© Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology
July 2016, Vol.42, No.2, 220 - 236.

Drawing Techniques in Assessment: A Summary Review of 60 Survey-based Studies of Training and Professional Settings

Chris Piotrowski
University of West Florida

Historically, drawing tests have been the target of extensive criticism based on incisive reviews of the literature (e.g., Lilienfeld et al., 2000; Motta et al., 1993; Smith & Dumont, 1995; Ziskin, 1995).The intent of the current study is to determine whether this collective movement has had a deleterious impact on the popularity of drawing methods in graduate training programs and professional usage worldwide. To that end, the author identified survey-based research with regard to drawing techniques that reported on assessment training and test usage patterns from 1989-2015. The 60 identified survey-based or records-based studies served as the data pool(USA=47; Overseas nations=13). The analysis showed that 38 of the 60 studies (63%) reported that drawing tests were viewed positively in the USA and in some countries outside of Europe. However, a bifurcation trend between academic training and professional practice settings was noted. Drawing techniques were ranked 'moderately' high (amongst the top 15 tests) in terms of usage, in 23 of the 49 studies of practice settings. However, only one of the 11 studies of academic settings showed a high degree of training emphasis with drawing techniques. In professional settings, drawing methods appear to be somewhat popular in clinical psychology and school psychology practice, less so in forensic and counseling psychology, and largely ignored in neuropsychological assessment. On a cautionary note, this review observed a slight diminutive trend on the use of drawing tests in practice settings over the last five years. However, a bibliometric analysis of the extant literature indicated that research attention on specific drawing instruments remains undiminished over the past decade. Overall, these findings provide data-based evidence that drawing techniques have been a major assessment approach to a sizeable minority of practitioners who conduct psychological testing. At the same time, academic and internship programs have largely shunned drawing instruments in coursework and training. This perplexing discrepancy in training versus practice should provide a lively, scholarly forum for the assessment field. Finally, there is a need for additional research regarding graduate-level assessment training in countries outside the USA (Piotrowski, 2015b), due to the dearth of studies of academic settings overseas.

Keywords: Drawing Techniques, Human Figure Drawings, Projective Drawings, Usage, Training.

Over the last 75 years, drawing techniques have been popular measures as assessment tools both in the USA (Cox, 2012; Handler & Hilsenroth, 1998; Handler & Smith, 2013; Handler & Thomas, 2014;Harrison, 2015; McGrath & Carroll, 2012; Newmark, 1985; Piotrowski & Keller, 1992, 2015a; Roback, 1968), and internationally (e.g., Dutta & Sanyal, 2016; Negi, 2015; Piotrowski et al., 1993; Stiles et al., 2015). Historically, drawing tests have generated scholarly criticism by clinicians and academicians, even during the zenith of their popularity (e.g., Butcher, 2006; Vukovich, 1983). Hence, these instruments have harbored a contentious place in the general field of assessment (Gresham, 1993; Lally, 2001; Lilienfeld et al., 2015; Piotrowski, 1984; Wood et al., 2002; Yama, 1990).In addition, there has been lively debate, even amongst advocates, with regard to interpretive approaches of specific drawing techniques over many decades (e.g., see Handler 1996; Handler & Habenicht, 1994;

Meyer et al., 2001; Reithmiller & Handler, 1997). In fact, Ziskin (1995, pp. 870-876) devoted a 7-page rebuke, based largely on condescending commentaries regarding drawing methods:

"… research indicates that conclusions based on DAP drawings may be primarily determined by factors or drawing characteristics that are secondary to, or even unrelated to the diagnostic categories or criteria of interest" (p. 874).

Proponents of human figure drawings (hereon, HFDs), however, counter critics based largely on the rich idiographic material garnered from drawing techniques. For example, Hammer (1985) proffers: "Symbolically, potent concepts such as H-T-P are saturated with emotional and ideational experiences associated with the personality's development" (p. 135), and suggests that drawing methods have several major attributes such as brevity, predominantly non-verbal, culture-free, open expressiveness, non-threatening, and is a vehicle in fostering a conducive 'introduction' to the assessment enterprise. In this vein, Flanagan and Motta (2007) contend that figure drawings "may aid in establishing rapport with youth and provide a springboard for practitioner hypotheses, guiding the course of the assessment" (p. 257). Accordingly, these advantageous features seem to be particularly critical in the assessment of children (see Handler, 1996, pp. 208-211).In support of projective tests, Weiner and Greene (2008) argue that drawing techniques can serve as a prodigious precursory tool in screening psychological disturbance or maladjustment identified through 'enquiry' that targets and reflects personality dynamics (i.e., conflicts, needs, 'press', self-perceptions, and coping style).

It must be acknowledged, based on empirical research, that findings involving drawing techniques have not been entirely encouraging (Kahill, 1984; Swensen, 1968). However, much of this literature has been critiqued with regard to flaws in research design. Handler (1996)aptly summarized it here:

"…many studies are poorly conceived because they do not parallel the ways in which the drawings are used in the clinical situation. For example, the drawings are typically investigated alone, taken out of context, and individual variables and signs are analyzed rather than allowing for contextual interpretation" (p. 288).

Despite perennial criticism, specific drawing instruments have received parsimonious coverage in major textbooks and handbooks regarding assessment testing (Groth-Marnat, 2009; Hammer, 1985; Handler, 1996; Harwood et al., 2011;Murstein, 1965; Rabin, 1986), as well as in books specifically on the general topic of drawing techniques (e.g., Burns, 1982; Dana, 2014; Hammer, 1978; Koppitz, 1984;Machover, 1949; Wenck, 1984).

Historical Context

Graduate-level Training Settings

From a historical perspective (i.e., prior to 1990), attitudes of mental health practitioners toward drawing techniques remained rather positive; however, views of clinical faculty and internship directors toward some projective tests have been more tepid (Piotrowski 1999, 2015b for review). McCully (1965) reported rather positive attitudes of internship directors regarding drawing methods, with 76% of respondents considering drawing techniques as somewhat or very important. However, in a survey of academic clinical psychologists in APA-approved clinical training programs, Thelen et al. (1968) found that figure drawings were considered as the least important in all of the projective techniques. About this time, Shemberg and Keeley (1970) detected a marked decrease in training in projective techniques in PhD clinical training programs. However, very positive attitudes toward diagnostic testing was reported by internship directors (Garfield & Kurtz, 1973). Other studies reported contrary findings, during the 1980s, where attitudes of academic faculty and internship directors toward drawing tests markedly diminished (Durand et al., 1988). Pruitt et al. (1985) found drawings largely de-emphasized in terms of coursework in 1983; 50% of the clinical faculty saw little importance in mastering competency in figure drawings. Corroborating these findings, Piotrowski and Keller (1984) reported that, based on reports

from 80 APA clinical psychology programs, HFDs and the H-T-P were not considered very important or central to training students.

Mental Health Practice Settings

Surveys of mental health practitioners in the 1970s corroborated the popularity of HFDs (Piotrowski & Keller, 1978), which continued into the 1980s (Fee et al., 1982; Lubin et al., 1984; Piotrowski, 1985; Sweeney et al., 1987; Tuma & Pratt, 1982; Watkins et al., 1988). Moreover, drawing techniques were found to be a mainstay in child assessment practice (Tuma & Pratt, 1982). Quite revealing surveys of practicing school psychologists (i.e., Goh et al., 1981) reported that drawing techniques were considered very popular. For example, Reschly et al. (1987) found that DAP ranked 4th, the H-T-P 8th, and the KFD 10th. Based on test usage data from 383 Australian psychologists, Sharpley and Pain (1988) found the DAP Test to be ranked 4th and highly recommended for inclusion in graduate-level training.

Rationale for Current Study

Based on a steady stream of rather disparaging commentary (commencing around 25 years ago) to expunge projective techniques from both training emphasis and clinical practice, it would be of interest to(a) illustrate the level of research interest in drawing techniques over time; (b)summarize survey data regarding coursework and training in drawing techniques in professional/graduate training programs since 1989; and (c)examine the extent of professional usage of drawing techniques in applied practice settings since 1989.

Investigatory Design

A systematic search of the database PsycINFO was conducted, as this research repository is considered a leading scholarly file of research in the social and behavioral sciences worldwide. Table 1 presents the volume of reference citations regarding drawing tests, indexed in PsycINFO. This output illustrates that 73% of all references have appeared since 1989 (614 of 840 citations) based on Total output; for journal references (69%), for books (88%), for dissertations (89%). Based on this analysis there has been no decline in the volume of research on drawing techniques evident in journal publications or books over the last decade. Table 2 summarizes survey findings of both academic and applied settings on training emphasis and usage of drawing techniques since 1989. This analysis includes the 60 published studies that were identified in journal publications, based on clinician/practitioner and academic/training samples; although, the vast majority of the data-pool is based on research conducted in the USA.

Table1. Reference Citations on Drawing Techniques Indexed in PsycINFO Database (Any Field search)

Search terms	Total	In Journals	Books	Dissert-ations
Drawings and Assessment (1951-2015)	840	638	111	80
Drawings and Assessment (1989-2015)	614	441	98	71
Human Figure Drawings (1989-2015)	185	135	23	26

Note. Values indicate total number of references.

Results

Of note, two caveats are in order: first, survey results are almost always based on those respondents who use tests or they are based on official clinical records; hence, many studies report data on less than 50% of sample surveyed due to a high percentage of non-responders. Thus, the aggregate shows that individual tests may be 'popular' but, only within the parameters of professionals who rely on tests in assessment. Second, an individual test's ranking is gauged amongst the myriad of assessment instruments that may be available, emphasized, or used; a test may rank high but, only in relation to other tests on survey forms used in a specific study. Thus, the findings presented here should be viewed through this cautionary lens.

The current analysis showed that based on the data since 1989 from both academic and

practice settings, assessment drawings have been emphasized or used to at least a 'moderate' degree as reported in 38 (63%) of the 60 studies in this review. However, a major bifurcation is evident in this trend between the practice and training settings. Drawing methods were highly ranked (amongst top 15 tests) in 23 of the 49 studies of practitioners. Conversely, in the 11 studies of academic or training settings, figure drawings ranked high in only one of the studies (and moderately in six of these 11 studies). Thus, there appears to be a vast chasm regarding attitudes toward drawing techniques between practicing professionals and academicians (see Piotrowski, 2015c for a further discussion). In addition, this extensive review revealed that there has been a slight decrease in enthusiasm for drawing instruments by practitioners in recent years although, survey data over the last decade and views of professionals and educators in the field of school psychology have not supported this downward trend (see Flanagan & Motta, 2007; Hughes et al., 2010).

Several other trends in practice or applied settings were noted: assessments of drawings seem to be popular with clinical psychologists but, less with forensic psychologists (e.g., Archer et al., 2006; Piotrowski, 2007), and largely eschewed by neuropsychologists. In fact, studies regarding forensic mental health assessment, including survey data from outside the USA (Martin et al., 2001), indicate that projective tests are not relied upon by practitioners in most legal settings (McLauglin & Kan, 2014; Ryba et al., 2003).

Interestingly, the current analysis shows that school psychologists strongly embrace drawing techniques, and this popularity has been recognized (e.g., Flanagan & Motta, 2007) in the scholarly literature. In part, this reliance on projective tests may reflect professional mandates as "school psychologists are required to assess social, emotional, and behavioral domains, or personality, as part of the comprehensive evaluation process to determine eligibility for special education" (Flanagan, 2007, p. 311). Indeed, drawing techniques have served professionals well in the socio-emotional adaptation of school-age children (Riccio & Rodriguez, 2007; TerLaak et al., 2005). It is noteworthy that several authors have commented on the inadequacy of training in personality assessment in school psychology programs (Decker et al., 2013; Flanagan & Esquivel, 2006).

Sub-doctoral level counselors and counseling psychologists seem to hold moderately positive attitudes toward drawing tests (e.g., Belter & Piotrowski, 1999; Clark, 1995; Peterson et al., 2014) but, recent survey data of graduate-level counselor training programs indicate rather tepid views toward these assessment approaches by academicians (i.e., Neukrug et al., 2013). These contemporary trends confirm earlier survey findings of practicing counseling psychologists where less than one-third of the respondents recommended that graduate students learn drawing techniques (DAP 32%,H-T-P 23%; Watkins et al., 1988). Moreover, surveys of counseling psychology training programs (Watkins et al., 1990) and practicing counselors (Bubenzer et al., 1990) found that although some projective tests were considered popular, drawing techniques were not emphasized.

Several international trends seem noteworthy: The popularity of drawing tests remains evident overseas in countries like India, Brazil, and Japan (e.g., Pathak, 1966). However, survey data indicate sparse enthusiasm toward drawing techniques in European nations (Bartram & Coyne, 1998). Moreover, there is a dearth of data on the status of drawing techniques in graduate-level educational or training programs in countries outside the USA (Piotrowski, 2015b).

A major reason for the popularity of drawing techniques, over the last 75 years, is that such measures tend to be particularly conducive in the assessment of young children (Sattler, 2006; Woolford et al., 2015), particularly in understanding and addressing social-emotional needs and educational challenges of students (Riccio & Rodriguez, 2007). Others argue that drawing methods have an integrative function within the multi-method assessment model (Flanagan, 2007; Hopwood & Bornstein, 2014).

Conclusions

Based on the current exhaustive analysis of 60 survey-based studies on test usage in both academic and practice settings, and review of the extant literature on drawing methods, several key observations are offered:

* Despite the perennial onslaught of criticism leveled against the drawing techniques in the literature, these instruments continue to be moderately popular in testing practice, particularly in child assessment and school psychology. However, several 'specialty' areas such as neuropsychology and, to a lesser extent forensic psychology, largely exclude drawing tests from their testing battery or clinical armamentarium.

* The available evidence suggests that (from their perspective) practitioners view the merits of drawing techniques as a diagnostic tool, as an indicator or direction for progress in therapy, and as a compliment to the overall assessment enterprise (Basu, 2014; Handler, 1996).

*Related to the above, professional practitioners seem to ignore published evaluation studies that question the psychometric credibility of projective tests (Anderson et al., 1984). The expository literature on this issue is largely speculative. On a related point, one major concern, pervasive in the assessment field, is the continuing chasm between psychometric practice and psychometric theory (see Elosua & Iliescu, 2012), which has not been adequately addressed to date.

* Over the last decade, drawing techniques have lost favor in graduate-level academic programs and training settings, and individualized coursework in these methods is largely unavailable. Hence, interested students need to pursue educational opportunities via unconventional venues such as workshops and individualized instruction from mentors.

* The current findings regarding drawing methods illustrate the continued popularity of and interest in projective assessment, as evidenced in coverage of specific projective tests in scholarly books (e.g., Aronow et al., 2013; Frick et al., 2010; Groth-Marnat, 2009; Harwood et al., 2011; Rabin, 1986). This scholarship reflects the vast research landscape of projective techniques evident in the extant literature.

* Unfortunately, there, is a dearth of published research on the status of projective techniques in graduate training programs outside of the USA (see Piotrowski, 2015b). This issue is of critical importance, as academic training can instill lifelong attitudes, motivations, interests, and even bias toward assessment approaches in the professional development of the novice practitioner.

Table 2. Emphasis or Use of Drawing Techniques in Training/Practice Settings across 60 Studies (1989-2015)

Study	Country	Sample	Findings
Piotrowski & Keller (1989)	USA	Test usage in 413 mental health facilities	HFDs were ranked 5th, H-T-P 7th.
Tsoi & Sundberg (1989)	Hong Kong	Division of Clinical Psychology of the Hong Kong Psychological Society	H-T-P ranked 3rd.
Watkins et al. (1990)	USA	Data based on 56 directors of counseling psychology training programs	Although, 71% felt that graduate students should learn projective assessment, and figure-drawing tests, these were not frequently mentioned.

Archer et al. (1991)	USA	165 respondents who were practitioners with a research interest in adolescent assessment	Kinetic Family Drawings used by 41% of respondents in 'standard battery' of tests; HFDs 33%; H-T-P 30%.
Butler et al. (1991)	USA	280 members of the International Neuropsychological Society	Although, several projective techniques were used in assessment by one-third of the sample, Drawing tests were not used frequently.
Ogawa & Piotrowski (1992)	Japan	Japanese clinical psychologists	H-T-P ranked 8th and DAP 12th.
Hutton (1992)	USA	389 school psychologists (members of NASP); update on the Goh et al. (1981) study	In the area of intelligence, the DAP ranked 3rd; in the area of personality assessment, the DAP ranked 1st and H-T-P ranked 7th.
Piotrowski & Zalewski (1993)	USA	A replication of the Piotrowski & Keller (1984) study; 80 Directors of both PhD and PsyD APA clinical psychology programs	37% of the programs suggested competency in Drawing techniques; this was at par (34%) with findings of the 1984 survey.
Pinkerman et al. (1993)	USA	Surveyed 126 psychologists in 37 juvenile/family courts on scope of testing practices of children under the age of 18 years	Projective tests were used frequently, including projective drawings.
Kennedy et al. (1994)	USA	Practicing school psychologists	HFDs ranked 3rd; H-T-P 5th; KFDs 7th.
Stinnett et al. (1994)	USA	Data analysis based on 123 members of the (NASP)	In social-emotional assessment, 37% use the H-T-P and 52% rely on the DAP.
Chan & Lee (1995)	Hong Kong	50 practicing psychologists in 1993	H-T-P ranked 2nd; DAP 7th.
Watkins et al. (1995)	USA	412 APA members who were clinical psychologists	96% of the respondents endorsed projective drawings as critical for clinical students to learn; projective drawings ranked 8th in terms of usage in practice.
Borum & Grisso (1995)	USA	102 forensic psychologists/ psychiatrists	33% of practitioners use projective tests; however, HFDs were deemed not popular.

Wilson & Reschly (1996)	USA	Data, obtained in 1992, on assessment practices from 251 members of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)	Among various tests, the DAP ranked 4th, the H-T-P ranked 6th, and the KFD 8th; Over 85% of the sample indicated that these techniques were covered in their training programs.
Lees-Haley et al. (1996)	USA	100 forensic neuropsychology experts	Figure drawings ranked 26th.
Culross & Nelson (1997)	USA	Surveyed about 63 instructors listed in NASP-approved graduate programs in school psychology on tests emphasized in personality assessment coursework	The DAP, H-T-P, and KFDs were ranked amongst the top 10 tests; noted by at least 50% of the sample.
Ackermann & Ackermann (1997)	USA	Practitioners in court-related custody evaluations	In a re-analysis of the findings, Hagen & Castagna (2001) found Projective drawings used in 17% of evaluations with children, KFD: 16%, H-T-P: 14%; in the assessment of parents, Projective drawings were included in 7% of evaluations.
Frauenhoffer et al. (1998)	USA	Surveyed 487 mental health practitioners (psychologists, counselors, social workers)	H-F-Ds ranked 6th.
Piotrowski et al. (1998)	USA	137 practitioners in National Register of Health Service providers in Psychology	Tests considered most important to practice: HFDs ranked 12th.
Muniz et al. (1999)	Spain, Portugal, & Latin America	Test use by practicing psychologists	DAP ranked 8th.
Boccaccini & Brodsky (1999)	USA	Diagnostic test usage in personal injury cases by 80 practicing forensic psychologists	Drawing techniques were not highly rated.
Piotrowski & Belter (1999)	USA	Extent of graduate-level assessment curriculum was reported by training directors from 84 APA-approved internship settings	33% of these internship sites provided training on H-F-Ds; however, 34% of these directors rated a decrease in training emphasis with projective techniques.
Camara et al. (2000)	USA	179 practitioners, mostly clinical psychologists	H-T-P was ranked 8th and HFDs 13th.
Archer & Newsom (2000)	USA	346 psychologists, working with adolescents	H-T-P ranked 7th; KFDs 11th.

Stedman et al. (2000)	USA	324 internship directors across a variety of mental health settings	Although, drawing tests were not discussed specifically, directors had favorable attitudes for Rorschach and TAT.
Boothby & Clements (2000)	USA	Correctional (prison) psychologists	Projective drawings ranked 6th.
Clemence & Handler (2001)	USA	Surveyed 382 internship settings on use and training of psychological tests	37% of directors suggested coursework and competency in the DAP, H-T-P, and KFDs.
Muniz et al. (2001)	European (Spain, UK, Holland, Slovenia, Croatia, Belgium)	3,455 professional psychologists use of psychological tests	HFDs were largely ignored.
Luiselli et al. (2001)	USA	Assessment for autism reported by100 practitioners in national service centers for developmental disabilities in 30 states	Projective drawings were used in 30% of these settings.
Belter & Piotrowski (2001)	USA	Survey data on 82 directors of APA-approved doctoral clinical/professional psychology training programs on assessment curriculum	Tests most emphasized: H-F-Ds in 37% of programs.
Childs & Eyde (2002)	USA	Course syllabi data, from 84 APA clinical psychology programs, determined coverage of projective assessment techniques	24% of programs indicated that Projective Drawings should be a key component in the assessment curriculum.
Cashel (2002)	USA	162 child & adolescent practitioners in outpatient, hospital and school settings	DAP ranked 6th; H-T-P 10th; KFD 14th.
Stedman et al. (2002)	USA	Based on survey data from 334 psychology interns, determined extent of pre-internship assessment report writing experiences	Student reports that included data from H-F-Ds were few.
Bow et al. (2002)	USA	84 psychologists reported on assessment practices with children in sexual abuse cases	Projective drawings were used most with children as 'interview' aids.
Demaray et al. (2003)	USA	Surveyed over 316 school psychologists on assessment practices in ADHD	Projective drawings were used by only 15% of sample.

Lally (2003)	USA	64 Diplomate-status forensic psychologists, test use in court-related evaluations	Projective drawings were deemed 'unacceptable' by 95% of sample.
Shapiro & Heick (2004)	USA	Determined assessment practices of 648 school psychologists (NASP members)	Projective drawings were noted but, not used frequently.
Echemendia & Harris (2004)	USA	Test use practices of 911 neuropsychologists	Projective techniques were not amongst top tests used.
Anderson & Paulosky (2004)	USA	Diagnostic assessment practices of 95 'eating disorder' specialists	Only 10% use any projective techniques.
Bekhit et al. (2005)	England	158 British clinical psychologists	50% of sample use drawings but, only informally in the assessment process.
Rabin et al. (2005)	USA/Canada	Assessment practices of 747 clinical neuropsychologists	Only the Clock Drawing Test was noted.
de Oliveira et al. (2005)	Brazil	35 professional psychologists	HFDs ranked 3rd.
Hojnoski et al. (2006)	USA	170 school psychologists reported use of projective tests	The H-T-P ranked 3rd; Kinetic Family Drawing 4th, and the DAP 5th.
Archer et al. (2006)	USA	152 forensic psychologists' use of projective techniques in court-related assessments	40% of respondents use projective drawings at least 'occasionally'.
Koonce (2007)	USA	246 NASP members were surveyed on selection of tests in ADHD assessment	For direction for selection of ADHD test battery, the DAP was ranked 7th.
Herzberg & Mattar (2008)	Brazil	Clinical psychology faculty use of projective tests in practice, University of Sao Paulo	DAP was ranked 2nd; H-T-P 8th.
Madaus et al. (2009)	USA	Assessment practices reported by 164 'special education' directors in five northeastern states	Apparently, projective techniques are not used in the assessment of social-emotional behavior.
Ogawa et al. (2010)	Japan	237 Japanese psychologists in practice	Tree Drawing Test (Baum) ranked 1st, used by 67% of sample; H-T-P ranked 7th (40%); DAP ranked 12th (28%); KFD ranked 15th (23%).

Smith et al. (2010)	USA	404 members of the International Neuropsychological Society or National Academy of Neuropsychology surveyed on personality assessment practices	Drawing tests were not ranked.
Donoso et al. (2010)	USA	150 professionals who conduct vocational rehabilitation evaluations	Overall, projective techniques were not used frequently; Projective drawings ranked 13th.
Raez (2011)	Peru	University psychologists in Lima, and members of the Peru Society of Rorschach & Projective Methods	92% of the sample use projective techniques; DAP used by 24%, H-T-P by 10%, Tree Test by 10%, and KFDs by 6%.
Ackermann & Pritzl (2011)	USA	213 forensic psychologists surveyed on tests used with parents in child custody evaluations	27% of the sample use projective drawings, which ranked 10th.
Evers et al. (2012)	17 European countries	Study conducted in 2009; data analysis based on 400 respondents regarding testing practices	Projective tests were not ranked highly in six countries (viz. Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK, Croatia, &Germany). H-T-P was used by 20% in Lithuania; Baum Test by 7% in Czech Republic; DAP (7%) and Tree Test (14%) in Romania.
Neukrug et al. (2013)	USA	Based on survey data from 210 counselor educators, this study examined graduate-level coverage of assessment instruments	89% of respondents teach the H-T-P, which ranked 13th; 65% use the Kinetic Drawing System for Family & School, which ranked 30th.
Peterson et al. (2014)	USA	926 counselors (clinical mental health, school, occupational) rated tests of all types regarding usage	H-T-P ranked 17th, H-F-Ds 21st, DAP 35th, &KFD 47th.
Neal & Grisso (2014)	International sample: USA (45%), Canada (7%), Europe (3%), Australia-New Zealand (4%)	434 forensic examiners of professional organizations	The only projective test noted was the Rorschach.

Ready & Veague (2014)	USA	Compared training in assessment across three training models (Clinical-Science, Scientist-Practitioner, Practitioner-Scholar) in APA-Accredited programs	No projective tests ranked in the top 10; only practitioner-scholar programs offer limited coverage on projective techniques.
Sotelo-Dynega & Dixon (2014)	USA	Cognitive assessment practices of 323 school psychologists	A variety of educational measures were popular; but, a scant reliance on drawing techniques.
Wechsler et al. (2014)	Iberian/Latin-American countries	Test development & usage in Portugal, Spain, Argentina, Venezuela, and Brazil	HFDs and H-T-P are popular in Brazil; Projective tests are popular in Venezuela; Spain and Portugal indicated low usage of projective tests.

References

Ackerman, M.J., & Ackerman, M.C. (1997). Custody evaluation practices: A survey of experienced professionals. Professional Psychology: *Research and Practice, 28*, 137-145.

Ackerman, M.J., & Pritzl, T.B. (2011). Child custody evaluation practices: A 20-year follow-up. *Family Court Review, 49*(3), 618-628.

Anderson, D.A., & Paulosky, C.A. (2004). A survey of the use of assessment instruments by eating disorder professionals in clinical practice. *Eating & Weight Disorders, 9*(3), 238-241.

Anderson, T.K., Cancelli, A., & Kratochwill, T.R. (1984). Self-reported assessment practices of school psychologists: Implications for training and practice. *Journal of School Psychology, 22*, 17-29.

Archer, R.P. (2013). *Forensic uses of clinical assessment instruments* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Archer, R.P., Buffington-Vollum, J.K., Stredny, R.V., & Handel, R.W. (2006). A survey of psychological test use patterns among forensic psychologists. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 87*, 84-94.

Archer, R.P., Maruish, M., Imhof, E.A., & Piotrowski, C. (1991). Psychological test usage with adolescent clients: 1990 survey findings. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22*, 247-252.

Archer, R.P., & Newsom, C.R. (2000). Psychological test usage with adolescent clients: Survey update. *Assessment, 7*(3), 227-235.

Aronow, E., Weiss, K.A., & Reznikoff, M. (2013). *A practical guide to the Thematic Apperception Test: The TAT in clinical practice.* New York: Bruner-Routledge.

Bartram, D., & Coyne, I. (1998). Variations in national patterns of testing and test use: The ITC/EFPA international survey. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 14*(3), 249-260.

Basu, J. (2014). Psychologists' ambivalence toward ambiguity: Relocating the projective test debate for multiple interpretative hypotheses. *SIS Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 21,* 25-36.

Bekhit, N.S., Thomas, G.V., & Jolley, R. (2005). The use of drawing for psychological assessment in Britain: Survey findings. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 78*(2), 205-217.

Belter, R.W., & Piotrowski, C. (2001). Current status of doctoral-level training in psychological testing. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 57*, 717-726.

Belter, R.W., Piotrowski, C. (1999). Current status of master's-level training in psychological assessment. *Journal of Psychological Practice, 5*(1), 1-5.

Boccaccini, M.T., & Brodsky, S.L. (1999). Diagnostic test usage by forensic psychologists in emotional injury cases. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30*, 253-259.

Boothby, J.L., & Clements, C.B. (2000). A national survey of correctional psychologists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*, 716-732.

Borum, R., &Grisso, T. (1995). Psychological test use in criminal forensic evaluations. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26*, 465-473.

Bow, J.N., Quinnell, F.A., Zaroff, M., & Assemany, A. (2002). Assessment of sexual abuse allegations in child custody cases. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 566-575.

Bubenzer, D.L., Zimpfer, D.G., & Mahrle, C.L. (1990). Standardized individual appraisal in agency and private practice: A survey. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 12*, 51-66.

Burns, R. (1982). *Self-growth in families: Kinetic Family Drawings (K-F-D) research and application*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Butcher, J.N. (2006). Assessment in clinical psychology: A perspective on the past, present challenges, and future prospects. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 13*(3), 205-209.

Butler, M., Retzlaff, P., & Vanderploeg, R. (1991). Neuropsychological test usage. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22*(6), 510-512.

Camara, W.J., Nathan, J.S., & Puente, A.E. (2000). Psychological test usage: Implications in professional psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 31*, 141-154.

Cashel, M.L. (2002). Child and adolescent psychological assessment: Current clinical practices and the impact of managed care. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*(5), 446-453.

Chan, D.W., & Lee, H.B. (1995). Patterns of psychological test usage in Hong Kong in 1993. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26*, 292-297.

Childs, R., & Eyde, L. (2002). Assessment training in clinical psychology doctoral programs: What should we teach? What do we teach? *Journal of Personality Assessment, 78*, 130-144.

Clark, A.J. (1995). Projective techniques in the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*(3), 311-316.

Clemence, A., & Handler, L. (2001). Psychological assessment on internship: A survey of training directors and their expectations for students. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76*, 18-47.

Cox, M. (2012). Children's representations of the human figure in their drawings. In V. Slaughter & C.A. Brownell (Eds.), *Early development of body representations: Cambridge studies in cognitive and perceptual development* (pp. 101-121). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Culross, R.R., & Nelson, S. (1997). Training in personality assessment in specialist-level school psychology programs. *Psychological Reports, 81*, 119-124.

Dana, R.H. (2014). Personality tests and psychological science: Instruments, populations, practice. In Leong, F.T. et al. (Eds.), *APA handbook of multicultural psychology,* Vol. 2: Applications and training (pp. 181-196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Decker, S.L., Hale, J.B., & Flanagan, D.P. (2013). Professional practice issues in the assessment of cognitive functioning for educational applications. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(3), 300-313.

Demaray, M.K., Schaefer, K., & Delong, L.K. (2003). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): A national survey of training and current assessment practices in the schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 40*(6), 583-597.

de Oliveira, K.L., Noronha, A.P., Dantas, M.A., & Santarem, E.M. (2005). The use of psychological techniques and instruments for behavioral psychologists. *PsicologiaemEstido, Maringa, 10*(1), 127-135.

Donoso, O.A., Hernandez, B., & Horin, E.V. (2010). Use of psychological tests within vocational rehabilitation. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 32*, 191-200.

Durand, V., Blanchard, E., & Mindell, J. (1988). Training in projective testing: Survey of clinical training directors and internship directors. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19,* 236-238.

Dutta, M., & Sanyal, N. (2016). A comparative study of emotional characteristics of children with and without ADHD by 'Draw a Man Test'. *Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 23*(1), 27-33.

Echemendia, R.J., & Harris, J.G. (2004). Neuropsychological test use with Hispanic/Latino populations in the U.S.: Part II of a national survey. *Applied Neuropsychology, 11*, 4-12.

Elosua, P., & Iliescu, D. (2012). Tests in Europe: Where we are and where we should go. *International Journal of Testing, 12*, 157-175.

Evers, A., Muniz, J., Bartram, D., et al. (2012). Testing practices in the 21st century: Developments and European psychologists' opinions. *European Psychologist, 17*(4), 300-319.

Fee, A.F., Elkins, G.R., & Boyd, L. (1982). Testing and counseling psychologists: Current practices and implications for training. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46*, 116-118.

Flanagan, R. (2007). Comments on the mini-series: Personality assessment in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(3), 311-318.

Flanagan, R., & Esquivel, G.B. (2006). Empirical and clinical methods in the assessment of personality and psychopathology: An integrative approach for training. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*(4), 513-526.

Flanagan, R., & Motta, R.W. (2007). Figure drawings: A popular method. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(3), 257-270.

Frauenhoffer, D., Ross, M.J., Gfeller, J., Searight, H.R., & Piotrowski, C. (1998). Psychological test usage among licensed mental health practitioners: A multidisciplinary survey. *Journal of Psychological Practice, 4*, 28-33.

Frick, P.J., Barry, C.T., & Kamphaus, R.W. (Eds.). (2010). *Clinical assessment of child and adolescent personality and behavior* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.

Garfield, S.L., & Kurtz, R.M. (1973). Attitudes toward training in diagnostic testing: A survey of directors of internship training. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40*, 350-355.

Goh, D.S., Teslow, C.J., & Fuller, G.B. (1981). The practice of psychological assessment among school psychologists. *Professional Psychology, 12*, 696-706.

Gresham, F.M. (1993). "What's wrong with this picture?" Response to Motta et al.'s review of human figure drawings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 8*, 182-187.

Groth-Marnat, G. (2009). *Handbook of personality assessment* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hagen, M.A., & Castagna, N. (2001). The real numbers: Psychological testing in custody evaluations. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 32*, 269-271.

Hammer, E.F. (1985). The House-Tree-Person Test. In C.S. Newmark (Ed.), *Major psychological assessment instruments*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hammer, E.F. (1978). *The clinical application of projective drawings*. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

Handler, L. (1996). The clinical use of drawings: Draw-A-Person, House-Tree-Person, and Kinetic Family Drawings. In C.S. Newmark (Ed.), *Major psychological assessment instruments* (2nd ed., pp. 206-293). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Handler, L., & Habenicht, D. (1994). The Kinetic Family Drawing technique: A review of the literature. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 62*(3), 440-464.

Handler, L., & Hilsenroth, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Teaching and learning personality assessment.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Handler, L., & Smith, J.D. (2013). Education and training in psychology assessment. In J.R. Graham, J.A. Naglieri, & I.B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology, Vol. 10: Assessment psychology (2nd ed.),* 211-238. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Handler, L., & Thomas, A.D. (Eds.). (2014). *Drawings in assessment and psychotherapy: Research and application.* New York: Routledge.

Harrison, L.J. (2015). Using children's drawings as a source of data in research. In O.N. Saracho (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in early childhood education: Review of research methodologies,* Vol. II (pp. 433-471). Charlotte, NC: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Harwood, T.M., Beutler, L.E., & Groth-Marnat, G. (2011). *Integrative assessment of adult personality* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Herzberg, E., & Mattar, A. (2008). Clinical instruments used in the department of clinical psychology of USP: 10 years later. *Boletim de Psicologia, 58,* 1-11.

Hopwood, C.J., & Bornstein, R.F. (Eds.) (2014). *Multimethod clinical assessment*. New York: Guilford Press.

Hojnoski, R.L., Morrison, R., Brown, M., & Matthews, W.J. (2006). Projective test use among school psychologists: A survey and critique. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 24,* 145-159.

Hughes, T.L., McGoey, K.E., & Owen, P. (2010). The importance of personality assessment in school psychology training programs. In E. Garcia-Vasquez, T.D. Crespi, & C.A. Riccio (Eds.), *Handbook of education, training, and supervision of school psychologists in school and community, Vol. 1: Foundations of professional practice (pp. 185-211)*. New York: Routledge.

Hutton, J.B., Dubes, R., Muir, S. (1992). Assessment practices of school psychologists: Ten years later. *School Psychology Review, 21*, 271-284.

Kahill, S. (1984). Human figure drawings in adults: An update of the empirical evidence, 1967-1982. *Canadian Psychology, 25,* 269-290.

Keddy, P., & Piotrowski, C. (1992). Testing in psychotherapy practice: Literature review survey, and commentary. *Journal of Training & Practice in Professional Psychology, 6*(1), 30-39.

Kennedy, M.L., Faust, D., Willis, W.G., & Piotrowski, C. (1994). Social-emotional assessment practices in school psychology. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 12,* 228-240.

Koonce, D.A. (2007). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder assessment practices by practicing school psychologists. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 25*(4), 319-333.

Koppitz, E. (1984). *Psychological evaluation of human figure drawings by middle school pupils*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Lally, S.J. (2003). What tests are acceptable for use in forensic evaluations? A survey of experts. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34*, 491-498.

Lally, S.J. (2001). Should human figure drawings be admitted into court? *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76,* 135-149.

Lees-Haley, P.R., Smith, H., Williams, C.W., & Dunn, J.T. (1996). Forensic neuropsychological test usage: An empirical survey. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 11*(1), 45-51.

Lilienfeld, S.O., Lynn, S.J., & Lohr, J.M. (2015). *Science and pseudoscience in clinical psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Lilienfeld, S.O., Wood, J.M., & Garb, H.N. (2000). The scientific status of projective techniques. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 1*(2), 27-66.

Lubin, B., Larsen, R.M., & Matarazzo, J.D. (1984). Patterns of psychological test usage in the United States: 1935-1982. *American Psychologist, 39,* 451-454.

Luiselli, J.K., Campbell, S., Cannon, B., et al. (2001). Assessment instruments used in the education and treatment of persons with autism: Brief report of a survey of national service centers. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 22*, 389-398.

Machover, K. (1949). *Personality projection in drawings of a human figure.* Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

Madaus, J., Rinaldi, C., Bigaj, S., & Chafouleas, S.M. (2009). An examination of current assessment practices in northeastern school districts. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 34*(2), 86-93.

Martin, M., Allan, A., &Allan, M.M. (2001). The use of psychological tests by Australian psychologists who do assessments for the courts. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 53*(2), 77-82.

McCully, R.S. (1965). Current attitudes about projective techniques in APA-approved internship training centers. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 29*(3), 271-280.

McGrath, R.E., & Carroll, E.J. (2012). The current status of "projective tests". In H. Cooper et al. (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 1: Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics (pp. 329-348).* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McLaughlin, J.L., & Kan, L.Y. (2014). Test usage in four common types of forensic mental health assessment. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 45*(2), 128-135.

Meyer. G.J., Finn, S.E., Eyde, L.D, et al. (2001). Psychological testing and psychological assessment: A review of evidence and issues. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 128-165.

Motta, R., Little, S., & Tobin, M. (1993). The use and abuse of human figure drawings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 8*, 162-169.

Muniz, J., Bartram, D., Evers, A., et al. (2001). Testing practices in European countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 17*(3), 201-211.

Muniz, J., Prieto, G., Almeida, L., & Bartram, D. (1999). Test use in Spain, Portugal and Latin American countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 15*(2), 151-157.

Murstein, B.I. (1965). *Handbook of projective techniques.* Oxford, UK: Basic Books.

Neal, T., &Grisso, T. (2014). Assessment practices and expert judgment methods in forensic psychology and psychiatry: An international snapshot. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*, 1406-1421.

Negi, R. (2015). Primary school children's constructions of literacy through drawings. *Psychological Studies, 60*(2), 204-214.

Neukrug, E., Peterson, C.H., Bonner, M., & Lomas, G. (2013). A national survey of assessment instruments taught by counselor educators. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 52*, 207-219.

Newmark, C.S. (1996). *Major psychological assessment instruments* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Ogawa, T., et al. (2010). *Psychological testing practices in Japan: Comparisons between 2010, 2004, and 1986.* Paper presented at the Japanese Psychological Association meeting (for full reportcontact: ogawa.toshiki.ke@u.tsukuba.ac.jp).

Ogawa, T., & Piotrowski, C. (1992). Clinical psychological test usage in Japan: A comparative study with a survey in the U.S.A. *Tsukuba Psychological Research, 14*, 151-158.

Ozer, S. (2009). Turkish children's human figure drawings: Can we borrow norms? *Educational Psychology, 29*(6), 701-712.

Pathak, P. (1966). *Draw A Man Test for Children.* Poona: Anand Agencies.

Peterson, C.H., Lomas, G.I., Neukrug, E.S., & Bonner, M.W. (2014). Assessment use by counselors in the United States: Implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*, 90-99.

Pinkerman, J.E., Haynes, J.P., & Keiser, T. (1993). Characteristics of psychological practice in juvenile court clinics. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 11*(2), 3-12.

Piotrowski, C. (2016). Bender-Gestalt Test usage worldwide: A review of 30 practice-based studies. *Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 23*(2), in press.

Piotrowski, C. (2015a). Projective techniques usage worldwide: A review of applied settings 1995-2015. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 41*(3), 9-19.

Piotrowski, C. (2015b). Clinical instruction on projective techniques in the USA: A review of academic training settings 1995-2014. *Journal of Projective Psychology & Mental Health, 22*(2), 83-92.

Piotrowski, C. (2015c). On the decline of projective techniques in professional psychology training. *North American Journal of Psychology, 17*(2), 259-265.

Piotrowski, C. (2007). Forensic psychological testing as a function of affiliation and organizational setting. *Organization Development Journal, 25*(1), 94-98.

Piotrowski, C. (1999). Assessment practices in the era of managed care: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55*, 787-796.

Piotrowski, C. (1985). Clinical assessment: Attitudes of the Society for Personality Assessment membership. *Southern Psychologist, 2*(4), 80-83.

Piotrowski, C. (1984). The status of projective techniques. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40,* 1495-1502.

Piotrowski, C., & Belter, R.W. (1999). Internship training in psychological assessment: Has managed care had an impact? *Assessment, 6*(4), 381-389.

Piotrowski, C., Belter, R.W., & Keller, J.W. (1998). The impact of "Managed Care" on the practice of psychological testing: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70,* 441-447.

Piotrowski, C., & Keller, J.W. (1992). Psychological testing in applied settings: A literature review from 1982-1992. *Journal of Training & Practice in Professional Psychology, 6*(2), 74-82.

Piotrowski, C., & Keller, J.W. (1989). Psychological testing in outpatient mental health facilities: A national survey. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 20*, 423-425.

Piotrowski, C., & Keller, J.W. (1989). Use of assessment in mental health clinics and services. *Psychological Reports, 64*, 1298.

Piotrowski, C., & Keller, J.W. (1984). Psychodiagnostic testing in APA-approved clinical psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 15*, 450-456.

Piotrowski, C., & Keller, J.W. (1978). Psychological test usage in southeastern outpatient mental health facilities in 1975. *Professional Psychology, 9*, 63-67.

Piotrowski, C., Keller, J.W., & Ogawa, T. (1993). Projective techniques: An international perspective. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 179-182.

Piotrowski, C., & Zalewski, C. (1993). Training in psychodiagnostic testing in APA-Approved PsyD and PhD clinical psychology programs. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*(2), 394-405.

Pruitt, J.A., Smith, M., Thelen, M.H., &Lubin, B. (1985). Attitudes of academic clinical psychologists toward projective techniques: 1968-1983. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16*, 781-788.

Rabin, A.I. (1986). *Projective techniques for adolescents and children*. New York: Springer.

Rabin, L. (2005). Assessment practices of clinical neuropsychologists in the United States and Canada: A survey of INS, NAN, and APA Division 40 members. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology, 20*, 33-65.

Raez de Ramirez, M. (2011). *Latin-American perspectives on projective techniques, Rorschach diagnostics, and evaluation of personality*. Data based on Symposium presented by the author: Lima, Peru.

Ready, R.E., & Veague, H.B. (2014). Training in psychological assessment: Current practices of clinical psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 45*, 278-282.

Reithmiller, R.J., & Handler, L. (1997). Problematic methods and unwarranted conclusions in DAP research: Suggestions for improved research procedures. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 69,* 459-475.

Reschly, D.J., Genshaft, J., & Binder, M.S. (1987). *The 1986 NASP survey.* Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Riccio, C.A., & Rodriguez, O.L. (2007). Integration of psychological assessment approaches in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools, 44*(3), 243-255.

Roback, H.B. (1968). Human figure drawings: Their utility in the clinical psychologist's armamentarium for personality assessment. *Psychological Bulletin, 70*, 1-19.

Ryba, N.L., Cooper, V.G., & Zapf, P.A. (2003). Juvenile competence to stand trial evaluations: A survey of current practices and test usage among psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34*(5), 499-507.

Sattler, J.M. (2006). *Assessment of children: Behavioral, social, and clinical foundations.* San Diego, CA: J.M. Sattler.

Shapiro, E.S., &Heick, P.F. (2004). School psychologist assessment practices in the evaluation of students referred for social/behavioral/emotional problems. *Psychology in the Schools, 41*(5), 551-561.

Sharpley, C.F., & Pain, M.D. (1988). Psychological test usage in Australia. *Australian Psychologist, 23*(3), 361-369.

Shemberg, K., & Keeley, S. (1970). Psychodiagnostic training in the academic setting: Past and present. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*, 205-211.

Smith, D., & Dumont, F. (1995). A cautionary study: Unwarranted interpretations of the Draw-A-Person test. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26*, 298-303.

Smith, S.R., Gorske, T., Wiggins, C., & Little, J.A. (2010). Personality assessment use by clinical neuropsychologists. *International Journal of Testing, 10,* 6-20.

Sotelo-Dynega, M., & Dixon, S.G. (2014). Cognitive assessment practices: A survey of school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools, 51*(10), 1031-1045.

Stedman, J.M., Hatch, J.P., & Schoenfeld, L.S. (2000). Pre-internship preparation in psychological testing and psychotherapy: What internship directors say they expect. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 31*, 321-326.

Stedman, J.M., Hatch, J.P., & Schoenfeld, L.S. (2002). Pre-internship preparation of clinical and counseling students in psychological testing, psychotherapy, and supervision: Their readiness for medical school and non-medical school internships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings, 9*, 267-271.

Stiles, D.A., McElrath, A.L., Lucas, J.E., Rajan, J., & Gupta, G.G. (2015). Adolescents' drawings about school and school subjects: Perspectives of youth from India compared with youth from seven other countries. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 41*(1), 16-24.

Stinnett, T.A., Havey, J.M., & Oehler-Stinnett, J. (1994). Current test usage by practicing school psychologists: A national survey. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 12*, 331-350.

Sweeney, J.A., Clarkin, J.F., & Fitzgibbon, M.L. (1987). Current practice of psychological assessment. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 377-380.

Swensen, C. (1968). Empirical evaluations of human figure drawings: 1957-1966. *Psychological Bulletin, 70*, 20-44.

TerLaak, J., de Goede, M., Aleva, A., & Van Rijswijk, P. (2005). The Draw-A-Person Test: An indicator of children's cognitive and socio-emotional adaptation? *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 166*(1), 77-93.

Thelen, M.H., Varble, D.L., & Johnson, J. (1968). Attitudes of academic clinical psychologists toward projective techniques. *American Psychologist, 23*, 517-521.

Tsoi, M.M., & Sundberg, N.D. (1989). Patterns of psychological test use in Hong Kong. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 20*, 248-250.

Tuma, J.M., & Pratt, J. (1982). Clinical child psychology practice and training: A survey. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 11*, 27-34.

Vukovich, D.H. (1983). The use of projective assessment by school psychologists. *School Psychology Review, 12*, 358-364.

Watkins, C.E., Campbell, V.L., & Manus, M. (1990). Personality assessment training in counseling psychology programs. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55,* 380-383.

Watkins, C.E., Campbell, V.L., & McGregor, P. (1988). Counseling psychologists' use of and opinions about psychological tests: A contemporary perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist, 16,* 476-486.

Watkins, C.E., Campbell, V.L., Nieberding, R., & Hallmark, R. (1995). Contemporary practice of psychological assessment by clinical psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26*, 54-60.

Wechsler, S.M., Oakland, T., Leon, C., et al. (2014). Test development and use in five Iberian Latin American countries. *International Journal of Psychology, 49*(4), 233-239.

Weiner, I.B., & Greene, R.L. (2008). *Handbook of personality assessment.* New York: Wiley.

Wilson, M.S., & Reschly, D.J. (1996). Assessment in school psychology training and practice. *School Psychology Review, 25*(1), 9-23.

Wenck, S. (1984). *H-T-P drawings: An illustrated diagnostic handbook*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Wood, J.M., Garb, H.N., Lilienfeld, S.O., & Nezworski, M.T. (2002). Clinical assessment. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 519-543.

Woolford, J., Patterson, T., Macleod, E., Hobbs, L., & Hayne, H. (2015). Drawing helps children to talk about their presenting problems during a mental health assessment. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 20*, 68-83.

Yama, M.F. (1990). The usefulness of human figure drawings as an index of overall adjustment. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 78-86.

Ziskin, J. (1995). *Coping with psychiatric and psychological testimony,* Vol. 2 (5th ed.,Challenging personality testing: The Rorschach & other projective methods, pp.823-884). Los Angeles, CA: Law and Psychology Press.

Manuscript submitted on February 18, 2016

Final revision received on April 18, 2016

Accepted on April 19, 2016.

Chris Piotrowski, University of West Florida; Email: cpiotrowski@uwf.edu