

\*

308 (616) (616) " Van de Castle Hall "

(Doniger, 1993)

.1

.1900 Interpretation of Dreams

(2004

-أ-

(Springin, 2005)

-ب-

-ج-

-د-

(1988 )

.2008/7/3

2007/4/11

\*

:

( )

:

-أ

.(Louise, 1984)

-ب

(1997)

)

.(1997

(Domhoff, 2004)

:

.1

.(1997 )

.2

.3

(1979 )

( Punamaki, 1998)

.4

.(Domhoff, 2002)

Hall /Van de  
Domhoff, )

Castle (1966)

.(1999

" "

" "

Compensatory

Jung

:

.(1995 )

(1971)Hilgard

.( )

.(1994 )

:

(2006 )

.(Jung, 1979)

Karen Harney

Leonard,

(2006 ) .

(1996)

.(1998 )

Erek From

.(2006 )

.(1997 )

Perls

.(2006 )

(Lucie, 1996)

:

.(1998 )

Punamaki,

(1997)

.(1998 )

(2003 )

.(

.(1997 )

)

(1986

REM

Rebound .

.(2006 )

(1991)

-1 :

:

-2

:

-3

:

[ ]

:

-4

( ) 2001 ,

(Domhaff

"

:

" Continuity Principle

Repetition Principle

.(Domhaff, 2001)

(Bergsons, 1996)

-1

-2

( ) ( )

:

(

:

(

(

:

( 551) Hall/Van de Castle ( ) (

(Tartz et al., 2006)

( )

(Rinfret, et. al., 1991)

30

(Hartmann's)

(330 )

Hall Van de Castle

.Bizarreness Scoring  
(Decicco,, 2007)

(Amiri, 1988)

56

( 40 35) (75)

Ulimen mited

Hall /Van de

.Castle method

Maggiolini et. al.,

(Stranch, 2005)

685

.(2007)

," "

30-10

12

12

:

38. 1%

.15-13 13-11 11-9 :

16

)  
( ... )

) Dream Bank

(Pallack, 1989)

14, 193

Domhoff et al., )

(2006

( St-onge, et al., 2005)

Hall/Van de Castle

39 106

.24

537

5

28

30

50 300

282

246

101

95

.2003

2002

2003

2002

11

(David, 2007)

Tore et )

SF-

27

(al., 2003

36

1181

Hall and Van de Castle

:

(Valli et al., 2006)

"

:

:

Hall/Van

Dream Bank

.de Castle system

Hall /Van de

.Castle

:

**Manifest Content**

:

.(1992 )

:

Dream

Dream

.(2002 ) work

Rrport

:

:

(3-1)

)

(

:

:

(616)  
 :  
 (308) (18-17)  
 (308) .(20-19)  
 (616)  
 (1)

(1)

% 7 .55	343	18-17	
% 3 .44	273	20-19	
4 .42	261		
6 .57	355		
%100	616	20-17	
%100	616	-	

.Content Analysis

Hall/ Van de Castle Method

1950 ( . ) .  
 1960 ( )  
 )

: :

•  
 \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \*  
 •  
 (Domhoff, 2002) \*

(2 )

2006/2007

(5400)

(25102)

20

16

50

-  
Hall/

( )  
-

Van de Castle

(2)

*			*			*			*					
		X	X			X						22	-1	

(1-3

)

\*

(3)

% 17	107	
% 16	101	
% 15	96	
% 14	89	
% 12	78	
% 11.5	71	
% 0.6	39	
% 0.5	36	
% 0.5	34	
% 0.2	12	

(4)

.616 =

*	**		308 = ( )	) 308 = ( )	
	%9	%30	% 37 6	% 28 26	-
	% 9	%70	% 62 10	% 71 65	-
		%100	%100 16 1	%100 91	

=+15

%15-11

=%10-6

=%5-1=

\*

=

\*\*

.(

:

(91)

(16)

%12

%10

) :

%13

:

:

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

( )

(5)

.616 =

			( )	( )	
	%21	% 60	% 45 11	% 65 50	
	%10	% 15	% 0. 8 2	% 17 13	
	%4	% 0. 5	% 0. 8 2	% 0. 4 3	
	%12	% 0. 8	% 0. 16 4	% 0. 5 4	
	%13	% 12	% 0. 20 5	%9 7	
		%100	%100 24	%100 77	

(6)

.616 =

			( )	( )	
	%9	% 30	% 23 5	% 32 27	
	%2	% 16	% 14 3	% 16 14	
	%6	% 30	% 26 6	% 32 27	
	%2	%13	% 14 3	% 12 11	
	%15	%11	% 23 .0 5	% 08 .0 7	
		%100	%100 22	%100 86	

(7)

.616 =

			)	( )	
	%19	% 47	% 0. 34 11	% 53 35	( )
	%10	% 23	% 30 10	% 20 13	
	%7	% 20	% 15 5	% 22 15	
	%16	% 10	% 21 7	%5 3	
		% 100	% 100 33	% 100 66	

(8)

.616 =

			( )	( )	
	%13	% 32	% 23 7	% 36 17	
	%7	% 56	% 60 18	% 53 25	
	%5	% 06	% 10 3	% 05 2	
	%1	% 06	% 07 2	% 06 3	" "
		%100	%100 30	%100 47	

. :

. :

. :

( )

.( )

." " :

(41)

(27)

.( 28)

(% 26)

(9)

616 =

			( )	( )	
	%14	% 18	% 26 7	% 12 5	
	%18	% 29	% 19 5	% 37 15	
	%4	% 09	% 11 3	% 07 3	
	%1	% 32	% 33 9	% 32 13	
	%1	% 12	% 11 3	% 12 5	
		%100	%100 27	%100 41	

(10)

616 =

			( )	( )	
	%17	% 15	% 06 1	% 23 5	( )
	%1	% 05	% 06 1	% 05 1	
	%16	% 80	% 88 15	% 72 16	
		%100	%100 17	%100 22	

(11)

.616 =

			( )	( )	
	%31	% 14	% 38 3	% 7 2	-
	%13	% 22	% 12 1	% 25 7	-
	%42	% 45	% 12 1	% 54 15	-
	%24	% 19	% 38 3	% 14 4	-
		%100	%100 8	%100 28	

(12)

.616 =

			( )	( )	" "
	%30	% 74	% 100 4	% 70 21	-
		-----	-----		-
	%30	% 26	-----	% 30 9	-
		%100	%100 4	%100 30	

( " " :

"

"

(0.05=α)

)

(

(14)

(MANOVA)

(14)

22 .1

19

44 .1

19

:

.1 13 .1  
. 19

19

45

(1

88 .1 63 .1 19  
19

"

19

"

78 .1 55 .1  
. 19

(2

19

(3

42 .2 10 .2  
19

(4

00 .2 19  
. 19

30 .2

:

(14)

)

19

(15) (MANOVA)

(04 .2)

19

.(18 .2)

(13)

.616 =

			( )	( )	
	%12	%42	% 0. 33 1	% 45 4	—
	%11	% 25	% 0. 33 1	% 22 2	—
	%0	% 33	% 0. 33 1	% 33 3	( ) —
		%100	%100 3	%100 9	

.(14)

0. 520	1. 22	126	19		
0. 825	1. 44	135	19		
0. 702	1. 33	261			
0. 443	1. 13	217	19		
0. 765	1. 45	138	19		
0. 609	1. 25	355			
0. 474	1. 16	343	19		
0. 794	1. 44	273	19		
0. 650	1. 29	616			
0. 826	1. 63	126	19		
0. 881	1. 88	135	19		
0. 862	1. 76	261			
0. 804	1. 55	217	19		
0. 871	1. 78	138	19		
0. 837	1. 64	355			
0. 812	1. 58	343	19		
0. 876	1. 83	273	19		
0. 849	1. 69	616			

0.987	2.10	126	19		
0.885	2.42	135	19		
0.947	2.27	261			
0.967	2.00	217	19		
0.915	2.30	138	19		
0.957	2.12	355			
0.974	2.04	343	19		
0.901	2.36	273	19		
0.955	2.18	616			

(15)  
(MANOVA)

0.00	610.0	3.0	2477.533	0.076	
0.21	610.0	3.0	1.530	0.993	
.000*	610.0	3.0	15.754	0.928	
0.74	610.0	3.0	4190.	0.998	*

(05 .0 ≥ α)

\*

83 .1 59 .1 19 (15)  
19

-. 237

(419.) ( )

05 .2 236 19  
- 19 (1.530) ( )  
(MANOVA)  
308

.(15. 754) ( )

(16)

(16)

18 .1 44 .1 19  
19

-. 268

[ ]

(16)  
(Estimated Marginal Means)

0.268	.04	1.18	19	
	.04	1.44	19	
0.237	.05	1.59	19	
	.05	1.83	19	
0-.308	.05	2.05	19	
	.06	2.36	19	

(Domhoff, 2006)

11

.Jung

Hall Van de Castle

(91)

(16)

Decicco, )

.,.(Tartz, et. al 2006)

Domhoff,

(Stranch, 2005)

(2007

.(David, 2007)

(2006)

( )

:

.1

)

.2

(

.3

(66)

(33)

.4

)

( . . . .

(30)

(47)

Hilgard )

( )  
(et al., 1971

(Domhoff, 2006)

11

(41)

(27)

( , ,Tore., et. al2003)

(8)

(28)

(30)

(4)

(1998 )

(Tore et al., 2003)

(Tartz et al., 2006)

(Rinfret et al., 1991)

(St-onge et al., 2005)

-

-

-

%90

:

( )

15

-

" "

( )

.102

1997

-

1994

20

.103 44

.16

2002

1995

.76

.527 433 390 28-27 14-13

York:Palgrave 4 1992

Domhoff, G. W., Meyer-Gomes, k. ., &Scherdl, M. 2006. Dreams as the expression of conceptions and concerns:Acomparison of German and American college students. *Imagination, Cognition and personality*, 25(3), 269-282. 2 .235 2006 .213-211 210-209 1997 .129 3

Doniger, w., Kelly, B. 1993. why study Dreams?AReligious studies perspective, *Dreaming*, 3, 1. 1 1998 .238 62

Hilgard E. R., RichardA. and Rital A. 1971. Introduction to psychology, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc. 270-271. 1991 .72-71 1972

Jung C. G., M-Lvon Franz, L, Joseph, H., Jolande, J. and Aniela, J. 1979. man and hissymbols, 17thEd., U. S. A. :Dell publishing co. Inc, 3-4. .66-65 9 3

Leonard M., Giambra, R., Jung, and Alicia, G. 1996. Age changes in Dream Recall in adulthood. *Dreaming*, 1, 17-31. 1998 .295-294 264-102

Louise, S. 1984. Perspective In Counseling Theories, New York, 36. 2003 .135 86 67

Lucie, G., Monique, L., Marie-J. and Joseph, D. 1996. Continuity and change:The Dreams of women Throughout Adulthood, *Dreaming*, 3, 187-199. 2006 33 3 .32

Maggiolini, A., Persico, A. Crippa, F. 2007. Gravity Content in dreams, *Dreaming*, 2, 87-97. 7 1988 .201

Mir A. 1988. Self-Reflection In Dreams In Relation To Self Awareness And Personality Growth: And Experimental Study, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 2814-B. 2004 .591 1986

Pallock, R. S. 1989. An Exploration of the manifest and latent content of the first dream reported in clinical practice, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 5529-B. .12 2005 2

Patrick, M. 1996. Bergsons theory of Dreaming, *Dreaming*, 6, 173-186. .16 61

Punamaki, R. 1998. The role of dreams in protecting psychological well-being in traumatic conditions, *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 22, 3.

Punamaki, R. L. 1997. Determinants and mental Health Effects of Dream Recall Among children Living in Traumatic Conditions. *Dreaming*, 7, 2.

Rinfret, N., Lortie, L. Monique, D. Koninck, J. 1991. The dreams of professional mothers and female students:An explorationof social roles and age impact, *Dreaming*., 3, 179-191.

St-onge, M., Lortie – L., Mercier, P., Grenier, J., Dekoninck, J. 2005. Emotions in the diary and REM dreams of young and adulthood women and their Relation to life satisfaction, *Dreaming*, 2, 116-128.

David, B., Decicco, T. 2007. The relationships between dream content and physical health, mood, self construal. *Dreaming*, 17, 127-139.

Decicco, T. 2007. Dreams of Female Univrsity Students:Content analysis and the relationship to discovery the Uliman method, *Dreaming*, 2, 98-112.

Domhoff, G. 2001. A new neurocognitive theory of dreams, *Dreaming*, 11, 13-33.

Domhoff, G. w. 1999. New direction in the study of dream content using the Hall and Van de Castle Coding system. *Dreaming*, 9, 115-137.

Domhoff, G. W. 2002. Using content analysis to study dreams: Application for the humanities. In k. Bulkeley(Ed. ), *Dreams:ARader on the Religious, Cultural, and Psychological Dimensions of Dreaming*, 307-319. New

- Tore A. Nielsen, Antonio L. Z, Valerie S., Sebastien. S, Philippe S., Carlyle. S and Don Kuiken. 2003. The Typical Dreams of Canadian University Students, *Dreaming: Journal of the Association for the Study of Dreams*, 4, 211-235.
- Valli, k., Revonsuo, A., Palkas, O., Punamki, R. L. 2006. The effect of trauma on dreams content, a field study of Palestinian children, *Dreaming*, 2, 63-87.
- Strach, L. 2005. REM Dreaming in the transition from late childhood to adolescence: A Longitudinal Study, *Dreaming*, 3, 155-169.
- Tartz, R. S., Baker, R. C, Krippner, S. 2006. Cognitive Differences in Dream Content and Boundary Structure between Asian, Pacific Islander Americans, and European Americans using Quantitative content Analysis, *Dreaming*, 2, 111-128.

## **Manifest Content of the Adolescent and University Students' Dreams in Secondary and University Stages**

*Kamil H. Katalo* \*

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims at identifying the manifest content of dreams (MCD) by adolescents in the secondary stage and university students, categories and indicators of dreams, the difference between the two stages, the difference in the variables of MCD (dream density, length, and recalls) according to sex and age, and their psychological problems through the MCD. The sample total was 616 dream reports from both stages and sexes (308 each /1 report by each student). Hall and Van de Castle Indicators were used to classify dream elements into categorie The results showed 10 categories and a number of indicators. Sex and age had an impact on the MCD variables.

The results were discussed and interpreted in the light of the related literature. Finally, the study is concluded with a number of recommendations.

**Keywords:** MCD (manifest content of Dreams), Dream Density, Length, Recalls.

---

\* Psychology Department, Faculty of Education, Hebron University, Palestine. Received on 11/4/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 3/7/2008.