictures' reported years range from the present to 1934 with the mean year at 1975.

Normative data for the KFDs were obtained. Frequencies of some of the emotional indicators are listed in Table 1. The criteria for the emotional indicators are in Appendix D. Common emotional indicators, occurring in greater than 25% of the drawings, include pencil erasures, missing essential body parts, shading, and transparencies. Rare indicators, occurring in less than 10% of the drawings, include barriers between figures, fields of force, positions of figures with respect to safety, compartmentalism, underlining of figures, lining at the top or bottom of the page, encapsulation, edged placement of figures, evasions, figures on the back of the page, buttons, jagged or sharp fingers, toes, or teeth, and excessive attention to detail.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Drawings
Containing Emotional Indicators

EMOTIONAL INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Barriers between figures	3	9
Fields of Force	1	3
Pencil Erasures	12	38
Arm Extensions	4	13
Positions of Figures with Respect to Safety	2	6
Missing Essential Body Parts	12	38
Shading or Crosshatching	8	25
Compartmentalism of Figures	1	3
Folding Compartmentalism	0	0
Underlining of Individual Figures	0	0
Lining at the Bottom of the Page	1	3
Lining at the Top of the Page	1	3
Encapsulation	1	3
Edged Placement of Figures	4	13
Evasions	1	3
Figures on Back of Page	0	0
Motionless or Stick Figures	7	22
Buttons	2	6
Jagged or Sharp Fingers, Toes, or Teeth	0	0
Bizarre Figures	4	13
Excessive Attention to Detail	0	0
Transparencies	13	41
Anchoring	7	22

Other significant aspects of the drawings include the mean height of self in the drawings at 5.45 cm. Height of self ranged from 1.2 cm to 18 cm. Central placement of the drawings occurred most commonly and was in 50% of the KFDs. Placement of the figures near or at the top of the page occurred in 31% of the drawings with the remainder at the bottom. Placement of self on the left side of the family

constellation was a more common occurrence in 60% of these subjects.

Frequencies and totals for the types of family figures drawn are noted in Table 2. One subject did not include self in the drawing. Those who drew spouses included only one spouse. Those who included children or in-laws drew on average two each. Those who drew grandchildren drew an average of 3 grandchildren. Those who included pets did not include children or grandchildren.

Table 2

Family Figures:
Types, Frequencies, and Total Number Included

TYPES OF FAMILY FIGURES	FREQUENCY	TOTAL
Self	31	31
Spouse	14	14
Children	23	46
Grandchildren	9	28
In-Laws	5	10
Pets	3	4

The common activity depicted, dining, occurred in 40% of the drawings. Other activities included sports, walking, and gardening. Least common activities were quilting, carpentry, and artistic painting.

Of the subjects' line quality characteristics, 28% had heavy pressure, 15% were light and sketchy, and the remain-

der were light to average with no pressure shown on the opposite side of the page.

Symbols used by these subjects do not differ significantly from those of younger populations. The frequencies of some of the common symbols are presented in Table 3. Table 3 shows that the most common symbols were tables, chairs, and plates. The house and tree symbols were in 16% of the pictures as were balls. The houses in the drawings commonly have the essential features, walls, door, window, roof, and chimney. All other symbols are in less than 10% of the pictures.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Drawings
Containing Each Symbol

SYMBOL	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
House	5	16
Tree	5	16
Flowers	3	9
Clouds	1	3
Birds	3	9
Warmth Symbols:		
Sun	3	9
Light	2	6
	1	3
Power Symbols:		
Train	1	3
Automobile	1	1
Lawnmower	2	6
Boat	1	3
Social Symbols:		
Church	2	6
Picnic	2	6
Table	10	31
Chairs	11	34
Plates	9	28
Activity Symbols:		
Balls	5	16
Glove	3	9
Bat	3	9
Racket	1	3
Animal Symbols:		
Dog	3	9
Cat	1	3
Bird	2	6
Horse	1	3

Discussion and Summary

As the United States population increases in age, measures and therapies will be in greater demand that address those aged sixty and above. This study addressed the techniques of reminiscence and drawings used for the elderly. This study showed no correlation between measures for the pictorial modality using the Kinetic Family Drawing (KFD) and the verbal modality using the Reminiscence Use Scale. However, there was a positive correlation between the drawings and the two Likert scale frequency of use questions on the Reminiscence Use Scale ($r=.3285$, $p<.05$). It is possible that the scales need to be further researched and developed to include more items and increase internal consistency. In addition, some subjects were displeased with the yes or no format. These subjects appear to prefer the degrees of the Likert scale and ability to qualify their answers. The KFD also may not be sensitive to reminiscence and is confounded by the individual's concentration on drawing the family constellation and dynamics.

The KFD is used as a projective technique to determine perceptions of the family constellation, concept of self, anxieties, and interrelationships. Normative data was collected on the drawings to assist in obtaining information on those aged 60 and above. These norms provide a basis and

promote the usefulness of the KFD as an instrument to detect abnormality or pathology.

Normative data for this population has shown that there are some similarities and differences from the younger population for which the KFD was originally intended. Characteristics of the drawings called emotional indicators are used to identify areas of emotional distress. It was surprising to find in this adult population that 41% of the drawings included transparencies, objects that appeared transparent when in reality they are not. Also in 38% of the subjects' drawings there were missing body parts, such as arms, feet, or halves of bodies not shown below the dining table. In 38% there were also pencil erasures which are purported to indicate anxiety when the erasures do not result in improvement. There was no way to determine in this study whether this was an indicator of anxiety, perfectionism, or may be an organicity indicator for this population.

Size of self in drawings is purported to be equated to a person's self-esteem. The mean size of self in this study for those age 60 and older is equivalent to those in other studies for younger populations.

Placement of self on the left of the family constellation in 60% of the drawings was surprising. Researchers have purported that drawings placed on the left are indicative of a preoccupation with the past or anxiety, but this

should be interpreted with caution as the subjects may begin drawing on the left, as in writing, and begin with self.

Types of figures included for this population are more varied than those of younger populations. This is to be expected as those aged 60 and older have experienced several life stages involving changing family situations. Whereas children predominantly draw their parents, self, and siblings with a present focus, this population had several options from which to choose for the family drawn. Fifty-five percent of the subjects in this study drew a family situation from the past involving their childhood with the family of origin or younger adult years with young children.

Family activities were similar to those of younger populations. Most common in both populations is a drawing of the family dining together as was found in 34% this study. A finding unexpected for this less active population was an emphasis on sports by 16% of the participants. Less common were the occupation themes highlighted in 9% of the drawings, a church emphasis in 6%, with gardening, feeding animals, walking, or no activities in the remainder.

Line characteristics are usually indicative as an emotional indicator, but are not interpreted in this study due to the subjects' age and physiological changes. Many have shaking hands that could cause wavy drawings or line discontinuity and would not necessarily indicate emotionality.

Symbols used were similar to those of younger populations, such as houses with essential features, trees, birds in the sky, and the sun. The most common symbols for this and younger populations using the KFD were tables, plates, and chairs.

The research literature does acknowledge weaknesses in methodology and definitions of reminiscence types, but at the same time claims the therapeutic benefits of reminiscence and drawings. This study's lack of significance does not support consistency between verbal and pictorial modalities of reminiscence. Some individuals expressed an orientation to the past through their questionnaires and drawings. They may be in the process of life review or evaluation of their life and therefore strengthened their measures, in which case more sensitive scales may be useful for the other subjects.

The effect of marital status on reminiscence and drawings was examined as a pilot study to future research, to determine if widowhood increases the likelihood of a past focus. Neither the subject's age nor widowhood was significantly correlated with the labeled year of the drawing nor reminiscence use in the small samples.

Continued use and research may show the validity of drawings and reminiscence as assessment and therapeutic tools for this population. Further normative research could examine distance of self from other figures, such as dis-

tance from parents, spouse, children, in-laws, or grandchildren. There were insufficient subjects to examine these variables in the present study.

A future reminiscence study may include the effect of gender on reminiscence and drawings as these subjects were predominantly women. Several potential male subjects declined participation. It will be necessary to continue the research with these populations, and with exceptional groups to provide contrasting norms. Studies will be necessary if we are to handle the problems and questions that will arise with the increased number of those aged sixty and above in United States.

Therapists have used both art and the life review process to facilitate memories, self-esteem, and reorganize personality in the older adult. The use of drawings and reminiscence as therapeutic tools has been noted, but were not correlated in this study with the quantifiable measures used.

REFERENCES

References

- Abt, L. & Bellack, L. (1950). Projective Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bergland, C. (1982). The life review process in geriatric art therapy: A pilot study. The Arts in Therapy, 9, 121-130.
- Buck, J.N. (1948). The H-T-P technique: A qualitative and quantitative scoring manual. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 4, 317-396.
- Burns, R.C. & Kaufman, S.F. (1970). Kinetic Family Drawings (K-F-D): An introduction to understanding children through kinetic drawings. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Burns, R.C. & Kaufman, S.F. (1972). Action, styles and symbols in Kinetic Family Drawings (K-F-D): An interpretive manual. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Butler, R.N. (1963). The Life Review: An interpretation of reminiscence in the aged. Psychiatry, 26, 65-76.
- Cumming, E. and Henry, W. (1961). Growing Old: The Process of Disengagement, Basic Books, New York.
- De Genova, M.K. (1991). Elderly life review therapy: A Bowen approach. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 19, (2), 160-166.
- Di Leo, J.H. (1983). Interpreting Children's Drawings. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Dobrof, R. (1984). Introduction: A time for reclaiming the past in M. Kaminsky (ed.), The Uses of Reminiscence: New Ways of Working with Older Adults, New York: The Haworth Press.
- Haight, B. K. (1991). Reminiscing: The state of the art as a basis for practice. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 33, (1), 1-32.
- Hanley, I. and Gilhooly, M. (1986). Psychological Therapies for the Elderly, New York: New York University Press.
- Harris, D.B. (1963). Children's drawings as measures of intellectual maturity. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

- Havighurst, R.J. and Glasser, R. (1972). An exploratory study of reminiscence. Journal of Gerontology, 27, 235-253.
- Hulse, W.C. (1951). The emotionally disturbed child draws his family. Quarterly Journal of Child Behavior, 3, 152-174.
- Johnston, F.A. and Johnston, S.A. (1986). Differences between human figure drawings of child molesters and control groups. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42, (4), 638-647.
- Klepsch, M. and Logie, L. (1982). Children Draw and Tell. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Koppitz, E.M. (1983). Projective drawings with children and adolescents. School Psychology Review, 12, (4), 421-427.
- Lesser, J., Lazarus, L.W., Frankel, R. & Havasg, S. (1981). Reminiscence group therapy with psychotic geriatric inpatients. The Gerontologist, 21, (3), 291-296.
- Machover, K. (1949). Personality projection in the drawings of the human figure. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.
- Mostkoff, D.L. & Lazarus, P.J. (1983). The Kinetic Family Drawing: The reliability of an objective scoring system. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 16-20.
- Reynolds, C.R. (1978). a quick-scoring guide to the interpretation of children's Kinetic Family Drawings (KFD). Psychology in the Schools, 15, 489-492.
- Romaniuk, M. & Romaniuk, J. G. (1981). Looking back: An analysis of reminiscence functions and triggers. Experimental Aging Research, 7, 477-489.
- Sherman, E. and Peak, T. (1991). Patterns of reminiscence and the assessment of late life adjustment. Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 16, (1/2), 59-74.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1991 (11th edition.) Washington, DC, 1991.
- Watt, L.M. and Wong, P.T.P. (1991). A taxonomy of reminiscence and therapeutic implications. Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 16, (1/2), 37-57.

- Woods, R.T. & Britton, P.G. (1985). Clinical Psychology with the Elderly, Rockville, MD: An Aspen Publication.
- Wright, J.H. and McIntyre, M.P. (1982). The Family Drawing Depression Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, (4), 853-861.
- Zeiger, B.L. (1976). Life review in art therapy with the aged. American Journal of Art Therapy, 15, 47-50.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

CONSENT FORM

To Whom It May Concern,

Debra Davenport, a graduate student at Austin Peay State University, is conducting research in the area of the adult population.

The purpose of the study is to supplement normative data on the drawings of adults. You will be given a piece of paper and asked to draw a picture of your family doing something together, and then to answer a short questionnaire. Even if you give permission you may withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

I hereby give Debra Davenport permission to use my drawing and questionnaire to provide research data for a field study through Austin Peay State University.

It is understood that no name, identification number, or any other method of personal identification will be associated with this data in any way, and that such methods of personal identification will not be used for data storage on electronic or nonelectronic media. In this way the anonymity of the persons involved will be maintained. It is also understood that the data gathered will be used for the purpose of group statistical analysis and interpretations will not be used for any other purpose not pertaining to the field study or to the establishment of developmental norms.

Participant in field study

I understand, and agree to abide by, the provisions stated above.

Debra L. Davenport, Graduate Student

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

Questionnaire

AS YOU READ THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE MARK THE ANSWER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOU.

WHEN I HAVE TALKED OR THOUGHT ABOUT THE PAST, I HAVE DONE SO...

1. because memories are pleasant, enjoyable, and to help pass the time. __yes__no

2. to make plans for the future. __yes__no

3. to teach others by drawing on my past experiences. __yes__no

4. to cope with a loss in my life. __yes__no

5. to be amusing and entertaining. __yes__no

6. to solve something in my past that is troubling me. __yes__no

7. to identify what was better in the past. __yes__no

8. to deal with some problem that is troubling me. __yes__no

9. to inform others of my accomplishments. __yes__no

10. to arrive at a better understanding of my past life and myself. __yes__no

11. to describe myself to others. __yes__no

12. to determine life's meaning. __yes__no

13. because recalling my past life lifts my spirits. __yes__no

14. When you are with others, how often do your conversations turn to past experiences?
__almost always __often __occasionally __seldom __never

15. When you are alone, how often do your thoughts turn to past experiences?
__almost always __often __occasionally __seldom __never

__AGE __MALE __FEMALE
 __SINGLE __MARRIED __DIVORCED __WIDOWED
 PERMISSION TO USE MY DRAWINGS AND QUESTIONNAIRE? __yes__no

Any additional comments you would like to add or think is pertinent you may write on the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

Kinetic Family Drawing Task

Each individual will be handed a blank sheet of paper (8 1/2 x 11) and a pencil.

1. Draw a picture of everyone in your family, including you, DOING something. Try to draw whole people, not cartoons or stick people. Remember, make everyone DOING something - some kind of action.
2. (Upon Completion) Label the figures, their ages, and the year that you think this picture represents.
3. Turn the page over and print your gender and age.
4. A questionnaire will now be passed out to be completed.
5. The drawing and the completed questionnaire will be stapled together, collected, and placed in an envelope if consent has been given.

APPENDIX D

Reynold's Guidelines for Evaluating
Kinetic Family Drawings

Reynolds (1978) listed the following signs and indicators to be used in formulating interpretive hypothesis about Kinetic Family Drawings:

Physical Proximity - physical distance between the subject and other figures in the drawing.

Barriers between the Figures - objects other than lines between the subject and another figure in the drawing.

Relative Height of Respondent - height of the self figure.

Fields of Force - ball, fire, electrical appliance or Xs included in the drawing.

Pencil Erasures - erasures or corrections in the drawing.

Arm Extensions - objects held in the hand that make the area controlled by the figure larger.

Descriptions of Figures Actions - the verbal expression of action agrees with the action depicted.

Positions of Figures with Respect to Safety - figures in a dangerous or vulnerable position.

Missing Essential Body Parts - one or more body parts missing.

Rotation of Figure - figures rotated 45 degrees or more from straight edge of paper.

Shading or Crosshatching - areas of shading in the drawing not including hair.

Compartmentalism of Figures - one or more straight lines used to separate one or more figures.

Folding Compartmentalism - folding the paper into sections and drawing figures in more than one section.

Underlining of Individual Figures - lines drawn under one or more figures.

Lining at the Bottom of the Page - line drawn at the bottom of the paper.

Lining at the Top of the Page - line drawn at the top of the paper.

Encapsulation - complete enclosure of one or more figures, but not all, by lines which do not stretch the length of the page.

Edged Placement of Figures - drawing all figures on two or more edges of the paper.

Evasions - one or more, but not all, drawings depicting stick figures or no action.

Number of Household Members - omissions or additions of family members to the drawing.

Figures on Back of Page - figures drawn on the back of the page and separated from the other figures.

Line Quality - lines drawn light, broken and uneven or heavy, unsteady and wavy.

Assymetric Drawing - figures drawn out of proportion to others or environment.

Motionless or Stick Figures - all figures drawn as stick figures or no action depicted by all figures.

Ordering of Figures - order in which figures were drawn.

Buttons - overemphasized or overelaborated buttons on the figures.

Jagged or Sharp Fingers, Toes, Teeth - fingers, toes, or teeth drawn as sharp or jagged points.

Excessive Attention to Detail - excessive details drawn.

Transparencies - see through objects for figures included in the drawing which in reality are not transparent.

Isolation of Self - self figure drawn isolated from other figures which are portrayed as a group.

Anchoring - drawing of all figures within one inch of a single edge of paper.