Abstract. We examined the relationship between texture responses (T) on the Rorschach and adult attachment in the Japanese population. 47 Japanese undergraduate and graduate students (mean age = 20.16, SD = 1.87) completed a self-report adult attachment scale as well as the Rorschach. An ANOVA revealed that T = 1 participants were attached more securely than were other groups. T > 1 participants were more preoccupied with attachment and scored higher on an attachment anxiety scale than the T = 1 group. Although these results were consistent with the interpretation of the texture response according to the Comprehensive System (CS), the results obtained for T = 0 participants were inconsistent with hypotheses derived from the CS. T = 0 participants were high on preoccupied and attachment anxiety scores, although they were theoretically expected to be high on dismissing or attachment avoidance. These results indicated that – at least in Japan – T should be regarded as a sensitive measure of attachment anxiety.
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Introduction

The texture response (T) on the Rorschach is regarded as a measure of need for interpersonal contact and closeness (Beck & Molish, 1967; Exner, 2003; Kataguchi, 1987; Klopf, Ainsworth, Klopf, & Holt, 1954). This interpretational hypothesis is widely accepted today by many Rorschach systems, although different perspectives about texture responses had been suggested by some prominent Rorschach researchers (Binder, 1933; Lerner, 1990; Piotrowski, 1957; Rapaport, Gill, & Shafer, 1946; Schachtel, 1966).
As Kleiger (1997) pointed out, shading responses including T have been the most controversial and the least researched determinant category. Herman Rorschach’s original inkblot did not include shading, so that the shading determinant was absent in his original article, *Psychodiagnostics* (Rorschach, 1942). According to Ellenberger (1954), due to printer’s error, shadings appeared in his inkblots. Rorschach immediately recognized this error as a potentially important variable in the response process and in his later article (Rorschach & Oberholzer, 1923) interpreted such that references to shading were related to an individual’s emotional adjustment.

After Rorschach’s death, some researchers elaborated shading determinants. To develop Rorschach’s original idea, Binder (1933) first investigated and elaborated shading responses, but he did not clearly refer to texture responses. Klopfer (1938; Klopfer et al., 1954), who first examined texture response, created the code c to represent these responses. He interpreted texture responses as relating to the handling of affectional need and to the basic expectation of affection which can be received from the outside world (Klopfer et al., 1954). This theorization about texture response and coding criterion was basically incorporated by Hertz (1940), Beck (1944), and in Japan Kataguchi (1987). Some researchers (Binder, 1933; Lerner, 1990; Piotrowski, 1957; Rapaport et al., 1946; Schachtel, 1966) stated somewhat different perspectives about texture responses, although in his Comprehensive System of the Rorschach (CS) Exner (2003) also interpreted along the line of Klopfer’s interpretational hypothesis about texture responses with Beck’s coding symbol T.

In the CS interpretative strategy, T is interpreted according to number of SumT, which is a counted score of texture responses in each record. Exner (2003) indicated that the presence of a single T response suggests that the person probably acknowledges and expresses a need for closeness, in a way similar to most people. A person who gives more than one T response (SumT > 1) has relatively strong needs for closeness. A person who gives no T responses (SumT = 0) appears to be more guarded and/or distant in interpersonal contacts. T is included in four of eight clusters in the CS (i.e., Affect, Interpersonal Perception and Behavior, Controls and Stress Tolerance, and Situationally Related Stress), and two special scores (i.e., Hyper Vigilance Index, HVL; and Coping Deficit Index, CDI). It is therefore important to establish the validity of T.

Recent studies (e.g., Cassella, 1999; Kleiger, 1997; Weber, Meloy & Gacono, 1992) investigated the validity of the interpretation of T, from
the viewpoint of Adult Attachment theory (Bartholomew & Holowitz, 1991; Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Adult attachment research and theory are derived from Bowlby’s Attachment theory, which is a lifespan developmental theory of social interaction and emotion regulation (Bowlby, 1973; Eng, Heimbeg, Hart, Schneier, & Liebowiz, 2001). This theory hypothesizes that early interactions with significant others are internalized into the form of attachment working models of self and other. These models organize cognition, affect, and behavior in close relationships throughout the lifespan (Mikulincer, 1998; Mikulincer, Shaver & Pereg, 2003).

In the area of adult attachment, most researchers have focused on attachment styles, which are systematic patterns of relational expectations, emotions, and behaviors that result from the internalization of a particular history of attachment experiences (Fraley, Garner, & Shaver, 2000). The concept of an adult attachment style was derived from Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall’s (1978) classical typology of attachment style of infants. This typology includes three categories: labeled secure, anxious, and avoidant. Hazan and Shaver (1987) argued that patterns of adults’ social interaction in the romantic and/or marital domains parallel Ainsworth’s categories.

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) later conceptualized a four-category model of adult attachment style (i.e., secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful), according to Bowlby’s original theorization of attachment working models. They suggested that the four categories are logically derived from combining valence of attachment working model of self (positive vs. negative) with valence of attachment working model of other (positive vs. negative). The descriptions of four attachment styles are as follows (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Moreira et al., 2003): Secure attachment style (both models are positive) is characterized as feeling comfortable with closeness and thus keeping appropriate levels of distance in relationships; preoccupied attachment style (negative model of self; positive model of other) is characterized as showing an intense desire for closeness, together with worry about partners’ feelings and the possibility of abandonment; dismissing attachment style (positive model of self; negative model of other) is characterized by the negation of attachment needs, so that these individuals passively avoid close relationships, value independence, and autonomy at the expense of intimacy, and consider relationships with others to be relatively unimportant; fearful attachment style is characterized by a strong conflict between a desire for intimacy and interpersonal distrust or fear of rejection. This latter conflict is
extremely discomforting for individuals with a fearful attachment style, so they typically avoid interpersonal closeness.

Although the four-category model has been broadly accepted, recent adult attachment researchers have suggested that individual differences in adult attachment are better understood from a dimensional rather than a categorical viewpoint (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). Mikulincer and his colleagues (2003) conceptualized two essential attachment dimensions, called attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. These dimensions correspond to attachment working models of self and other. Attachment anxiety is conceptualized as corresponding to negativity in the attachment working model of self. Individuals with high attachment anxiety (i.e., a negative model of the self) are characterized by anxiety about abandonment by attachment figures. They tend to fix attention on distress-evoking stimuli, monitor attachment figures closely for signs of impending abandonment, magnify expressions of distress, and maintain proximity to and solicit comfort from attachment figures (Mallinckrodt & Wei, 2005). Attachment avoidance is conceptualized as corresponding to a negative attachment working model of others. Individuals with high attachment avoidance (i.e., a negative model of others) are characterized by avoidance of intimacy. They tend to fear becoming close to others and to divert attention from both distress-evoking stimuli and attachment related thoughts and feelings (Fraley & Shaver, 1997).

These conceptualizations provide a theoretical framework to understand how people construct an interpersonal relationship, regulate emotions and feelings, maintain their own mental health, and so forth (Mikulincer et al., 2003).

Previous studies have also discussed the cultural influences on adult attachment. Research supporting attachment theory has been conducted primarily in Western cultures, so that several important notions of attachment theory are deeply rooted in Western cultural value systems (Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, & Zakalik, 2004). According to Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, and Morelli (2000), American culture emphasizes autonomy and individuation in contrast to Japanese culture, which emphasizes social harmony and interdependence. They also stated that individuals with corresponding characteristics were more likely to adjust to each respective culture. Also, in attachment literature, high attachment anxiety is more prevalent in Japanese culture than in Western cultures including the United States (Schmitt et al., 2004; Takahashi, 1986). Such findings suggest that there is cultural diversity in individual differences of adult attachment, although van IJzendoorn and Sagi (1999)
conclude that “[cross-cultural] studies are remarkably consistent with theory. Attachment theory may therefore claim cross-cultural validity” (p. 731).

As noted above, previous studies investigated the validity of the CS interpretation of T from the viewpoint of adult attachment theory. Weber et al. (1992) found that compared to controls conduct-disordered adolescents tended to produce few or no T responses. They suggested that this result reflected the difficulties conduct-disordered adolescents have forming healthy attachment relationships. Similarly, Hartmann, Norbech, and Gronnerod (2006) found that psychopathic violent offenders who have difficulties forming attachment relationship with others produced a T response less frequently than did controls.

Cassella (1999) directly investigated the relationship between the T response and adult attachment. He extensively reviewed previous literature about T responses and adult attachment to investigate the conceptual validity of T (Weiner, 1977). He found that previous findings pertaining to the T response could be comprehensively understood from the theoretical framework of adult attachment. To confirm this relationship, he examined whether (1) a dismissing and fearful attachment style relates to a lack of T response (T = 0); (2) a secure attachment style relates to a moderate frequency of T response (T = 1); and (3) a preoccupied attachment style relates to increased frequency of T response (T > 1). All such relationships were indeed found. Berant, Mikulincer, Shaver, and Segal (2005) reported similar results using a dimensional approach: Participants with a T = 0 showed higher attachment avoidance compared with participants with more than one T response. The conceptual validity of the CS interpretation of T has generally been supported.

Although recent studies provided empirical support for the CS interpretation of T, the generally lower frequency of T observed in Japan makes a clinical interpretation of T difficult there. According to Japanese normative data for nonpatient adults (Takahashi, Takahashi, & Nishio, 2007), the modal value of SumT is 0, with a mean of 0.60. Exner’s normative data, however, indicate a modal response equal to 1, with a mean of 0.94 (Exner, 2003). In addition, the Hyper Vigilance Index (HVI) (T = 0) was more frequently positive in Japan (12%) than in Exner’s normative data (1%). Are Japanese nonpatient adults really more avoidant and vigilant in interpersonal situations? If this is not the case, many Japanese people would be evaluated as more avoidant and vigilant than they actually are. In fact, the standard Japanese manual for the CS recommends caution when interpreting T = 0 protocols (Takahashi et
The validity of the CS interpretation of T has not been well established in Japan. From this standpoint, validation studies of T in Japan are required.

Allen and Dana (2004) suggested that the cultural universality of specific Rorschach variables remains an open empirical question. When culture-specific normative data about particular CS variable differ from Exner’s norm, important questions arise: Could we interpret this variable by simply conforming to the CS interpretation strategy? Does the variable represent a culturally specific construct or a culturally universal one? A body of literature from cross-cultural psychology has now conclusively demonstrated important ways in which normative personality attributes associated with cognition, emotion, and self-representation vary across cultural groups in intensity, form, and meaning (Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Triandis & Suh, 2002). Thus, CS variables and indices may be influenced by cultural differences in various ways. We can assume that some CS variables would likely tap culturally specific constructs, whereas other variables would probably tap culturally universal constructs. This unresolved question is best addressed through direct tests of the cross-cultural construct validity and equivalence of the interpretations of data from CS variables (Allen & Dana, 2004). Investigating this issue with regards to T might lead to a reexamination of validity and perhaps a reconstruction of the interpretation of T.

This study tests the validity of the CS interpretation of T in Japan. We tested the hypotheses that were tested by Cassella (1999) in order to determine whether the CS-ascribed meaning of T is culturally specific or culturally universal. The hypotheses of this study were as follows:

- A dismissing and fearful attachment style may relate to a lack of T responses ($T = 0$);
- A secure attachment style may relate to moderate frequency of T responses ($T = 1$);
- A preoccupied attachment style may relate to an increased frequency of T responses ($T > 1$).

These relationships are observed in a Japanese sample and it is tested whether or not the CS interpretation of T is culturally universal. If the relationships noted by Cassella (1999) are not observed here, then we can assume that the interpretation of T is not culture universal.
Method

Participants

Forty-seven Japanese undergraduate and graduate students (14 male, 33 female) participated in this study. Mean participant age was 20.2 (SD = 1.9, range = 18–29). The participants consisted of two sample groups that had been recruited in different regions in Japan. To confirm the homogeneity between the two groups, we conducted t-tests and Mann-Whitney U-tests comparing both groups on all variables examined in this study. Results revealed no statistically significant differences between the two groups, and we therefore integrated the two groups into one. None of the participants had previously taken the Rorschach, and all participants produced 14 or more responses.

Instruments

The Rorschach

The first author administered the Rorschach and coded all records according to the CS (Exner, 2003). To ensure interrater reliability, a third-party Rorschach researcher coded all records independently, and the first author and another coder discussed coding accuracy of all responses. Finally, consensus was established for all codes.

Adult Attachment Questionnaire

Adult attachment patterns were assessed using the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The RQ is a single-item measure made up of four short paragraphs, each describing a prototypical attachment pattern as it applies to close adult peer relationships. Participants are asked to rate their degree of correspondence to each prototype on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = not at all like me to 7 = very much like me. The four attachment patterns assessed are the Secure, Preoccupied, Dismissing, and Fearful patterns. For the RQ, two attachment dimension scores (Attachment anxiety and Attachment avoidance) are also available from the original four ratings for use in theoretically driven formulas. Attachment anxiety scores are obtained by summing
the ratings of secure and dismissing, and then subtracting the ratings of preoccupied and fearful. Attachment avoidance scores are obtained by summing the rating of secure and preoccupied, and subtracting the ratings of dismissing and fearful* (Griffin & Bartholomew, 1991). Lower scores on each variable represent high tendencies toward the relevant dimensions. This study used the Japanese version of the RQ.

Procedure
Twenty-three of the 47 participants first completed the RQ in an Introduction Psychology class at Kyoto Bunkyo University. After completing this measure, they were asked to participate in the Rorschach examination. They agreed to do the Rorschach without a monetary reward. Several days after completing the RQ, participants completed the Rorschach individually at the laboratory.

The remaining 24 participants had been recruited in several classes at the University of Tsukuba. Participants first completed the Rorschach at the laboratory and then the RQ individually as well**.

Results
Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive statistics of SumT and RQ variables are presented in Table 1. Frequency of $T = 0$ responses was 29 (61.67%), $T = 1$ was 11 (23.40%), and $T > 1$ was 7 (14.89%).

Main Analysis
A one-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate mean differences of RQ variables among the SumT groups ($T = 0$, $T = 1$, $T > 1$). Table 2 shows means and SDs for the 3 groups on each variable. Statistically significant

---

* We computed dimension scores according to Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) on standardized ratings to control for differential variances of the four ratings.

** While the participants also completed other questionnaires, we don’t report these results in this paper.
differences between the three groups were observed on Preoccupied, $F(2, 44) = 10.77, p < .001$, Secure, $F(2, 44) = 16.24, p < .001$, and Attachment Anxiety, $F(2, 44) = 12.00, p < .001$ (see Table 2). Additionally, a trend toward significance was observed on Dismissing, $F(2, 44) = 2.66, p < .10$. Tukey-Kramer’s posthoc tests revealed that $T = 1$ was higher on Secure than $T = 0$ ($p < .001$) and $T > 1$ ($p < .001$). $T > 1$ was higher on Preoccupied and Attachment Anxiety than $T = 1$ ($p < .001, < .001$). $T = 0$ was higher on Preoccupied and Attachment Anxiety than $T = 1$ ($p < .01, p < .01$), and there was a trend toward $T = 0$ being higher on Dismissing than $T > 1$ ($p < .10$).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for SumT and RQ variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ variables</th>
<th>SumT</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>A.Avo</th>
<th>A.Anx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A.Avo. = Attachment Avoidance; A.Anx. = Attachment Anxiety. The formulas for calculating scores of Attachment Avoidance and Anxiety are; A.Avo. = (Secure + Preoccupied) – (Avoidance + Fearful); A.Anx. = (Secure + Avoidance) – (Preoccupied + Fearful). A.Avo. and A.Anx. were calculated with standardized scores of original 4 attachment patterns ratings.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and $F$ ratios of RQ variables by SumT groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ Variables</th>
<th>SumT</th>
<th>Dismissing</th>
<th>Preoccupied</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>A.Avo</th>
<th>A.Anx</th>
<th>$F(2, 44)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T = 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 29$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>10.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 11$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T &gt; 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>16.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 7$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.Avo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.Anx.</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.55</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>−1.96</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>12.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A.Avo. = Attachment Avoidance; A.Anx. = Attachment Anxiety. The formulas for calculating scores of Attachment Avoidance and Anxiety are; A.Avo. = (Secure + Preoccupied) – (Avoidance + Fearful); A.Anx. = (Secure + Avoidance) – (Preoccupied + Fearful). A.Avo. and A.Anx. were calculated with standardized scores of original 4 attachment patterns ratings. Within each variable means with different subscripts were significantly different at $p < .05$. **$p < .01$. 
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Discussion

The results of this study partially replicated the findings of a previous study (Cassella, 1999). In other words, participants with T = 1 feel comfortable with closeness and thus keeping appropriate distance in relationships, and participants with T > 1 show an intense desire for closeness, together with worry about partners’ feeling and the possibility of abandonment, as hypothesized. However, participants with T = 0 and T > 1 were both significantly higher on attachment anxiety than participants with T = 1, though there were no significant differences in attachment avoidance. A trend toward participants with T = 0 being higher on Dismissing score was found, although differences on Preoccupied and attachment anxiety scores were more pronounced. These results indicate that the T response in Japan is sensitive to the dimension of attachment anxiety rather than of attachment avoidance. This point is not conform with the standard CS interpretation (Exner, 2003) and previous studies (e.g., Cassella, 1999). In other words, a relationship between T = 0 and avoidance of intimacy is unclear in Japanese respondents. Thus, in Japanese clinical settings, a quantified interpretation of the CS that assumes that T = 0 is a sign of interpersonal avoidance needs to be employed carefully.

The results of this study have the following clinical implications. Although participants with T = 0 were high on attachment anxiety, they did not report a contact sensation, which could be viewed as a sign of need for affection by the earliest researchers of texture response (Klopfer et al., 1954). These people feel anxiety about the possibility of abandonment and have strong dependent needs. However, they may not experience contact sensations consciously, or they may not express their need for affection in an obvious fashion. It may be assumed that they avoid intimate relationships due to abandonment-related anxiety, rather than by minimizing the value of intimate relationships, or by valuing independence and autonomy.

One possible explanation of these results is derived from ideas about Japanese cultural characteristics of attachment. According to Rothbaum et al. (2000), attachment anxiety is the central component of Japanese attachment relationships. Mikulincer et al. (2003) assumed that attachment anxiety is the vital part of an attachment system that aims to maintain connections with others to survive and adjust. In Japanese culture, connections and harmonization with others are very important condic-
tions in order to survive and adapt, so an interdependent construal of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) is likely to be formulated on the basis of social adaptation. For this reason, attachment anxiety becomes the main component of intimate relationships, rather than avoidance of intimacy (Rothbaum et al., 2000).

From this viewpoint, the results and implications of this study are theoretically consistent with Japanese cultural characteristics of attachment. Briefly, people with a T = 0 protocol should avoid intimate relationships due to anxiety about abandonment, which is a central feature of Japanese culture, rather than minimizing the value of intimacy or valuing independence and autonomy, which is a central feature of Western culture. However, there were no significant differences on fearful scores across all T groups. The aforementioned feature of T = 0 is similar to characteristics of the fearful attachment style. It may be argued that T = 0 participants’ emotional conflict (accompanied by inhibition of intimacy) are less extreme than the fearful attachment style. Further investigations are needed to clarify this point. Furthermore, to confirm the assumption that T response is a sensitive measure of attachment anxiety in Japanese culture, a dimensional scale of adult attachment like the Experience in Close Relationship scale (Brennan et al., 1998) would need to be employed in the future research.

The following limitations are present in this study. First, although our suggestion of a cross-cultural explanation about our results in this study is consistent with previous findings of adult attachment research, we need further investigations about adult attachment characteristics in Japanese culture. Second, participants in this study are undergraduate and graduate students, so that we cannot generalize our findings across Japanese of all ages. In future research, we need investigations with participants of other ages. Third, as this is the first study that shows Japanese culture-specific characteristics of the texture response, we need to replicate the findings in future research.

**Conclusion**

Results of this study partially supported the validity of our interpretation hypothesis of the texture response from the view point of adult attachment theory. We also suggested that the T response should be regarded as a sensitive measure of attachment anxiety rather than a
measure of attachment avoidance at least in Japan. When Japanese clinicians interpret T, they should adjust their interpretation to Japanese cultural characteristics of attachment, rather than simply conform to the CS interpretation strategy. It could be assumed that T response is a culture-universal measure of adult attachment, but at least in Japan, there is a cultural specificity in terms of characteristics of Japanese adult attachment. It would be valuable to study the cultural specificity of personality characteristics, in order to ensure adequate interpretation of the Rorschach in diverse cultural groups.
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Summary

In general, the Texture response (or T) on the Rorschach has been regarded as a measure of need for interpersonal contact and closeness. Though recent studies provided empirical support for this interpretation of the T response from the viewpoint of Adult Attachment theory, the validity of the T response had not been well established in Japan due to its generally lower frequency there (the modal value of SumT in Japanese normative data is 0, with mean of 0.60). Validation studies of the T response in Japan are required. In the present study, we examined the relationship between T responses on the Rorschach and adult attachment in the Japanese population. Forty-seven Japanese undergraduate and graduate students (mean age = 20.16, SD = 1.87) completed a self-report adult attachment scale (the Experience in Close Relationship scale) as well as the Rorschach. An ANOVA revealed that T = 1 participants were attached more securely than were T = 0 and T > 1 groups (p < .001). T > 1 participants were more preoccupied with attachment and scored higher on an attachment anxiety scale than the T = 1 group (p < .001). Although these results were consistent with the interpretation of the T response according to the Comprehensive System (CS), the results obtained for T = 0 participants were inconsistent with hypotheses derived from the Comprehensive System. T = 0 participants were high on preoccupied and attachment anxiety scores (p < .01), although they were theoretically expected to be high on dismissing, fearful, or attachment avoidance. These results suggested that the T response should be regarded as a sensitive measure of attachment anxiety rather than a measure of attachment avoidance – at least in Japan. However, our results partially supported the validity of the CS interpretation of T response, while at the same time indicating that Japanese culture-specific interpretation of T response is required.
従来から、ロールシャッハ法における材質反応（T）は対人的な親密さへの欲求を反映するものであると見なされてきた。先行研究がこの解釈仮説に対して成人愛着理論の観点から実証的な支持を与えている。しかし、日本における包括的システムの基準データによると、材質反応の出現頻度は比較的低い（日本基準データによるSumTの基準値は0，平均値は0.60）。そのため、この解釈仮説が日本でも妥当かどうかを検討するための、さらなる妥当性研究が必要であると言える。本研究では日本における材質反応の妥当性を検証するために、ロールシャッハ法における材質反応と成人愛着との関係を、日本人を対象として検討した。調査対象者は47名の日本人大学生・大学院生（平均年齢=20.16，SD=1.87）で、それぞれに対して成人愛着の質問紙（the Experience in Close Relationship scale）とロールシャッハ法を実施した。分散分析の結果、T=1群は他の群に比べてより安定した愛着を示した（p<0.001）。また、T>1群はT=1よりもとらわれ型の傾向と愛着不安が強かった（p<0.001）。これらの結果は包括的システムにおける材質反応の解釈仮説と一致する結果であったが、T=0群に関してはこれと一致しない結果が得られた。すなわち、T=0群は理論的に愛着極端型、とらわれ型の傾向や愛着回避が高い事が予想されたが、実際にはとらわれ型の傾向と愛着不安が強かった（p<0.01）。以上の結果は、少なくとも日本においては、材質反応は愛着回避よりも愛着不安に敏感な指標であるという可能性を示すものであるといえる。本研究の知見は材質反応の妥当性を部分的に支持するものであったが、同時に日本人の特徴に合わせた材質反応の解釈を行う必要性を示唆している。
Résumé

En général, la réponse de texture (T) du Rorschach signifie le besoin de contact et d’affection des autres. Bien que les recherches sur la théorie de l’attachement chez l’adulte confirment cette hypothèse, sa validité n’est pas satisfaite au Japon parce que beaucoup de japonais ne donnent guère la réponse T (M = 0.60, Mo = 0). Cette recherche a examiné la relation entre la réponse T et l’attachement chez adulte dans la population japonaise. 47 étudiants ont participé à cette recherche (Age moyen = 21.16, SD = 1.87.) Ils ont passé deux tests: le Rorschach et un questionnaire d’attachement (Experience in Close Relationship scale, ECR.) L’analyse ANOVA a révélé que le schéma d’attachement du groupe T = 1 était plus sûr que dans le groupe T = 0 et T > 1 (p < .001.) Le groupe T > 1 montra des signes de préoccupation par rapport à l’attachement dont le score élevé à l’ECR indiquait un schéma «angoissé», comparé au groupe T = 1 (p < .001.) La plupart de ces résultats ont confirmé l’interprétation de la réponse T proposée par le Système Intégré, mais le résultat du groupe T = 0 n’est pas en accord avec l’hypothèse de Système Intégré. Bien qu’on puisse théoriquement anticiper l’élévation du score du schéma d’attachement «évitement» ou «désorganisé» dans le groupe T = 0, on ne peut pas le confirmer. Au contraire, plus le groupe T = 0 était préoccupé par l’attachement plus le score de «anxiété» à l’ECR était élevé (p < .001.) En conclusion, la réponse T doit être considérée comme une mesure plus sensible à l’anxiété qu’à l’évitement de l’attache dans la population japonaise. En conséquence, il faut explorer davantage la dimension culturelle dans l’interprétation de la réponse T.

Resumen

En general, las respuestas de Textura (T) en Rorschach se han considerado como un indicador de la necesidad de contacto y cercanía interpersonal. Aunque muchos estudios recientes han ido aportando un mayor soporte empírico para esta interpretación de la respuesta T desde la perspectiva de la Teoría del Apego Adulto, la validez de la respuesta T en Japón aún no está suficientemente bien establecida, debido a la baja frecuencia de este tipo de perceptos (la Moda de SumT en los datos normativos de población japonesa es de 0.60). Partiendo de este dato, se requiere una mayor validación de los estudios sobre respuestas T en Japón.
En esta investigación se examinan las relaciones entre respuestas T en Rorschach y las modalidades de apego adulto en la población japonesa. Cuarenta y siete estudiantes japoneses graduados y de pre-grado (media de edad = 20.16, SD = 1.87) completaron una Escala de apego adulto de tipo autoinforme (la Escala de Experiencia en Relaciones Cercanas) y el test de Rorschach.

El análisis de ANOVA reveló que los participantes con $T = 1$ mostraban un nivel de apego claramente superior a los grupos que obtenían $T = 0$ y $T > 1$ ($p < .001$). Los sujetos con $T1$ parecían más preocupados por lograr relaciones y puntuaban más alto en los ítem de ansiedad de apego que los del grupo de $T = 1$ ($p < .001$).

Aunque estos resultados fueron bastante concordantes con la interpretación de T según el Sistema Comprehensivo (CS), los datos obtenidos por los sujetos de $T = 0$ no se ajustaban a la hipótesis derivada del CS, en el sentido de que estos sujetos ($T = 0$) también puntuaban más alto en los ítem relacionados con la preocupación y ansiedad de apego, mientras que lo que cabría esperar teóricamente era que ellos obtuvieran puntuaciones más elevadas en todo lo relacionado con la inhibición, el temor o la evitación del apego.

Los resultados sugieren que la respuesta T puede considerarse como una medida muy sensible de la ansiedad de apego más que como un indicador de la evitación del apego, al menos en la población japonesa. No obstante, nuestros datos también apoyan, al menos parcialmente, la validez de la interpretación del CS acerca de la respuesta T y, al mismo tiempo, señalan la necesidad de realizar una interpretación culturalmente específica de las T para la población japonesa.