



가 denough & Harris WAIS-R

(pre- Goodenough WAIS-R Goodenough & Harris

dicator) . Goodenough Goodenough & Harris

Harris Buck

가 가 가

가 3 15 (71 ), 가 가

(73 ) 가 . 5 15 125

10) Koppitz

.90 Goodenough & Harris WISC-R,

2),

가 .26 .92 .38 , WISC-R

.77

3)4).

Goodenough & Harris 가 WISC-R

1948 Buck - - (r=.57)

가 가

- 가

Goodenough & Harris 가

가

.7~.75 3)9).

5), 6)7).

Koppitz Goodenough Koppitz 가

Development Item(KDI)

30 5~14 , ,

가 가

Koppitz 가

.6 .8 95%

가 1). Groves Fried(1991) 8) KDI 5 ,

7 3 4 가 가

Koppitz 가 가

. Abell Heiberger Joiner Schmidt

(1994) 9) Buck 11) , ,

Goodenough , WAIS-R 가

가 가

Buck 가 Goo- 가



2. 도구 및 절차

11 가  
 가 7  
 7  
 가 1 가  
 5  
 9 /  
 가  
 2, 1, 0 가  
 (1) 가  
 / 가 1 가  
 가? (2)  
 35  
 가? (3)  
 97%, 99%

3. 자료 분석 방법

14

방 법

1. 연구 대상

1 6  
 27 ( 15, 12, 9.4 ± 1.9 )  
 가 (Pearson Correlation Coefficients)  
 SAS (SAS 6.0, SAS  
 institute, USA) , p 0.05  
 6 30 ( 25, 5 9.4  
 ± 1.7 )  
 가  
 가 (ADHD) 결 과  
 15 , 6 , 145  
 2 , 1 , 248  
 1 , 1 , 1 ,  
 1 , 1 , -  
 1 .  
 1.19(SD=1.21)  
 3.77(SD=2.78)  
 6(SD=1.90)  
 2.87(SD=2.92)  
 (KEDI - WISC) 가 , KEDI -  
 WISC 109 ± 18.5  
 115 (32), (21), (19)  
 ± 12.1, 103 ± 21.4

(37), (54), (49), (DAPDIF)  
 Table 1, Table 2  
 14, DAPCON, DAPABS, DAPDIF  
 (DAPCON), (DAPABS), 가  
 0 14, 가

**Table 1.** Frequencies, mean & standard deviations of concrete and abstract characteristics

Characteristics	Normal group (n = 27)	Clinical group (n = 30)	F
	Freq(M ± S.D.)	Freq(M ± S.D.)	
Concrete	32(1.19 ± 1.21)	113(3.77 ± 2.78)	19.92**
Heavy line	1(0.04 ± 0.18)	19(0.63 ± 0.85)	14.28**
Smuged line	11(0.41 ± 0.61)	32(1.07 ± 0.87)	12.98**
Extreme shading	12(0.44 ± 0.62)	9(0.30 ± 0.53)	.45
Perseveration	2(0.07 ± 0.25)	12(0.40 ± 0.67)	6.42*
Lack of details	2(0.07 ± 0.37)	21(0.70 ± 0.92)	12.39**
Rigid body	4(0.15 ± 0.35)	19(0.63 ± 0.85)	8.90**
Erasures with no improvement	0(0.00 ± 0.00)	1(0.03 ± 0.18)	1.0
Abstract	162(6.00 ± 1.90)	86(2.87 ± 2.92)	22.47**
Spontaneity	51(1.89 ± 0.07)	28(0.93 ± 0.98)	12.138**
Proportion	10(0.37 ± 0.61)	5(0.17 ± 0.53)	1.28
Aesthetic appearance	10(0.37 ± 0.61)	5(0.17 ± 0.46)	1.44
Consistent line	37(1.37 ± 0.82)	17(0.57 ± 0.86)	9.49**
Full figure	49(1.81 ± 0.72)	22(0.73 ± 0.98)	16.45**
Erasures with improvement	2(0.07 ± 0.25)	3(0.10 ± 0.31)	.21
Movement	3(0.11 ± 0.31)	6(0.20 ± 0.48)	.92

\*p < .05, \*\*p < .01

**Table 2.** Means and standard deviation for DAP and Similarity Test scores

Variable		Normal group (n = 27)	Clinical group (n = 30)	F
DAPCON	M(SD)	1.2( 1.2)	3.8( 2.8)	19.92**
DAPABS	M(SD)	6.0( 1.9)	2.9( 2.9)	22.47**
DAPDIF	M(SD)	- 4.8( 2.8)	0.9( 5.3)	25.06**
Similarity test	M(SD)	12.4( 2.1)	12.0( 3.8)	.24
Full IQ	M(SD)	115.4(12.1)	103.3(21.4)	6.74*

\*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, DAPCON : , DAPABS : , DAPDIF : -  
 Full IQ :

**Table 3-1.** Correlations of DAP and similarity test scores for total (n = 57)

	DAPCON	DAPABS	DAPDIF	Similarity Test
DAPCON	-			
DAPABS	- 0.78**	-		
DAPDIF	0.93**	- 0.95**	-	
Similarity test	- 0.42**	- 0.51**	- 0.50**	-

\*\*p < .01 DAPCON : , DAPABS : , DAPDIF : -

**Table 3-2.** Correlations of DAP and similarity test scores for normal group (n = 27)

	DAPCON	DAPABS	DAPDIF	Similarity Test
DAPCON	-			
DAPABS	- 0.65**	-		
DAPDIF	0.86**	- 0.95**	-	
Similarity test	- 0.21**	0.17**	- 0.20**	-

\*\*p < .01 DAPCON : , DAPABS : , DAPDIF : -

Table 3 - 1  
DAPABS  
.51(p<.01)

(r = .54, p<.01). Table 3 - 2 Table 3 - 3

(r = .17)  
(r = .69, p<.01).

Table 4

**Table 3-3.** Correlations of DAP and similarity test scores for clinical group(n = 30)

	DAPCON	DAPABS	DAPDIF	Similarity Test
DAPCON	-			
DAPABS	-0.72**	-		
DAPDIF	0.92**	-0.93**	-	
Similarity test	-0.51**	0.69**	-0.65**	-
**p<.01	DAPCON :	DAPABS :		
	DAPDIF :			

**Table 4.** Correlations of individual DAP scores with similarity test

DAP variable	Similarity test	
	Normal group (n = 27)	Clinical group (n = 30)
Heavy line	-0.04	-0.37*
Smudged line	-0.21	-0.09
Extreme shading	-0.19	0.02
Perseveration	-0.26	-0.30
Lack of detail	0.06	0.39*
Rigid body	0.17	-0.54**
Erasures with no improvement	0.00	-0.15
Spontaneity	-0.03	0.63**
Proportion	0.03	0.26
Aesthetic appearance	0.28	0.40*
Consistent line	0.31	0.33*
Full figure	-0.11	0.62**
Erasures with improvement	-0.12	0.12
Movement	-0.01	0.34
Concrete thinking	-0.21	-0.51**
Abstract thinking	0.17	0.69**
Con-Abs	-0.20	-0.65**

\*p<.05, \*\* p<.01

Table 3

(r = -.54, p<.01)

(r = .62, p<.01)

(r = .63, p<.01),

가(r = .69, p<.01)

가 (r = -.51, p<.01)

Table 5 6

(r = .61, p<.01)

가

(r = .78, p<.01)

(r = -.65, p<.01).

논 의

가

**Table 5.** Correlations among similarity test scores, FIQ & DAP scores for normal group

	Similarity test	DAPDIF	FIQ
Similarity test	-		
DAPDIF	-0.20	-	
Full IQ	0.61**	-0.26	-
**p<.01, DAPDIF :			
FIQ :			

**Table 6.** Correlations among similarity test scores, FIQ & DAP scores for clinical group

	Similarity test	DAPDIF	FIQ
Similarity test	-		
DAPDIF	-0.65**	-	
Full IQ	0.78**	-0.68**	-
**p<.01, DAPDIF :			
FIQ :			

Gustafson Waehler<sup>9)</sup> , 가  
 , 가  
 , 가  
 WISC 가 KEDI - Table 1  
 , 가가 가 ,  
 , 가  
 19)  
 , 가 Abell<sup>10)</sup> 가 가  
 Koppitz<sup>1)</sup>가  
 ,  
 (DAPABS)  
 (r = .69, p < .01) , 가  
 / 가가 /  
 , 가 19) (90.4%)  
 , Table 1 가  
 가 가  
 가 0 4 가 가  
 , 가  
 가 가  
 , 가  
 , 가

### References

- 1) **Koppitz EM** (1968) : Psychological evaluation of human figure drawings. New York, Grune & Stratton
- 2) **Harris DB** (1963) : Children's drawings as measures of intellectual maturity. New York, Harcourt, Brace, & World

가가  
 , (DAP-  
 ABS)  
 (DAPCON) 가

- 3) **Aikman KG, Belter RW, Finch AJ Jr** (1992) : Human figure drawings : Validity in assessing intellectual level and academic achievement. *J Clin Psychol* 48 : 114-120
- 4) **Kahill S** (1984) : Human figure drawings in adults : An update of the empirical evidence. *Can J Psychol* 25 : 269-292
- 5) **Buck JN** (1948) : The H-T-P test. *J Clin Psychol* 4 : 151-159
- 6) **Rubin HA** (1954) : A quantitative study of the H-T-P and its relationship to the Wechsler-Bellevue Scale. *J Clin Psychol* 10 : 35-38
- 7) **Guertin WJ, Sloan WA** (1948) : A comparison of the H-T-P and Wechsler Bellevue IQs in mental defectives. *J Clin Psychol* 4 : 424-426
- 8) **Groves JR, Fried PA** (1991) : Developmental Items on Children's Human Figure Drawings : A Replication And Extension of Koppitz To Younger Children. *J Clin Psychol* 47 (1) : 140-148
- 9) **Abell SC, Heiberger AM, Jhonson JE** (1994) : Cognitive Evaluations of Young Adults By Means of Human Figure Drawings : An Empirical Investigation of Two Methods. *J Clin Psychol* 50 (6) : 900-905
- 10) **Abell SC, VON Briesen PD, Watz LS** (1996) : Intellectual Evaluation of Children Using Human Figure Drawings : An Empirical Investigation of Two Methods. *J Clin Psychol* 52 (1) : 67-74
- 11) **Joiner TE Jr, Schmidt KL** (1997) : Drawing Conclusions or Not-From Drawings. *J Pers Assess* 69 (3) : 476-481
- 12) **Handler L, Habenicht D** (1994) : The Kinetic Family Drawing technique : A Review of the Literature. *J Pers Assess* 62 (3) : 440-464
- 13) **Wachler CA, Zaback T** (1991) : Sex of Drawings and Self-Esteem. *Percept Mot Skills* 73 : 683-688
- 14) **Wachler CA** (1997) : Drawing Bridges Between Science and Practice. *J Pers Assess* 69 (3) : 482-487
- 15) **Martlew M, Connolly K** (1996) : Human Figure Drawings by Schooled and Unschooled Children in Papua New Guinea. *Child Dev* 67 : 2743-2762
- 16) **Cox MV, Maynard S** (1998) : The Human Figure Drawings of Children With Down Syndrome. *Br J Dev Psychol* 16 : 133-137
- 17) **Gilchrist D** (1991) : An Examination of Human-Figure Drawings of Kindergarten boys and girls before and after short-term instruction. *Ear Child Dev Care* 73 : 63-71
- 18) **Merril LL** (1994) : Draw-a-Person Test As a Measure of Anxiety in the Work Place. *Percept Mot Skills* 79 : 11-15
- 19) **Gustafson JL, Wachler CA** (1992) : Assessing Concrete and Abstract Thinking With the Draw-A-Person Technique. *J Pers Assess* 59 (3) : 439-447

**ASSESSMENT OF CONCRETE AND ABSTRACT THINKING OF  
CHILD-PSYCHIATRIC CHILDREN WITH THE DRAW-A-PERSON  
TEST AND KEDI-WISC SIMILARITY TEST**

**In Ju Kim, M.A., Min Sup Shin, Ph.D.**

*Division of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Seoul  
National University Children's Hospital, Seoul*

**Objective :** This study was conducted to examine the Draw-A-Person test as a non-verbal indicator of concrete and abstract thinking.

**Method :** Thirty child-psychiatric children and 27 normal children were individually assessed with Draw-A-person Test and KEDI-WISC, and the scores were compared between similarity test and DAP.

**Results :** The results showed significant differences between the groups. In clinical group, there were significant correlations with DAP scores and similarity test scores, especially abstract scores on DAP were highly correlated with similarity test scores. Results indicate characteristics of abstract thinking may be more discernable on the DAP than concrete thinking in clinical group.

**KEY WORDS :** Draw-A-Person test · KEDI-WISC similarity test · Concrete thinking · Abstract thinking.