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CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE

**The General Purpose**

The general purpose of this thesis is to determine some of the major characteristics of the personality structure of the sixteen-year-old "dependent" adolescent. It is an attempt to answer such questions as: What is the "dependent" sixteen-year-old adolescent like? What are his major personality traits? What are his principal modes of adjusting to his world?

**A Definition of Terms**

What is meant by a "dependent" child? The word "dependent" is being used in a technical sense. A "dependent" child is one whose first two years or more of life have been spent in a family setting but who has since been transferred to an institution and who has spent most of his life in an institution. The "dependent" child, therefore, must be distinguished from the "institution" child. Goldfarb (1944) defines the "institution" child as one whose first two or three years of rearing have been in an institution. The distinction between the "institution" and the "dependent" child is an important one. Deprivation of normal or comparatively normal parental care from the very beginning of life is bound, generally speaking, to have a more devastating
effect on the development of the child than institutionalization which takes place after a comparatively normal infancy. (Brody, 1956; Crow and Crow, 1962).

The Specific Purpose

More specifically, the purpose of the thesis is to investigate the differences in personality structure existing between a group of 50 dependent sixteen-year-old adolescents and a group of 100 family-reared adolescents of the same age. It is an attempt to answer such questions as: Do these two groups differ significantly on certain Rorschach categories? What differences in personality structure underlie significant differences in the Rorschach scoring categories? If these questions, after investigation, can be answered even in a somewhat hypothetical way, the purpose of the thesis will be achieved, for this will lay the foundation for a more detailed investigation of the personality and the world of the dependent adolescent.

The General Hypothesis

The general hypothesis of this thesis is that the personality structure of the dependent sixteen-year-old differs significantly in certain characteristics from the personality structure of the normally reared sixteen-year-old. The assumption of the thesis is not that family-reared children are "normal" and that institutionally reared children are "neurotic." There are both normal and neurotic institutionally reared children, just as there are normal and neurotic family-reared children. It is as-
sumed that in the case of the dependent child there is a "general developmental lag" operative, and that this retardation is complemented by the development on the part of the dependent child of certain different characteristic ways of meeting life situations.

**Thesis Rationale**

As will be seen below, little has been said in the psychological literature about the dependent child. Long ago it came to be recognized that both the dependent and the institution child benefit by early foster home placement, if this is possible (Brody, 1956; Crow and Crow, 1962). But there are children who, for one reason or another, cannot be placed in such homes. They remain the wards of the institution until the end of high school, and then they are more or less on their own. The personality structure and the problems of the institution child have been discussed fairly widely in the literature. But an understanding of the institution child is not, as was indicated above, ipso facto an understanding of the dependent child. The ego or self—the organized values, attitudes, conscious needs, goals, and ideals which define the psychological self, the center of the personality organization from which the individual gains identity and continuity (Allport, 1955)—is generally considered to take its basic form very early, within the first few years of life (Crow and Crow, 1962). Precisely during this period of life the environment of the institution child and that of the
dependent child differ radically. This thesis is written in order that the personality structure and problems of the dependent child might be understood more clearly so that he might be guided and counselled more effectively.

It is not the direct purpose of this thesis to investigate developmental factors contributing to the personality structure of the dependent child. But if his general personality structure at age sixteen is more clearly understood, it will be an easier task to investigate the developmental factors which have contributed to this structure.

The Sixteen-Year-Old

Why was the sixteen-year-old chosen for this study? It is assumed that the cumulative effects of institutionalization will be more apparent at this age. Ames, Metraux, and Walker (1959) have noted that sixteen is an age of expansion and exuberance.

Gesell, Ilg, and Ames had already noticed this tendency:

The 16-year-old youth if he rises to tiptoe can almost see the horizon of adulthood. He is himself a pre-adult. Society accords him his higher status in various laws, customs, and expectations. . . . (W)e can detect in sixteen a constellation of traits which at a pre-adult level are foretokens of the so-called mature mind. . . . Self-awareness, self-dependence, and personal-social adjustments have come into better balance and integration. This makes him at mid-adolescence a sort of prototype of a pre-adult (1956, pp. 250-254).

The Rorschach record at this age is in almost every respect fuller. It is assumed, therefore, that the general personality differences between the two groups will stand out more strikingly at this age, and, if there is any general developmental lag in
the dependent adolescent group, it will be more apparent here.

The Research Tool

The Rorschach test will be the instrument of research. Specifically, the scoring categories of the Rorschach will become the basis of a number of specific hypotheses concerning the personality structure of the dependent sixteen-year-old. Overt behavior is always the result of a number of interrelated personality processes operating in terms of the various demands and constraints of particular situations; it is an "unitas multiplex" (Rickers-Ovsiankina, 1960). Thus, as Ainsworth (Klopfer, Ainsworth, Klopfer, and Holt, 1954) points out in her review of Rorschach validation research, one is inclined to look askance at "single-variable" studies attempting to predict behavior in complex situations. And the same may be said, but perhaps to a lesser degree, about studies attempting to use the Rorschach scoring categories to delineate the general personality structure of a group. Yet, where it is possible to derive pointed hypotheses relating test variable to overt behavior and personality characteristics, and if one can reasonably manipulate the experimental situation, such research can be effective, and it can contribute to an understanding of test variables. This is the hope of the present study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This review will consist of the following categories: (1) a consideration of the literature dealing with early infant deprivation, which refers mainly to the institution child; (2) literature dealing more directly with the dependent child and adolescent; (3) Rorschach studies of adolescents; (4) Adolescent Rorschach responses by Ames et al. This work will be given special consideration in that its sixteen-year-old population will be used in this study as a control group; (5) Goldfarb's Rorschach study of institution children. This study will be given special consideration as being the kind of study that most closely approximates the present one.

Early Infant Deprivation

The general deterioration that overtakes institutionalized infants has been remarked upon in the literature at least since the beginning of the century. Coe (1914) stated that institutional care of children can provide the conditions of physical health, but not the individualizing and socializing influences that are essential to normal growth. He believed that it was already an axiom among social workers that the child who is deprived of his natural family connection should be placed as soon
as possible in another family and not in an institution. References in recent years have related to the psychic stress suffered by these infants and its significance for the development of ego functions. Infant psychiatry has directed attention particularly to the failure of many institutions to offer adequate human stimulation to the infants. Durfee and Wolf (1933) found that infants institutionalized for more than eight months during their first year showed such severe psychological disturbances that they could not be tested. However, they do not go into the nature of these "psychological" disturbances, nor do they indicate how they were measured. Levy (1937) studied a group of children who in their earliest years had received little or no maternal care and love; he found that their affect was shallow and that they had various neurotic symptoms in common. Today, however, one would be very slow to use the term neurotic or the term psychotic of infants and children. Otherwise, one runs into the anomaly of having to use such terms as the "general neurosis of adolescence"; terms such as these have the tendency to empty general nosological categories of any specific meaning. When dealing with infants and children, present-day writers seem to deal with deviations in more general developmental terms (Crow and Crow, 1962). Levy described these children as suffering from "affect hunger" and mentioned a large group of young children with this condition, in all of whom it was apparently related to deficient social relationships. These children later showed
persistent relationship difficulties, says Levy, but he does not fully describe what he means by "relationship difficulties," nor does he establish any clearly effective experimental design in his study which unmistakably points up the causal relationship between lack of early maternal love and care and and subsequent relationship difficulties. Bakwin (1942) summarized the clinical picture of institutionalized infants: failure to gain weight, frequent stools, persistent respiratory infections. He noted that a return of the distressed infant to his home brings about prompt and striking gains within a few days, gains not explicable on the basis of nutrition and/or recovery from infection. However, he does not indicate clearly why the gains mentioned could not be partly explained by a change in diet and recovery from infection. In fact, he bases his conclusions principally on clinical insight rather than upon experimental control of the environment. He also leaves unexplained the case of the infants who did not manifest this "institutional distress."

Goldfarb (1943) showed that an extensive period of deprivation of infants in institutions was profoundly detrimental to their psychological growth. He compared the development of institution children with the development of children who had been placed in foster homes immediately after birth or in early infancy. Both groups were studied at a period when both were in foster homes, about three years after the placement of the last institution child studied. No child was more than six years old
at the time. He noted striking behavioral differences in the two groups. The institution children were overtly anxious, afraid of new situations, and showed social misconduct. Hyperactivity was conspicuous among them and they showed a marked demand for adult attention. Goldfarb found Levy's "affect hunger" appropriate for the institutionalized children, who also more frequently than others showed an absence of emotional responsiveness. This study, however, suffers from the fact that Goldfarb made no attempt to describe or evaluate the developmental process of either group in the intervening years. There are, therefore, intervening variables subject to no control whatsoever. Obviously such factors as the quality of care and attention given the children in the various foster homes would influence personality development to some degree. The study also uses certain categories difficult to evaluate--e.g., "demand for adult attention," "afraid of new situations," "an absence of emotional responsiveness," etc.--terms that would be much more understandable and meaningful if they were broken down into more specific (and thus perhaps more measurable) forms of behavior. A subsequent study by Goldfarb (1945a) of two groups of adolescents provided similar findings. He states that the institutionalized children suffered from a "language handicap" and that it seemed to be related to the passivity and apathy shown toward the environment. However, no pains were taken to analyze this "language difficulty," nor was there any attempt to indicate experimentally or otherwise the
dynamics underlying the alleged relationships between this difficulty and "passivity and apathy shown toward the environment."

Beres and Obers (1950) described thirty-eight cases of adolescents who had been separated from their mothers in infancy and placed in institutions for varying periods of time up to four years. Psychiatric diagnosis reinforced the impression that children who are deprived at a very early age of continuous and satisfactory contact with a person and so cannot identify satisfactorily suffer distortion in the psychic structure. They remain immature, socially deficient, with poor ability to tolerate frustration and to postpone gratifications, with character disorders, learning disturbances, disturbed personal relationships, and identification of a weak and superficial nature. Again this study suffers from a lack of objective methods of personality evaluation. It assumes the importance of "identification" (lack of it causes "distortion" to the psyche) without any explanation of the dynamics behind it. Clinical "impressions" often take the place of popular "impressions" without obvious justification. Also, in this study the longest period of institutionalization was four years. In that the subjects had been separated from their mothers in infancy and were now being observed in adolescence, it would seem that the authors leave a good deal of the lives of the subjects unaccounted for. We are not sure if the children returned to parents or were placed in foster homes, nor is there anything such as a case history to account in some way
for the intervening years. It is merely assumed that any psychic defects observable in adolescence had their origin in maternal deprivation.

Spitz's research has produced the most explicit hypotheses about the effects of institutionalization and deprivation during infancy. He compared the general developmental status (1945, 1946), the emotional behavior (with Wolf, 1946), the autoeroticism (1949), and the presence of pathology (1951) in 130 infants in two institutions. One was a nursery attached to a penal institution, where the interned mothers were serving time and could thus be considered socially maladjusted to some degree or other. The other institution was a foundling home with infants of an unselected urban population of poor but normal and socially competent mothers of good background. The infants in the foundling home suffered progressive developmental loss, and this was attributed to the relative absence of human and environmental stimulation, limited locomotion, and loneliness. The nursery infants, who received abundant stimulation, did not suffer this loss. It was in the nursery, however, that Spitz and Wolf (1946) observed the special condition which they called "anaclitic depression." Fischer (1952) found evidence in fifty-two institutionalized six-month-old infants of a definite hospitalism syndrome which either completely inhibited or reduced the infant's ability to cooperate in psychological examinations. One group manifested a general passivity; the other group manifested re-
duced social activity or hyperactivity. In both groups there was a lack of interest in the outer world. This syndrome disappeared and average behavior was elicited during testing if the infants were removed to normal homes. Though the work of Spitz and Fischer is in general more painstaking and careful than that of the other studies mentioned so far, it has not escaped criticism.

Pinneau (1955), in a critical analysis of the data presented by Spitz and by Fischer, was impressed by certain statistical discrepancies. These studies are also marred by the omission of genetic, organic, and inherent intellectual deficit factors from the investigations. A pluralistic evaluation of all these factors might help to assign to "hospitalism" its rightful place in the pathogenesis of personality formation. Kanner (1957) also suspects that Fischer and Spitz overemphasize the "hospitalism syndrome" in the development of pathological personality problems.

Lewis (1954), in a study of children placed in temporary shelter for deprived children, concedes the immense value to a child of enjoying his mother's love and care, but cautiously adds that her findings suggest that "the relationship of cause and effect is here intricate and not yet ready to be cast into a form which he who runs may read." Unfortunately, her cautious attitude is not shared by all investigators.

A comprehensive study of works dealing with the effects of early deprivation was published by Bowlby (1951) for the World Health Organization. He found only three studies that contradict
the mass of data attesting to the bad effects of maternal deprivation, and these three studies seemed to be without any real scientific merit. So it would seem beyond doubt that all these reports show convincingly that the deprivation of early psychologic stimulation is indeed a factor in personality formation. So the classic picture of the institutionalized infant is one of impoverishment, which in past times referred to physical needs and now refers more to the need of psychic stimulation.

Most of the studies mentioned so far have taken place in a psychiatric setting. They all, or at least most of them, suffer from certain common faults. The primary impediment, of course, to the type of investigations mentioned above is the impossibility of experimenting with infants and children when there exists the possibility of harm. No one may "deprive" an infant in a controlled manner in order to see what effect this might have on his development. Secondly, it is difficult to cull out difficulties in infants and even in children which are patently psychological in nature. What we must keep asking ourselves is: What is the cause or the causes of this apparently deviant mode of behavior? This is especially difficult to determine at early developmental stages. Thirdly, many of these studies suffer from poor design and inadequate controls. Too much is left to "impression" and clinical "intuition." The data kept in so-called "observational" studies is often too general or too loose to be ultimately valuable. Again, the problems involved in differential diag-
nosis and the special difficulties which arise in this regard with children are often overlooked. In general, then, there is a tendency toward too much intuition and not enough science in psychiatric reports.

**Dependent Children**

The literature dealing directly with the psychological effects of institutionalization on dependent children is scanty. Practically nothing appears in the psychological literature itself, and it is a tedious task to try to sift this information out of the social work literature. The task is complicated by the fact that the literature does not always make a distinction between the institution child and the dependent child.

Trotzkey (1930) defends the place of the institution in the life of the dependent child. His opponents, he says, present an unfair case against the institution. They say that in the group life of the institution the child is lost in the shuffle; the restrictive and repressive nature of mass dealing cannot but affect the child adversely, starve him emotionally, and dwarf the development of his personality, stamping upon him the impress of submissiveness, mediocrity, and inferiority. Trotzkey claims that the family is no longer the all-embracing factor it once was in the life of the child, that the institution has emerged from the days of excessive regimentation and has become enlightened as to the psychic needs of its charges, that institutions are prepared to make a more competent "study" of the needs of the individual
child (by staff psychologists, etc.) than the foster home, that the institution does not differ essentially from the boarding school, that identification with the institution can give a sense of security, and that the institution often provides a wider field for the development of individuality than does the foster home.

Trotzkey's study is worthwhile if for no other reason than that it makes one at least consider the question whether institutional placement is not in some cases better for the child. However, he presents an idealized picture of the institution and its facilities, especially with respect to the psychic needs of the institutionalized child. Obviously his considerations are the fruits of personal experience, but he makes no attempt to weigh the pro's and con's of institutionalization scientifically in the strict sense of the term. Many of his conclusions can be easily turned against him. For instance, he claims that identification with the institution can give the child a sense of security. One might reply that identification with the institution can foster an unhealthy attitude of dependence in the child. *A priori*, either statement might be generally true; the point is that both need validation.

Abbatiello (1952) compared frustration patterns in orphans and non-orphans, aged seven years and below. In his study he made no distinction between the institution child and the dependent child. This might have contributed to more definitive re-
sults. He tentatively concludes that no significant difference exists in the frustration pattern of the orphan and non-orphan, at least at the ages included in the study. One thing he did notice was that the orphan had a greater tendency to excuse others from blame. In this study the author used the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. He fails to point out some of the defects of the Study which might have influenced his results, e.g., the fact that in the standardization samples of children, the different age samples were not comparable in other respects, that the present norms are considered only tentative and approximate, that scoring is not entirely objective, and that appreciable differences have been found among scorers in the classification of individual response. Since the answers of younger children are given orally, he might also have mentioned the added dangers of examiner influence. Also it is not clear whether the responses represent what the subject would do in a similar situation as depicted in the test, what he thinks he ought to do, or what he feels like doing but would not actually do. It would seem that more normative data especially at earlier ages is needed so that the validity of the Study might be examined.

Keller (1958) compared the problems of the institutionalized seventh and eighth graders with those of their non-institutionalized counterparts. His results showed that the institutionalized children had a significantly greater number of problems, especially in the following areas: self-centered concerns, school, money-
work-future, relations to people in general, and health-physical development. The institutionalized children were more bashful, had difficulty in talking over their problems, did not get along with teachers, missed someone very much, wondered what to do after high school, and got tired easily. The additional problems of the institutionalized group were seen as a function of being separated from parents. The author of the present study routinely administered the Mooney Problem Check List to his sixteen-year-old dependent adolescent population. Contrary to Keller, he discovered that the dependent child had a deep desire to talk his problems over with someone and lamented the fact that those in authority were not more approachable. The difference between the two groups, however, may be a function of the difference in age. A number of the problems mentioned as being significantly more frequent among the dependent population could possibly be a function of a difference in intellectual ability—e.g., school, money—work—future, did not get along with teachers, wondered what to do after high school. The author does not provide any data as to the relative intellectual ability of the two groups. Keller does not seem to offer sufficient justification for the general conclusion that additional problems among the dependent group are a function of being separated from parents. His study seems to be more a normative one which does not warrant generalized conclusions of this order. One might, for instance, suggest that some of the problems mentioned above arise from the dependency
attitude created by institutionalization and not necessarily by separation from parents. Such conclusions need to be justified more rigorously.

Gardiner (1956) points out how difficult it is for a child from a broken home to develop a completely healthy personality in an institution. The companionship of affectionate parents is essential to his learning how to live in society. Gardiner notes that the concepts a child has of his parents will largely determine his notions of human beings in general. His self-concept depends on the tone of the emotional experiences he has with his parents. The child from a broken home is insecure, may become incapable of stable love relationships with others, and tends to set up defenses (e.g. acting out) because of his insecure position. In general, the child from the broken home feels that he is different from other children and is permeated by a spirit of rejection. While most of these conclusions may be true, most of them need more verification than Gardiner offers. They might be termed "common-sense" conclusions, but they need to be put on a more scientific ground. For instance, better methods are needed in order to determine both "the concepts a child has of his parents" and "his notions of human beings in general." TAT and Rorschach studies have showed that a person's verbalizations concerning people do not always square with his deeper feelings towards them. Gardiner's work is more a series of hypotheses that must be verified than a set of conclusions. But his work does
point up the difficulty of measuring certain variables, e.g. "in-capability of stable love relations with others."

Sister Elizabeth Marie (1960) reviews the principal problems confronting the institutionalized child: infantile behavior, especially in those who have experienced parental rejection from infancy; general destructive tendencies; inability to tolerate competition with peers; impulsivity; the need to gratify wishes immediately; regressive activity; loss of the ability to relate well with others; fearfulness; seductive behavior with adults; weak super-ego. She notes that some children placed in foster homes return to the institution because they cannot tolerate the warmth of the family setting. Such children require time to develop a positive personal experience with human beings before they can adjust to family living. This last insight is an interesting one, but this is the only place in the literature reviewed that it is mentioned. Her study does not pretend to be scientific; what she relates is obviously the fruit of personal experience. But such studies, if they may be called such, merely emphasize the need of research in this field.

Crow and Crow (1962) believe that the attitudes of the institutionalized child present evidence to show that the institution is second best to the family setting, even when the home itself lacks something of the ideal. The institutionalized child lacks the security that comes from the sense of belongingness experienced by the child in a home. Even in good institutions care
becomes routine and close contacts between attendants and children are minimal. Sometimes they are even discouraged. They believe that less harm seems to be done to the child if his earlier experiences are in a home situation. Institutionalization, they say, if at all necessary, should not take place until after the age of two years. They find evidence to show that children reared in institutions usually are more retarded in language development than are children of even poor and uncultured parents. Crow and Crow have obviously culled these conclusions from various authors but they give no indication of their sources. The conclusions are in harmony with the findings in other studies, but it is very difficult to discover just how these conclusions were reached.

Bodman (1950) found that subjects who had spent three years or more in an institution were less mature socially, had fewer community contacts and fewer friends, participated less in organized social activities, and showed less interest in members of the opposite sex than normally-reared subjects. However, he does not demonstrate the causal relationship between these factors and institutionalization. Naito (1959) studied happiness trends in institutionalized and non-institutionalized children. He found that the source of happiness for home children was parental love and that institutionalized subjects have a lower level of desire for happiness. However, in that his study was carried out with a group of Japanese children, care must be taken to study the mean-
ing of the home and of "happiness" in the Japanese culture before any cross-cultural conclusions may be drawn. Burmeister (1954) believes that the need to be alone and the need to be different must be satisfied even in the institutionalized child if he is to have full emotional development.

The studies have given some concrete idea of the poverty of the literature dealing directly with the dependent child. Some new insights are offered—e.g., the need of the institutionalized child for privacy, his negative reaction to the warmth of a home setting—but they are just that, insights and not verified scientific conclusions. Most of the studies lack proper design and control, there is too great a tendency to rely on common-sense inferences, and this leads to over-generalizations. Some of the authors give us the fruits of their personal experience in caring for institutionalized children, but ultimately, as valuable as these considerations might be, they cannot take the place of controlled studies.

**Rorschach Studies of Adolescents**

Hertz, in general, has done a good deal of work with respect to the Rorschach scoring system (1936-37, 1938a, 1938b, 1938c, 1942, 1951). Statistically determined normal detail, popular, and good-form responses of 300 junior high school students have been assembled in her **Frequency tables for scoring responses to the Rorschach inkblot test** (1951). The third edition lists all responses appearing in 1,350 records of children aged 11 to 16.
years. Much of the existing normative information on adolescent Rorschachs has likewise been contributed by Hertz (1935). Another set of papers written with Baker (1942, 1943a, 1943b, 1943c) compares in detail the movement and color responses of 76 of her subjects who took the test at both 12 and 15 years of age. This study indicates the rather striking change that occurs in the individual during this period. At this period there seems to be a decisive "introversive swing," a temporary contraction of the whole personality. The existence of this tendency seems to have been confirmed by the work of Ames et al. (1959). There is a definite lack of the type of work turned out by Hertz and her associates. Normative studies demand a good deal of work and do not have the satisfaction of reaching even moderately spectacular conclusions. In a number of the studies mentioned above the sampling is still inadequate both quantitatively and qualitatively, but it is a step in the right direction, a step too few research workers are willing to take. The need for normative studies is especially acute in the adolescent field where there exists a tendency to draw unwarranted conclusions from Rorschach protocols that have been interpreted in the same way as adult protocols.

In Hertz we begin to see that the Rorschach is an instrument sensitive to developmental changes, but wider and more thorough sampling must fill in the lacunae evident in adolescent Rorschach study.

A group of publications on adolescent Rorschach responses
has come from the Institute of Child Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley. The records for this research were collected as part of an 18-year longitudinal study. Subjects were tested in alternate years, with over 100 children tested at 11, 13, and 15, smaller numbers at 12, 14, and 16, and all subjects at 18 years. The first of the studies resulting from this project (McFate and Orr, 1949) is a statistical presentation of age norms, with means and standard deviations, medians, first and third quartiles, and percentage scores for many of the Rorschach scoring categories. For the variables considered, a fairly full picture is given of the score distribution for boys and girls at each age. Additional studies in the series analyze the Rorschach records in further detail. Ranzoni, Grant, and Ives (1950) examine the stimulus properties of the individual cards, comparing the location, determinant, and content scores most commonly elicited at ages 11, 13, 15, and 18. In another paper, Ives, Grant, and Ranzoni (1953) present the incidence of neurotic signs in the Rorschachs of this group at each age. Signs of adjustment are also presented. This longitudinal study brings up the question of the relationship between normative studies and longitudinal studies. It has not been sufficiently determined what kind of test sophistication repeated administrations of the Rorschach produce in the individual subject. Until this has been determined, it would seem best to keep longitudinal studies separate from strictly normative studies. These studies at the University
of California also highlight other problems in adolescent Rorschach studies. Small, widely spread normative studies tend to defeat their very purpose. Usually the sample is restricted to a certain part of the country and all too often to a particular socio-economic class. Studies are based on the availability of subjects and not on the intrinsic needs of good experimental design, including adequate sampling. These diverse studies often use different scoring systems, different administration techniques, different interpretative hypotheses. These factors make it difficult to compare one study with another and thus the value of each single study is severely limited. Too much effort is being expended without sufficient results. The studies at Berkeley are well done when considered in themselves. But the question remains as to whether the results obtained can be integrated into a more fulsome stream of Rorschach data concerning the adolescent. Again, it is difficult to understand the absolute value of studies which point out the incidence of neurotic signs in an adolescent population when others refer to adolescence as a period of transient neuroses. In such cases, one begins to wonder what absolute value language has.

Two articles by Beck and various of his associates, (Rabin and Beck, 1950; Thetford, Molish, and Beck, 1951) present data on a sample of children in two age groups: 10-13 and 14-17. Mean scores and some frequency distributions are given for the ordinary Rorschach categories. In addition, there are means for
Beck's $Z$ score, his lambda index, and $R$ for each blot. There is also normative information concerning sequence types and experience-balance types. Hertzman and Margulies (1943) compared the Rorschach responses of students at the college level and at the junior high school level. Mean scores are given for the usual Rorschach variables and for the $M: \text{Sum } C$ and $W:M$ ratios. Hershenson (1949) gives similar information for a group of 30 boys and girls averaging 16½ years of age. Paulsen (1943) also studied a group of 30 children at ages 6, 8, 10, and 12. He points out that personality development shows certain general trends, but that it does not proceed regularly or uniformly in the individual child. Development is rather characterized by "spurts, plateaus, and occasionally regressive movements." Suares (1938), following up on the work of Loosli-Usteri and Shapiro, made a longitudinal study of 21 girls and 21 boys. She, too, noticed the introversive tendency between the ages of 12 and 15 mentioned above. These studies show certain common faults. The principal difficulty again revolves around the limitations of the experimental samples. It seems that a fruitful topic of study would be the sampling in these widely divergent studies. One would have to study the sampling methods in each case with a view ultimately to collating the data derived from the different sources. Another difficulty with the studies just mentioned is that there is a lack of background material for both experimental and control groups. The Rorschach is sensitive to certain background factors
especially intellectual ability, and there is little attempt in these studies to spell out these factors.

Margulies (1942) studied successful and unsuccessful students, mean age 13, equated in I.Q. and social status. The unsuccessful children tended to show more signs of color and shading shock, while the successful children showed more Fc, FC, and m, lower A%, and, in general, more signs of adjustment. This is one of the very few studies in which intellectual and social background were controlled. The study would be even more meaningful against the background of solid normative data. Unfortunately such data was lacking at the time, and to a considerable extent is still lacking today. In a study of 25 high school failures compared with 25 honor students, Beckham (1950) found the unsuccessful students refused more cards, had fewer responses, poorer F%, and fewer M. In that he did not control the factor of intellectual ability, it is not certain whether the differences noted are due primarily to personality maladjustment or to differences in intellectual ability. The latter, it seems, could account for most of the differences noted.

There have also been a number of studies dealing with adolescent delinquents. Gorlow, Zimet, and Fine (1952) contrast the Rorschach of 13 delinquents (mean age 12.3 years) with 13 non-delinquent children of the same age. Significant differences appear between the groups, with delinquents obtaining higher scores for both anxiety and hostility (judged by indexes based on
an analysis of content). There is no indication in this study that the groups were properly matched. Also, up to the time that this study was made, very little had been written concerning the exact meaning of the content categories of the Rorschach. It is true that the two groups differ on the variables scored, but no real research up to that time had showed the validity of the indexes used. This study seems to belong to that group which has "inspectional validity," unverified by any real experimental work.

The best Rorschach study of delinquents seems to be that of Schachtel (1951). The subjects were 500 delinquents and 500 matched controls, mean age 14½. Schachtel was not informed as to which boys were delinquent and which were not until completing his evaluation of the records. In his discussion comparing the two groups, he is wary of statistical variables, but he does present mean scores for a number of variables. He finds that non-delinquents give higher $R$ and higher $D_1%$. Fewer delinquents had $S$ responses, and non-delinquents give higher mean $M$ and total movement scores. It should be pointed out that the fact that non-delinquents tend to give more $S$ responses seems, at least at first glance, to go against what the normal antecedent supposition might have been. If $S$ really does indicate "an oppositional tendency in the intellectual sphere" (Klopfer, Ainsworth, Klopfer, and Holt, 1954, p. 309), it might be supposed that the delinquent might produce a larger number of such responses. However,
it may be that the delinquent's revolt is primarily an emotional rather than an intellectual one, in which case his non-delinquent counterpart would excel in specifically intellectual oppositional tendencies. More delinquents had formless color scores (CF plus C) exceeding form-determined color scores (FC). And more delinquents had introversive or ambiequal M: Sum C ratios, while more non-delinquents had constricted or extratensive ratios. More important to Schachtel than mean scores, however, was his use of a checklist of 54 psychological traits (e.g., self-assertiveness, hostility, etc.) to be rated plus, minus, or ? on the basis of total Rorschach impression. Of the 991 blind judgments made, 67 per cent were correct and only 7 per cent incorrect, while in 26 per cent of the cases, the Rorschach failed to provide adequate material for judgment. The study has the merit of emphasizing the fact that personality judgments concerning individuals must ultimately be made from the total configuration of the Rorschach protocol, with the findings in one area of personality serving as a check for findings in another area. We are left in the dark as to how the author determined the scoring in each of the 54 categories he established. Clinical impressions ultimately rest upon theoretical formulations concerning the various Rorschach variables and their interrelationships. The bases for clinical impressions should be spelled out as clearly as possible so that they might be subjected to experimental verification. Otherwise, the Rorschach may tend to become, in the hands of some, a
kind of gnostic instrument, and studies take on the aspect of puzzles, the solutions of which are to be successfully predicted. Again, it is one thing to know that the Rorschach is being used to differentiate between two specific nosological groups, while it is another to use the Rorschach to reach a valid diagnosis in an individual case.

Cox (1951) contrasts the Rorschach scores of 60 boys attending a child guidance clinic with 60 boys from public schools in an effort to define neuroticism on the Rorschach. Subjects range in age from 8 to 12 years and the two groups are close in mean I.Q. scores. Of the clinic group, about half seem to be characterized by the descriptions "aggressive," "destructive," "temper tantrums," while half are "withdrawn," "submissive," etc. Statistical tests show the clinic group to have fewer D, F, F-plus, and F responses, as well as more C responses and more refusals. In this study the subjects were known to be disturbed and some effort was made to see precisely how this disturbance would show up on the Rorschach. The study is somewhat marred by the fact that all nosological categories in the case of the clinical subjects were grouped together. The general design of the study is good and the results point out certain signs of poor adjustment.

Adolescent Rorschach responses: Developmental trends from ten to sixteen years

This study by Ames, Metraux, and Walker (1959) is the third
volume on Rorschach responses compiled by these research psychologists from the Gesell Institute of Child Development. It is a report of a study designed to determine developmental trends that are associated with age and sex differences, and to provide normative data on children's Rorschach responses for this 7-year period. The first part of the book describes the subjects, method, and statistical analysis used in the study, and also presents the results in regard to such variables as location, determinants, and content. Part II contains seven chapters devoted to each age group individually. A statistically "average or typical" Rorschach summary is presented for each age, and these data are compared with those of other age groups and are principally discussed in terms of developmental trends. Here we find discussed such findings as the trend toward a slow increase in the number of responses with age, a decrease in $W\%$, an increase in $D\%$, no change in $R\%$, a slight decrease in $F\%$, with essentially no change in $F-plus\%$, a slight upward trend for $M$, and an increase in the use of controlled color responses as manifested in the increase of $FC$. Knopf (1960) points out some of the limitations of this study. The work is based on 700 Rorschach records, those of 50 girls and 50 boys at each successive age. Many children, however, contributed records at more than one age, and only 271 children contributed single records. This distribution, in effect, resulted in 33 to 50 per cent overlap of subjects between adjacent ages, and, consequently, confounded cross-sectional and longitu-
dinal data in the statistical analysis of the results. No at-
tempt was made to discover to what degree test sophistication in-
fluenced the results of successive administrations of the test. The principal fault of this study was that the sample was not re-
presentative. The subjects were of predominantly above-average intelligence (as far as this was determined), and most of the subjects (over 75 per cent) were from upper middle-class socio-
economic backgrounds. The authors also failed to discuss their results in the light of current Rorschach literature. They also seemed to assume a more or less univocal meaning for each Ror-
schach category, a meaning which they apparently believed would be accepted by all. The least they could have done was to indi-
cate more clearly the breadth of meaning possible in each Ror-
schach scoring category. Their findings would have to have been stated in a more hypothetical way, but it seems that they would have been more accurate. No attempt was made on their part to integrate their normative findings with the normative findings of others.

**Goldfarb's Study: Effects of early institutionalization on adolescent personality**

This study (1944) comes closest to the kind of study carried on in this present thesis. There is, however, an essential dif-
ference. His experimental group consisted of eight boys and sev-
en girls ranging in age from 10 to 14 (mean age 12.2 years). The subjects had entered the institution at a mean age of 4.5 months.
and remained there for an average of 3.25 years. At about 3 years 7 months, they were transferred to foster homes, where they were reared up to the time of the study. As will be seen below, a quite different population is the subject of the present study. Goldfarb's study deals with the institution child, while the present study deals with the dependent child. In this sense the history of the two groups is almost opposite, Goldfarb's population spending infancy and early childhood in an institution, and the population of this study spending infancy and sometimes early childhood in a home situation. In his population Goldfarb found no difference in $R$ and in location scores. His institution group, however, was far inferior to his control group in $F$-plus%. He considered this tendency to "loose perceptions" to be most distinctive of the institution group. He considered the institution child to be less controlled and less capable of developing logical constructs (higher $OF$ and $O$ together with lowered $F$-plus%). He considered the institution child, in problem solving, as less likely to be guided by an attitude of self-correction, critical reflection, or an awareness of reality factors. Goldfarb anticipates that the behavior of such a child would be thoughtless and not goal-directed. He sees in the institution child's tendency to give low quality $W$ responses an inadequate attempt to solve problems and gain recognition. The institution child meets reality very inadequately and is deficient in his ability to form abstractions and meet experience along reflective conceptual
Almost all the original responses in the institution group are inaccurately perceived (0-). Goldfarb sees this as an indication of deviation from the normal in behavior and general adjustment and also as an indication of a lessened drive toward social conformity. The institution children tended to give more Q responses, indicating a relative lack of rational control and greater emotional immaturity. He also notes that the intellectual level of the institution child tends to be lower. In fact, the particular intellectual and emotional trends of the institution children are inseparable. They appear to reflect a basic syndrome of traits that permeates the total personality. In contrast to foster home children, the institution children tend to be: (1) less mature, less controlled, less differentiated, more impoverished; (2) more passive and apathetic, less ambitious, and less capable of adjustment related to conscious intention or goal. Goldfarb considers these traits to bear a dynamic relationship to the depriving influences of the early institutionalization experience and specifically to the absence of a warm, consistent, continuous, day-to-day contact with an adult in the role of a parent person, and a life-routine determined solely by group routine. The absence of a parent-child relationship in infancy makes it difficult, in some cases perhaps even impossible, for a child to enter into normal, warm relationships later. This conclusion we have seen before (Sister Elizabeth Marie, 1960).

Certain defects in Goldfarb's study lessen the force of the
conclusions he draws. His sample is rather small to begin with. Then it is difficult to see why he chooses a group of foster-home children as a control group. His study might tell us more about the relationship that exists between the institution child and the foster-home child than it does about the absolute relationship between the institution child and the normally reared child. And yet, in his conclusions, he talks as if the study had been one which compared the institution child with the normally reared child. He does not discuss the possible variables that might occur in the foster home that would influence the development of these children. To leave these variables unaccounted for in the case of both institution and foster-home child is to rob his conclusions of some of the force they might otherwise have. In drawing his conclusions, he manifests too great a tendency to assume a one to one correlation between Rorschach variables and behavioral manifestations. It seems that he should have at least couched his conclusions in a more hypothetical language in order to indicate in some way the fact that there is a good deal of dispute regarding such one to one correlation. The study is also marred by lack of background data for both groups. He presents no clearcut indications of the intellectual level of each group. Thus, his conclusions tend to be overly generalized. He also generalizes on developmental factors which were not a subject of his study. That is, he begins, in a rather apodictic fashion, to assign causes to the personality traits discovered.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE EXPERIMENT

Collecting the Data

Rorschach tests were administered individually to 50 sixteen-year-old adolescents, 25 girls and 25 boys, from two different homes for dependent children run by the Catholic Charities Bureau of the Archdiocese of Chicago. These tests were scored for the following categories:

1. Number of card refusals
2. Number of responses
3. Percentage of W responses
4. Percentage of D responses (d was also included in this category)
5. Percentage of DA responses
6. Number of M responses
7. Number of FM responses
8. Number of M responses
9. Percentage of F responses
10. Percentage of F-plus responses
11. Number of shading responses (all shading being grouped under symbol F(C))
12. Number of C' responses
13. Sum-C index
14. Number of FC responses
15. Number of CF responses
16. Number of C responses
17. Percentage of responses found on cards VIII-IX-X
18. Percentage of animal responses
19. Percentage of human-content responses
20. Number of anatomy responses
21. Number of object responses
22. Number of plant responses

The author visited Dr. Louise Ames at the Gesell Institute
of Child Development in New Haven and obtained similar data on 100 sixteen-year-olds, 50 boys and 50 girls. This is part of the population used by Ames et al. in Adolescent Rorschach responses. Her sixteen-year-old population serves as the control group for the present experiment. This group will be described below.

The Experimental Group

The mean age of the experimental group of 50 dependent adolescents was 16 years and 6 months, with a standard deviation of 3.81 months. The range of the number of years of institutionalization was 2 to 14 years, with a mean of 9 years and two months, and a standard deviation of 3.58 years. All these subjects were the products of broken homes of various types. Some of the subjects had one parent living, some had two living, and some had no parent living. The subjects had various degrees of contact with living parents or relatives, but this was limited, in almost every case, to a two week period in the summer plus an occasional week-end at home during the school year. Some of the subjects had no such contact throughout the year. One of the defects of the design of the present experiment lies in the fact that no I.Q. data were available for these subjects. The assumption will have to be that the experimental group differs significantly from the control group in intellectual ability. The reason for this assumption lies in the fact that intelligence is a function of the total developmental process. Emotional deprivation and the confined atmosphere of the institution result in lowered intel-
lectual functioning (Kanner, 1957; Lewis, 1954).

The Control Group

The mean age of Ames' population was 16 years 4 months, with a standard deviation of 2.94 months. I.Q. data were available for 55 of the sixteen-year-old subjects, though there was no uniformity as to the type of intelligence test used. Some of the I.Q.'s were the results of school tests administered from one to six years previous to the administration of the Rorschach. For what it is worth, the mean I.Q. of these 55 subjects was 115.5, with a standard deviation of 13.1. If we may assume that this is the tendency of the remaining 45 subjects, this would mean that the group as a whole was above average in intellectual ability. If this is true and if it is also true that the experimental was no more than average in intellectual ability (and perhaps even below), great care must be taken in drawing conclusions from the Rorschach concerning these two groups, for the Rorschach is certainly sensitive to discrepancies in intellectual ability and level of intellectual functioning.

The subjects tested by Ames et al. were also not representative in the area of socio-economic status. Over half the records were contributed by subjects whose fathers were professional workers, over three-fourths by subjects whose fathers had professional, semi-professional, or managerial occupations. Only 9 percent had semi-skilled, minor clerical, minor business, or slightly skilled occupations. This factor, too, might influence Ror-
schach performance and is another reason why extreme caution will have to be used in drawing conclusions from the Rorschach data concerning differences between the two groups.

As poor as this population is as a control group, it was the only one available to the author at the time of the study. Given the divergence in background between the two groups, differences in Rorschach performance should be more striking than they would be if the two groups were better matched in intellectual ability and if the socio-economic status of the control group were normal rather than above normal.

It should be remembered that the author noted various other deficiencies in the study by Ames et al. These other deficiencies have no bearing on the present study. Since nothing else from the study was used besides the population, only the sampling deficiencies are not of major importance. They are, and the author will take efforts to remind the reader of these deficiencies before he discusses the results of the test and draws his conclusions.

The Hypotheses

There is an hypothesis for each of the scoring categories listed above. First, for each category some attempt is made to examine the literature and give an indication of the breadth of meaning generally assigned to the scoring variable. Then, the hypothesis itself is presented, that is, given the behavioral meaning of the particular scoring category, it is hypothesized
that the two groups will or will not differ significantly in that category. Also, some attempt is made to explain, usually in developmental terms, why the dependent group should or should not differ from the control group in the particular category. Since the main purpose of this study is to try to form an adequate picture of the personality structure of the sixteen-year-old dependent adolescent, developmental considerations are of secondary importance and are given only to round out the picture of the personality structure.

The hypotheses below are based on the following factors: (1) the literature dealing with the institution environment and its effects on the child, (2) clinical judgment formed by the author in his contacts with the institutionalized subjects, and (3) discussion with Catholic Charities psychologists who have worked with dependent children.

Card Refusal

Phillips and Smith (1953) see card refusal as expressing some kind of detachment from the Rorschach test, based on reluctance to become involved with others. Card rejectors are often unaware of or insensitive to the feelings of others and also afraid to explore their own reactions; they may be stubborn, perplexed, and unwilling to reveal themselves; they may be conveying a sense of inadequacy, or it may be a question of lack of understanding of what is going on. Beck (1952) sees in card refusal over-cautiousness and a need for certainty, a "nothing ventured,
nothing lost" attitude. It might also be that the subject is trying to keep a distance between himself and the painful feelings which are threatening him. Card rejection for Beck may also be a sign of free anxiety. Ames et al. (1959) view card refusals as indicating lack of sureness of self or a tendency not to be straightforward.

All authors would agree that card rejections might also be a function of some type of shock, but Klopfer et al. (1954) warn against immediately interpreting card rejection as shock. Other shock indicators (e.g., objective and subjective color disturbance) must be evaluated before including card refusal among shock indicators.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will refuse a significantly greater number of cards. It is a question of the dependent adolescent's relative unwillingness to involve himself with others, his relative lack of self-confidence, and especially his relative unwillingness to reveal himself. The dependent adolescent is a very cautious adolescent. It is not assumed that he is significantly more perplexed, insensitive, or anxious. As a part of his defense of self in the institution, the dependent child develops a "the-less-they-know-about-me-the-better" attitude. He fears authority. It is true that he would like to be understood, but generally speaking, he does not look upon the authorities of the institution as functioning in the role of understanding helpers. They are simply authorities or guardians with all the psy-
hological implications of these terms. This attitude becomes a
generalized mode of reacting towards adults.

Klopfer et al. (1954) indicate that, for the adult, a moder-
ately large number of responses is probably optimum. If responses
are given easily and, to a degree, enthusiastically, they indicate
a person perceptually responsive and receptive to the world about
him. Although Klopfer sees a very large number of responses as
possibly indicating compulsivity, both Ames et al. (1959) and
Klopfer et al. (1954) see a relatively large number of responses
as indicative of a person who is expansive and outgoing. Piotrow-
ski (1957) talks about R's being facilitated by a certain degree
of detachment which permits the subject to get absorbed in his
own imagination or conscious application of creative powers to the
solution of potential problems. He also sees low R as a function
of (1) inadequate cooperation, (2) inhibition over which the indi-
vidual has no control, and (3) irreversible intellectual diffi-
culties. Phillips and Smith (1953) see several possibilities in
restricted R: (1) a high level of anxiety, (2) generalized re-
striction of self-expression, (3) an indication of a guarded record.

The hypothesis: The experimental and the control group will
not differ significantly in the production of R. Though sixteen
is a year of expansion, the Rorschach output at this age is still
rather restricted when compared to the output of the average a-
dult. In view of the relatively small number of R which we
might expect the sixteen-year-old to produce, it would be difficult to expect a significant difference between the two groups. It might be hypothesized that some of the factors listed above as contributing to a restriction of R might well be operative in the case of the dependent adolescent, but these influences are not deemed relatively strong enough to make a significant difference in the number of responses produced. A significant reduction in R at this age could almost be considered a regressive or a pathological indicator. But, as indicated above in the general hypothesis, the experimental group is not to be considered pathological.

**Location Scores in General**

The areas that an individual chooses for interpretation provide some measure for evaluating his perceptive processes. The relative emphasis of areas chosen for response may tell us whether his emotional and intellectual tone is expansive or restricted, painstaking or sloppy. We derive some idea of whether his thinking tends to be generalized, abstract, critical, and realistic (Ames et al., 1959).

A W may be achieved in two principal ways. The whole may be achieved by integrating parts that have been differentiated out of the blot, that is, the parts are seen as separate but related. On the other hand, the whole may be seen as global and relatively undifferentiated (Klopfer et al., 1954). If these two approa-
ches are examined, it becomes evident that the former is obviously the more mature approach. Klopfer uses form level rating to distinguish between these two types of W.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly higher percentage of W responses, and these W's will be of the global and relatively undifferentiated type. The overall validity of this hypothesis depends on two considerations. First of all, it is assumed that there will be no significant difference between the two groups in total number of responses. If the total number of responses were significantly different, this could well mean that the group having the larger number of responses would be expected to have a smaller percentage of W's, for the more responses given, the more D's expected. Secondly, since form level rating was not used in Ames' study, it is necessary to devise some way to determine whether the dependent group exceeds the other not only in percentage of W responses, but in percentage of global W responses. It seems that the latter will be the case if two conditions are fulfilled: (1) if there is a significant difference between the two groups in $F$-$\text{plus}$% (the dependent group scoring significantly lower), for the $F$-$\text{plus}$% scoring category—especially as it appears in this study—has the general characteristics of a form level rating, and (2) if the form level rating for the W responses of the dependent group is generally mediocre. If these two conditions are fulfilled, and given no significant difference in the total number of responses given by
each group, then, if the dependent group exceeds in percentage of W's, they will ipso facto exceed in percentage of global W's.

It remains to indicate the rationale behind this hypothesis. Why should the dependent group have a higher percentage of global W's? There are several reasons: (1) general developmental lag—as the adolescent approaches adulthood, the percentage of W responses given should decrease (Ames et al., 1959); (2) greater apathy and more of a tendency to withdraw than the normally reared child; (3) a significant lack of interest in the ordinary details of experience as a function of the general curtailment of experience necessitated by institutionalization; (4) a certain willingness not to go out to the world; (5) interference with the constructive use of intellectual capacities.

In the D response it is as though the subject were aware of the tendency of the blot to subdivide itself and did not resist it by an attempt to pull the parts together. When there is stress on the production of D's of good form level, there is interest and ability to differentiate perceptually. This is interpreted as a practical, everyday, common-sense application of intelligence, an interest in the presented, obvious facts of experience (Klopfer, Ainsworth, Klopfer, and Holt, 1954). If the subject can quite readily accept details when the limits are tested, the neglect of the practical, everyday, common-sense view of things does not seem deep or serious.
Since the previous hypothesis indicated a significant increase in \( W \% \) for the dependent group, it follows that there will be some effect on the categories \( D \) and \( Dd \) (in this study \( d \) responses were included with \( D \) responses). It is hypothesized that the difference between the two groups will at least approach significance, not only because of the hypothesis concerning \( W \), but also because of the hypothesis concerning \( Dd \) delineated below. There is no particular reason to suppose that the lessening of \( Dd \) is due to any lack of practical, everyday, common-sense application of intelligence in the dependent adolescent. That is, it seems that the Rorschach hypotheses relating to global \( W \) and to \( Dd \) (especially \( Dr \)) are more applicable to the dependent adolescent than are the hypotheses relating to lack of \( D \).

\[ Dd \]

The \( Dd \) response in a well-balanced record may indicate that the subject is capable of a highly differentiated responsiveness in a perceptual sense; such an individual would be gifted with a quick and flexible perceptual approach. But the \( Dr \) response can also indicate that the ability for differentiation is employed to give a certain arbitrary flavor to perception (seeing things in an unusual or "different" way) which is not conducive to easy communication with others (Klopfer et al., 1954).

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly greater percentage of \( Dd \) responses. It is assumed that one of the factors necessary for the development of a completely
normal range of perception is close communication in early years with members of a family. The child that develops more or less "on his own" will tend to see his world differently. This does not mean that there is necessarily any loosening of ties with reality. When it is said that the dependent child develops "differently," this does not mean pathologically. A different perceptual orientation need not be abnormal in the sense of pathological.

Movement in General

A person who uses movement is less stimulus bound and less closely dependent on the objectively given than in the case of the form response. In contrast to the latter, when bringing about the relatively complex movement response, the testee puts more of himself into the task, drawing on the broader and deeper personal resources (Rickers-Ovsiankina, 1960). Rorschach (1942) contended that the ability to employ the movement factor in interpreting the blots implied mental productivity, a creative potential, and, in a more extended sense, a tendency toward inner living.

The M response contains three main features: (1) a kinesthetic projection—an enlivening of the blot material; (2) a human concept or at least one involving human attributes; and (3) perception at a comparatively highly differentiated and usually well-integrated level. There has been a great deal of speculation on and investigation into the meaning of the M response. At least some attempt is made here to indicate the major conclusions of
this investigation. Klopfer et al. (1954) see the M response as indicating a certain richness of imaginal processes and the ability to use these processes to enrich one's perception of the world; an ability to see one's world as peopled and consequently to feel empathy with others; a relatively high level of ego functioning; an ability to bridge the gap between inner resources of drive and fantasy and the outward orientation of reality testing and object relations; good intellectual capacity; an ability to integrate impulse life with a conscious value system through which a person tends to control his behavior, guide his satisfactions, and postpone his gratifications; the presence of inner resources upon which a person can fall back in periods of stress, making possible a retreat within himself; and clues to the self-concept and to the degree of self-acceptance. Ames et al. (1959) see M as indicating richness of inner life and of inner creativ- ity and as providing clues to the degree of self-assertiveness of the individual. Beck (1949) adds that M indicates mental activities in which we would like to engage in the outer world but cannot, or dare not; they are our wishfulfilling activities. Thus M gives some insight into a person's fantasy life, which means that the associations encased in such responses actually project the subject's intimately personal living. Piotrowski and Dudek (1956) see M as indicating interest in interhuman relations. Persons with many M responses are inclined to develop a definite style of life. They cultivate self-respect, they have a tendency to think
first and act later in the face of trouble; they tend to be secretive regarding their motives; they prefer to rely on themselves rather than on others in difficult situations; and they like to base their security on the development and growth of their personal assets: knowledge, professional skills, intelligence, self-control, and the like. Piotrowski (1960) suggests that M responses indicate liveliness of intellect and a greater diversity of active interests. Rickers-Ovsiankina (1960) stresses the ego-involving character of the subject-environment relation which prevails in the "creation" of the M response.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce significantly fewer M responses. This should be one of the most sensitive categories for detecting differences between the dependent adolescent and his normally reared counterpart. Studies in the development of personality have shown that self-acceptance in the broadest sense is essential to general personality development and particularly to effective involvement with others, and that acceptance by another is basic to self-acceptance (Curran, 1952; Rogers and Dymond, 1954; Rogers, 1961; Sullivan, 1953). This intimate, continual acceptance throughout the developmental years is lacking in the life of the dependent child. He is accepted by the institution, and he does not necessarily fall prey to the personality disorders which arise from actual rejection or perverted and improper acceptance. But acceptance by an institution simply cannot take the place of acceptance by parents. Although it does
not produce the same results as rejection, institutionalization does have an adverse effect. In to a certain extent, then, is a gauge as to how effectively one is becoming a person. The dependent adolescent does not lack the qualities indicated by M, but he does not possess them as fully as the normally reared child nor does he possess them in the same rich way. It has been shown that even full intellectual development is dependent on adequate emotional development. This is normally lacking outside the family constellation. Much of the "brilliance" of intelligence in its widest sense seems to be a function of emotional development, which development is inadequate in the institution.

FM

Piotrowski (1937, 1957, 1960) sees FM responses as indicating (1) the subject's prototypal role in life which, however, influences overt behavior only in states of lowered integration and in states of diminished consciousness and defective self-control; (2) the prototypal roles in life which were more prominent in the subject's past, probably before the sixth year of life; and (3) the approximate degree of physical buoyancy. He indicates that these prototypal roles are not now the dominant ones. Ames et al. (1959) see animal movement responses as representing natural, un-acculturated drives. Klopfer et al. (1954) see FM responses as representing awareness of impulses to immediate gratification, which, in contrast with the conscious goals represented by M responses, tend to be impulses regarding which the person often lacks
insight, understanding, and acceptance.

The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in the number of FM responses. The dependent child gives no direct evidence of either an excess or a deficiency of prototypal drives, of awareness of such drives, or of physical vigor. The sixteen-year-old is seeking to establish controls and at this age they are somewhat tenuous. The dependent adolescent perhaps is having a more difficult time trying to control prototypal impulses, but developmental considerations would not lead us to believe that the strength of these impulses is greater in his case.

Ames et al. (1959) sees m as a sign of aggressivity, repressed or overt, an indication that the subject feels his inner promptings to be hostile. Klopfer et al. (1954) suggest that m indicates tension and conflict—conflict between the impulse life and long-range goals of the individual, and tension due to the effort to inhibit impulse. Piotrowski (1957) indicates that m might represent wished-for life roles which the individual feels to be beyond his ability to assume; such convictions about the unattainability of these roles implies being conscious of limitations and thus points to a feeling of bitterness and depression. In a word, Piotrowski would see in m an indicator of feelings of frustration. All, therefore, would agree that m represents consciousness of conflict and tension even though they differ somewhat in delineating the source.
The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in the number of $m$ produced. It would seem that institutionalization should produce greater conflict and frustration, but this is not the point. The point is whether the dependent child is less capable of adapting himself to frustrating conditions. If he is incapable of adjusting to situations which are de facto frustrating, then his awareness of tension and conflict should be greater. But incapability of adaptation in this sense does not characterize the dependent adolescent any more than it characterizes the family-reared adolescent. Nor are there any significant developmental differences which would justify hypothesizing such a difference. The inner controls implied in $M$ are not operative in the case of the dependent adolescent, but there are external controls which help him adjust to his impulse life. The resulting tension does not appear to be any greater in his case than it is in the case of his normally-reared counterpart.

Klopfer et al. (1954) see an adequate number of $F$ responses (20-50 per cent in the adult) as indicating the ability of the individual to view his world in an impersonal, matter-of-fact way. This serves as an aid to controlled adjustment. However, $F\%$ may increase to such a level that it may indicate "neurotic construction," a state in which a person, although intellectually capable of a more richly differentiated response to his world, is inhibited in such response in that he has repressed his tendencies to
acknowledge his own inner needs and to act according to his own emotional reactions. If F is almost the sole type of response (80% or over), the individual might be so insufficiently differentiated in his intellectual function or so poorly integrated in personality organization that he is unable to respond to anything but the bare outline of reality structure. He does not even begin to recognize his own inner needs, nor is he able to perceive the nuances of his emotional surroundings. Ames et al. (1959) note a drop in F% at the age of sixteen and attribute it to the expansive and outgoing nature of his emotional surroundings. Actually little is said in the general literature about F% as such. Most authors tend to refer only to F-plus%.

The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in percentage of F responses. There is certainly no reason to consider the dependent adolescent as constricted in any pathological sense, nor does he give the impression of being significantly more constricted than his counterpart in a normal home environment. He might well tend to show more of the characteristics of the fifteen-year-old because of an assumed general developmental lag, and fifteen is an age of at least comparative restriction and withdrawal. The dependent sixteen-year-old might sometimes give the impression of being comparatively more restricted, but the author believes that he gives this impression because he is more guarded in his general response than his home-reared counterpart.
F-plus%

It has generally been found that F-plus% rises from early childhood (Klopfer and Davidson, 1944; Rabin and Beck, 1950; Thetford, Molish, and Beck, 1951; Vorhaus and Kay, 1943), though a lowering is found in the adolescent years which may well reflect the temporary ego weakening of this emotionally stressful period (Beck, 1954; Thetford et al., 1951). Rorschach (1942) considered F-plus% as indicating the ability to concentrate, a control of the perceptual and associational processes, and a facility for critical interpretation. Rickers-Ovsiankina (1960) sees it as a measure of intellectual ability, accurate perception, and the ability to apply oneself consistently in a critical and objective manner. For her it is an indication of ego-strength. Hertz (1960) views F-plus% as a function of intellectual effort, initiative, and energy together with realistic, logical, and constructive thinking. Lowered F-plus% indicates inadequate reality testing and perhaps confusion. Rapaport (1946) has emphasized that the achievement of adequate form perception results from the individual's capacity to delay the discharge of impulse, thus allowing for a certain critical formation of the reality-appropriate response. Beck (1948) states that F-plus% is the critical work of the intellect; it depends on the effective functioning of the highest levels of cortical control. Korchin (1960) finds that F-plus% reveals ego-strength, the degree of denial of threatening fantasy, the degree of lack of associational material out of
which to construct responses (this might be due to some kind of cultural isolation), the motivation of the subject, the degree of awareness of and respect for the social values which define the rules of organized social life.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will score significantly lower in F-plus%. This is seen as a function of the dependent child's general developmental lag, his relative lack of motivation and interest in the task at hand, a "different" perceptual approach, lowered intellectual ability, and a lessened awareness of social values. This would also be a function of a relative lack of the ability to concentrate effectively on a task over a period of time. Developmentally, lessened intellectual effectiveness might be seen as a result of restriction of opportunities for adequate emotional development. Furthermore, institution confinement and routine tend to lower general aspirational level and the general impact of motivational forces. The dependent adolescent, too, has not had the opportunities of his home-reared counterpart for reality testing. This, too, might account for a relative lack of associational material out of which to construct completely adequate responses. And it is also assumed that social values are more effectively learned and assimilated in a home rather than in an institution environment.

Shading (F(C))

Ames et al. (1960) grouped all shading responses together under the symbol F(C). They see shading responses as indicating
the subject's emotional and intellectual sensitivity, his ability for empathy, and the degree of his concern with adapting to others and to the environment. \( F(C) \) responses give some insight into the anxieties of the individual, and in some instances indications of what may provoke these anxieties. Klopfer et al. (1954) also see some shading responses as anxiety indicators. They see shading responses in general as pointing to the way in which the subject handles his primary security needs and his derived needs for affection and belongingness. The interpretation of shading responses, especially texture responses, relates to the handling of affectional need and to the basic expectation of affection to be received from the outside world. Phillips and Smith (1953) see shading as suggesting an inhibition of motility and therefore a contraindication to acting out. That is, shading is ultimately a control indicator. More specifically, shading may indicate sensitivity to social contacts.

It is somewhat difficult to formulate an hypothesis with references to this category in view of the diversity of opinion (or lack of opinion) of Rorschach authorities. The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in the production of shading responses. The dependent adolescent does not appear to be any more or any less anxious than the family-reared adolescent. It may be argued that he should be much more aware of his affectional needs than his normally-reared counterpart, because he has been deprived of normal parental affection. However, there are
two principal ways of reacting to deprivation of affection. On the one hand, he might become overly aware of his affectional needs, but, on the other, he might tend to the opposite extreme and deny these needs. If this were to happen on a chance basis in the dependent group, there would be a tendency for the extremes to cancel each other out. In such a case, even given a disturbance in awareness of affectional needs, still no significant difference would appear between the two groups. Developmentally speaking, we might expect some disturbance as to affectional need, but this Rorschach category does not seem adequate, at least on a group basis, to explore this area of personality.

Ames et al. (1959) find black a very rare response in the protocols of adolescents. According to their study, at no age does the mean score reach .2. They therefore consider such responses as rare and worthy of refined and critical evaluation in an individual protocol. Klopf er et al. (1954) consider black as a toned-down response to color, indicating a responsiveness to stimuli from the outer world which can only be expressed in a toned-down hesitant way. Bohm (1960), following Mohr, sees both positive and negative significance in black: the positive meanings are the stable, the unalterable, the solemn, the symbol of authority, the majesty of death, the divine. The negative meanings are guilt, rebellion, anxiety, and judgment. Phillips and Smith (1953) find one implication of $C'$ applicable in all cases:
it is related to an inhibition of motility and its presence may be interpreted as a contraindication to impulsive acting out. It signifies a tendency toward ideation rather than activity.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly greater number of C' responses. This tendency should reflect the general hesitancy of the dependent adolescent to involve himself emotionally. He is not as sure of himself as his family-reared counterpart. He is more sensitive to "the stable" and to symbols of authority in general. He is aware of a spirit of rebellion within himself, but generally inhibits its outward expression.

**Color in General**

Rickers-Ovsiankina (1960) notes that color perception as such does not involve complex processes of articulation and organization. The person becomes aware of color at once, without an intermediate step of reflecting, organizing, or evaluating. She sees color as related specifically to the emotional sphere, especially to a person's emotional reactivity. Color impresses its essence on the observer in an immediate and impelling fashion. There is no place for active reflection and evaluation, and reaction toward color will tend rather toward receptive and relatively primitive forms. Schachtel (1943) sees the subject's position in color perception as receptive, passive. Goldstein (1939) sees it as a state of surrender. Hence, the extent of accessibility of inner personal regions to outside influences represented by
color and the facility of outward expression of these regions depend on the degree of permeability (Lewin, 1936) of the individual's outside boundary. Thus color response might well indicate the degree of permeability of this boundary.

Klopfer et al. (1954) believe that the way in which the subject handles color gives an indication of his mode of reacting to an emotional challenge from his environment which taxes his skill in integrating an outside influence with his activity-in-progress. Color can tell us something about the way the person reacts to the emotional impact of relationships with other people. They point out that color responses are believed to indicate how the person actually meets an emotional challenge in a behavioral sense.

Shapiro (1956) attempts to define a mode of perception which may be associated with color experience in general, and has proposed to concept of perceptual passivity. In that color experience is immediate and passive, he (1960) sees color as requiring less in the way of perceptual tools or organizing capacity.

It is associated with a passive perceptual mode in that it becomes more dominant, more compelling in quality, and perhaps even antagonistic for articulation in conditions in which active perceptual organizing capacity is impaired or is only rudimentary; at the same time, under optimal conditions, color becomes integrated with form perception, is itself modified in subjective experience, and acquires new functions of economy and enrichment (Shapiro, 1960, p. 171).

He does not believe that it is correct to assume that a defensive, total avoidance of color reflects simply an avoidance of expres-
sion of affects. It may rather be a lack of more or less ade-
quately organized discharge channels, such as are assumed for or-
dinary affective experience.

Singer (1960), after reviewing the literature, considers it possible that the outstanding feature in color responses is the relative diffuseness of the reaction. Beck (1952) sees an inability to react to color as the mark of a person insensitive to the world's exhilarating values. The more color-dictated associations (in the non-pathological record), the more the individual is capable of reacting with warm feeling for his fellow humans.

**Sum C**

**Sum C** is a function of the total color responsiveness of the individual. It is, therefore, as indicated above, a sign of the emotional sensitivity and emotional reactivity. It indicates a person's sensitivity to emotionally charged situations, and gives some indication of the degree of the permeability of the individual's "outside boundary." The various color categories (EC, CF, and C) tell us more about the specific perceptual and behavioral ways the individual reacts to emotional impact.

The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in the **Sum C** index. As will be seen below, it is assumed that the dependent adolescent will differ behaviorally in his reaction to emotional impact, but there seems to be no particular reason to suppose any basic lack of sensitivity to emotional stimuli. A significantly impaired sensitivity to emotional impact would seem
to argue for a basic ego defect. Such might be the case of the
institution child, deprived from birth of factors considered es-
sential to basic ego formation and development. Such is not the
case with respect to the dependent child.

FC

Ames et al. (1959) consider FC as an index of adaptive affec-
tivity or at least a desire for adaptive affectivity. They dis-
covered that FC reaches a peak at sixteen. They see in this indi-
cations that the sixteen-year-old is conforming, that he adjusts
well to others, and that he is generally pleasant and on an even
keel. This, of course, is in line with the basic thinking of
Rorschach himself (1942). Klopfer et al. (1954) believe that the
subject, in producing the FC response, accepts the challenge of
integrating color into a concept of definite form. For them, FC
responses indicate a ready control over emotional impact without
loss of responsiveness. A person capable of giving an adequate
number of such responses would exhibit a pleasant, gracious, and
charming response to social situations and would get along smooth-
ly with other people. Rapaport et al. (1945) see in the FC res-
ponse the ability to delay tension discharge; thus FC is a con-
trol indicator. Shapiro (1960) sees the person capable of FC
responses as one who is not merely passively gripped by sensory
experience, but one who can actively use such experience. This
implies a more autonomous perceptual attention, a capacity for a
more flexible and therefore more adaptive sort of perception. He
concludes, then, that

FC responses . . . may reflect not only an adaptive responsiveness in the narrow socially oriented sense but also a range of sensitivity, a mobility of attention, and a susceptibility to pertinent impression all of which are equally significant in connection with such functions as judgment, planning, and, in general, style of thought (Shapiro, 1960, pp. 191-192).

Phillips and Smith (1953) see in an increased number of FC responses signs of perceptual development. This perceptual development is paralleled in behavior by an increase in restraint and regulation of the forms of self-expression. FC is an index, then of the capacity to learn under stress conditions. The individual who over-stresses FC is the one who believes that it pays to conform. For Beck (1945), the individual capable of FC responses is actuated by feelings, but even while responding to them, he masters them out of consideration for others. Such a person understands others through the medium of his feelings.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly lower number of FC responses. This hypothesis is based on the following considerations. The dependent adolescent, though he might not act out any more than his normally-reared counterpart, feels a greater tendency to rebel. His rapidly developing emotional life would seem to accentuate this tendency. He would not, therefore, tend to "understand others through the medium of his feelings," at least not to the same degree as the family-reared adolescent. On the other hand, his dealings with his peers are not characterized by the same turmoil as his dealings
with authority figures, but it is assumed that general developmental lag makes him less capable of integrating his newly developed feelings to the extent that they contribute substantially to the development of smoother social involvement.

In the course of his development, the dependent child is more or less forced to go along with others. This does not mean that he is socially at ease. Often it seems to be a question of tolerating others until the time of liberation, of submitting to a situation that cannot be changed. The difficulty involved in establishing this hypothesis centers around the fact that general "range of sensitivity," the "mobility of attention," and the "susceptibility to pertinent impression" mentioned above by Shapiro as contributing to such functions as "judgment, planning, and in general, style of thought," do not seem to be lacking in any significant degree in the dependent adolescent. Therefore, if FC is primarily an index of social ability and control and only secondarily an index of the underlying perceptual set emphasized by Shapiro, then the hypothesis should stand.

**CF**

Ames et al. (1959) consider CF responses as representing more egocentric, suggestible, and impulsive affect. This, of course, is Rorschach's (1942) basic hypothesis. Rapaport et al. (1945) believe that this response together with the C response represents an insufficient integration of the perceptual impact of color with form. Klopfer et al. (1954) see both positive and negative mean-
ings in the CF response: positively, it indicates spontaneity, while negatively, it may point to inadequate control of emotional responsiveness. A preponderance of passive CF responses (e.g., flowers) might indicate a passively reactive personality that tends to be "pushed around" by the conflicting emotional demands of social situations. Shapiro (1960) sees the CF response as reflecting a certain degree of lability and unusual vividness of affect. He finds two kinds of CF predominance: one, characterized by vivid and unusually unstable emotional reactions, and a second, characterized much more by impulsive action. But CF need not have any particularly pathological overtone. It might reflect a capacity for a wide range of affect discharge, that is, spontaneity. Finally, the CF response might indicate a sensuous abandonment to the stimulus. Beck (1945) believes that the highly labile reactivity indicated by the CF response can indicate either a disrupting stress and turmoil or a more delicate sensitivity, related to constructive effort. Therefore, for him, the exact meaning of CF must be gleaned from the entire personality picture.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly greater number of CF responses. The dependent adolescent is not as involved with or committed to those around him as the adolescent reared in a normal family setting. He is, therefore, more egocentric. He tends to be more impulsive than the family-reared adolescent, and even though he controls his impulsivity fairly well, these controls are not "inner." Also, since,
developmentally, the CF response falls midway between the G and the FC response, general developmental lag might be a factor in the dependent adolescent's production of CF. It is not that the dependent adolescent is less emotionally sensitive; it is rather that he is more awkward or more retarded in the integration of these emotions. He has not had the warm contacts that facilitate this type of integration.

Ames et al. (1959) note that G responses are considered indicative of nonadaptive and poorly integrated emotional reactions. Klopfer et al. (1954) see in the G response indications of a pathological lack of emotional control. It is a question of explosive emotionality. Rapaport et al. (1945) believe that such responses reflect a "short-circuiting," an absence of the capacity for delay which is a precondition for further perceptual and associative elaboration. G for Shapiro (1960) is a helpless, immediate response to color, denoting extreme lability and poor psychic integration. Beck (1945) calls it an infantile response. He believes that if it occurs in the adolescent, it leads to an expectation of tantrums or other emotional outbursts. According to Phillips and Smith (1953), the person giving G responses is likely to be self-centered and demanding, and so impatient that he finds it very difficult to delay immediate gratifications.

The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in the production of G. The degree of poverty of emotional inte-
gration indicated by the Q response simply does not characterize the dependent adolescent. Q responses should be few in both groups. The general developmental lag assumed to be operative in the case of the dependent adolescent cannot be equated with regression. The dependent adolescent is not completely at home in emotionally charged situations, but he is not helpless or infantile.

Number of Responses on Cards VIII-IX-X

According to Klopfer et al. (1954), the percentage of responses to the last three cards indicates general responsiveness to emotional stimuli from the environment. Some people tend to "dry up" when presented with the color cards, while others seem stimulated even though they may not use color in their responses. Sum Q is usually considered as an indication of overt reactivity; the percentage of responses on the last three cards might well indicate activity whether overt or not. The latter category might be looked upon as an indication of potential responsiveness to the emotional implications of the environment. If potential responsiveness exceeds overt responsiveness, the hypothesis is that there is a conflict between natural responsiveness and conscious attitudes, a repression of emotional responsiveness.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce significantly more responses on cards VIII, IX, and X. The emotionality of the dependent adolescent is more covert than that of the normally-reared adolescent. We might expect greater color respons-
iveness (indicating perhaps greater emotional turmoil) but always in the context of a need to conceal, an unwillingness to reveal oneself. This would involve the repression of emotional responsiveness mentioned above.

Content in General

Vassiliou has recently (1961) surveyed the literature dealing with Rorschach content. She notes that it is only in recent years that investigators have focused attention on content analysis in the clinical or experimental literature. For Rorschach (1942), the actual content of the responses was of secondary importance as far as interpretation was concerned. He did not systematically investigate the problem of content analysis. Shapiro (1959) attempts to show that it is not intrinsic to the test to consider determinants more important than content. Schafer (1958, 1960) notes that content and form interpenetrate and mutually define each other. Lindner (1946) believes that particular kinds of responses can reflect basic processes and dynamism. Brown (1953) believes that a process of censorship operates in the selection and rejection of percepts. Thus, different levels of repression are demonstrated by variations from the visible segment of perception. Beck (1944) considers the content the "mental furniture" of the subject. It is a source of knowledge concerning the subject's interests and personal needs. Phillips and Smith (1953) believe that content symbolizes the motivations and attitudes of the subject; content for them is more a function of the indivi-
dual than of the stimulus.

From a more negative point of view, Klopfer et al. (1960) demonstrated a lack of relationship between intelligence test results and content diversity. They also found that the relationship between diversity and range of interests is not better than chance. At least this was true of their population. Schafer (1958) believes that we say more about the individual if we focus on themes rather than on traditional content categories. And Wertheimer (1953) generally advises that Rorschach workers be cautious in using one-to-one behavior correlates.

This study will present hypotheses for five content categories: animal, human, anatomy, object, and plant.

Rorschach (1942) found that animal forms are seen most frequently, and he interpreted $A\%$ as a quite reliable indicator of stereotypy. $A\%$ increases when the intellectual level decreases. He also found that $A\%$ increases with depression and decreases with elation. Klopfer et al. (1954) consider excessively high animal content as indicating either low intellectual capacity or disturbed adjustment. Piotrowski (1957) points out that $A\%$ increases when there is an unwillingness to exert oneself intellectually and then there is a tendency to intellectual comfort either because of neurosis or because of a lack of training in intellectual discipline. Phillips and Smith (1953) suggest that the anxious individual develops a high $A\%$ or that an $A\%$ beyond expectancy is
an index of a relatively low level of social adjustment or immaturity regardless of the mental age reflected in the particular animal content developed. Thus, a high A% is not necessarily the result of a high anxiety level but may reflect immaturity as well.

The hypothesis: The two groups will not differ significantly in percentage of animal responses. The dependent adolescent is not more depressed, immature, intellectually lazy, or anxious than his normally-reared counterpart. Even if the two groups do differ somewhat in the development of intellectual capacity (see above), it is doubtful whether this difference is significant or that it would show up as immaturity in the guise of a significantly higher A%.

A recent study presents evidence (Fisher, 1962) to support the following hypotheses in reference to H%: (1) the greater the frequency of human responses, the more positively and acceptingly does the individual view himself as a person; (2) the greater the number of human responses, the less confusion or conflict about sexual identity; (3) the greater the number of human responses, the less concern about personal vulnerability and fragility; (4) the greater the number of human responses, the less the sense of being childlike or immature. Kadinoky (1946) indicates that responses with human content represent interest in inner life. Hertzman and Pearce (1947) report that human responses are capable of representing keenly felt attitudes about oneself and the environ-
Failure to produce human responses is associated with suppression of the self-picture and horror of the self. Ames et al. (1959) see high $R$ as indicating a warm interest in and responsiveness to other people. Beck (1952) notes that the absence of the whole human form is likely to indicate repression of this theme. He finds that hysterics produce fewer human content responses than others, the inference being that they are repressing painful and conflictual thoughts concerning their relations with others. Phillips and Smith (1953) note that as $R$ increases, not only the absolute number but also the proportion of human content responses tends to increase. Therefore, any hypothesis concerning $R$ would have to take this factor into consideration. (Note that it has already been hypothesized that the two groups will not differ significantly in the production of $R$.) They also indicate that human content implies interest in and sensitivity to others; however, it does not necessarily imply involvement with others. Individuals who develop an $R$ below expectancy are usually persons who lack understanding of and sensitivity to others and who have few warm relationships. In general, the more that human content is de-emphasized, the more the subject tends to establish a wall between himself and others and the greater is his social isolation. Piotrowski (1957) believes that $R$ measures approximately the degree of interest in the psychology of others. The most frequent reason for a lack of interest, according to him, is hostility leading to an intellectual aversion for people.
The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly lower percentage of animal content responses. This hypothesis is based on the consideration that the dependent child does not tend to accept himself as fully as the family-reared child. Counselling psychologists (Rogers, 1951, 1962; Curran, 1952) have emphasized the necessity of acceptance-in-depth by another as a prerequisite for adequate self-acceptance. This kind of acceptance has been lacking in the life of the dependent adolescent. The dependent adolescent is also more egocentric, more concerned about his personal vulnerability. He is not "at home" with himself as he would like to be, and the result is that he cannot be "at home" with others. He is not necessarily at odds with others; it is simply that there appears to the dependent adolescent to be more of a wall between himself and others.

**Objects**

An over-production of objects (more than 10 per cent) meant, for Rorschach (1942), a lack of concentration. Piotrowski (1957) elaborates on this and attributes it to a lack of dominant intellectual interest which would absorb the individual's creative activities. Over-production of objects, he claims, is not connected with lowered intelligence but rather with lack of productivity. If objects are lacking to any significant degree, it seems that this would imply a lack of perceptual differentiation stemming from a constricted range of perceptual possibilities.

The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce signifi-
cantly fewer object responses. This lowered percentage should reflect a relative lack of perceptual differentiation in the dependent adolescent. It should also reflect the narrower range of intellectual interests of the dependent adolescent. His environment seems to stand in the way of the development of any dominant intellectual interest. Whether the dependent adolescent is basically less intelligent may be open to question, but because of motivational reasons, he does tend to be less productive.

Anatomy

Beck (1944) and Mons (1951) have noted a relation between anatomy responses and hypochondriasis. Rav's investigation (1951) failed to support such a relationship, but he did hold that more than one anatomy response can be interpreted as a pathological sign. He also found a connection between card refusal and anatomy response frequency. Anatomy is a weaker form of refusal. Kadinisk (1954) and Poss (1940) believed that such responses reflect concern about bodily harm. Phillips and Smith (1953) believe that anatomy responses reflect a sensitivity to and concern with the expression of destructive impulses. Klopfer et al. (1954) suggest that anatomy responses are an index of insecurity. Piotrowski (1957) believes that a high number of anatomy responses reflects feelings of intellectual inferiority, or at least an intellectual indolence. Ames et al. (1959) have noted that there is more anatomy content in the records of adolescents than in the records of adults. Thus, anatomy has some maturational signifi-
The hypothesis: The experimental group will produce a significantly greater number of anatomy responses. The dependent adolescent is more guarded than his normally-reared counterpart. He does not want to reveal himself, and in his case the At response might be a toned-down refusal. He is also more concerned with a tendency to act out. He is less secure than the family-reared adolescent and is often more intellectually indolent, if only because of his more confining environment. The dependent adolescent also tends to be more self-centered, and anatomy responses might well indicate a more pronounced preoccupation with his own body. General developmental lag might also account for an increase in At.

**Plant**

Phillips and Smith (1953) associate two sets of attributes with plant content: (1) passivity and femininity, and (2) dependency. Piotrowski (1957) considers botany content to indicate strong, positive, but crude and self-centered emotional drives. Sometimes such responses symbolize sexual objects and refer to unresolved sexual tension.

The hypothesis: The dependent group will produce a significantly greater number of plant responses. The dependent adolescent is more passive and dependent; he also tends to be more self-centered and crude in his emotionality.

**Statistical Procedure**
As Cronbach (1949) has pointed out, the statistical procedure of choice in dealing with Rorschach data is Chi Square. Therefore, the following procedure will be followed in analyzing the data obtained from the tests. After the tests have been scored, tables will be set up for each scoring category (e.g., number of R, number of M, etc.) in which will be tallied the number of subjects achieving a particular score (e.g., the number having no M, the number having 1 M, the number having 2 M, etc.). This tabulation will be made for both the experimental group and the control group. Next, fourfold Chi Square tables will be set up, based on the previous tabulation. The division for the combined groups will be made as close to the median as possible in each scoring category. Finally, the following formula will be applied to the assembled data (McNemar, 1949):

\[ x^2 = \frac{N(\left|AD-BC\right|-\frac{N}{2})^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)} \]

This formula includes a correction for continuity to take into consideration the discrete nature of the data.

Conduct of the Experiment

The 50 Rorschach tests were administered individually to the dependent adolescents during the summer of 1961. The tests were administered in classrooms of each of the homes for dependent children. The examiner first talked briefly with the subject and attempted to put him at his ease. It was pointed out that the information provided by the test would not be communicated to anyone else and that the purpose of the test was to examine group
characteristics and not to discover "what was wrong with" each individual. The standard instructions for the administration of the Rorschach were memorized by the examiner and repeated in exactly the same way to each subject. There was no testing of the limits. After the test, the subject was allowed to make any comments or ask any questions he would like concerning the test or any other subject. It was also indicated that he could see the examiner if he wished on any of the days that the examiner returned to give further tests. Some of the students took advantage of this by ventilating in both general and specific ways their feelings about the institution. Each testee was also given a copy of the Mooney Problem Check List and asked to fill it out at his leisure. He was not forced to do this in any way. He was assured that the information would not be communicated to any of the authorities and that if it were to be used, the individual would remain completely anonymous. He was asked to return the Check List the following week, whether he had filled it out or not.

Some subjects were quite cooperative, while others manifested almost an unwillingness to be taken away from the routine of the institution. Since the tests were administered during the summer months, it was a question of taking the subject away from some assigned task—sweeping floors, working in the carpenter shop or the electric shop, etc. Many of the subjects gave the impression that the test was merely another task to be performed and forgotten. The majority of the testees did not express any
desire to know group or individual results. This certain lack of enthusiasm should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the test. It would seem to place a number of the records in the "guarded" category. As far as the examiner could judge from mere external signs, none of the subjects tested manifested any noticeable degree of anxiety over taking the test.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS, ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS

Results and Analysis

In Table I (pp. 77-78) there is given an indication of the hypotheses together with the results of the statistical analysis. If a significant difference was predicted and the level of significance ($p$) is .05 or below, the hypothesis is considered valid. If a significant difference was predicted and the level of significance falls between .05 and .10, the hypothesis is considered to tend toward validity. If no significant difference was predicted and the level of significance is above .10, the hypothesis is considered invalid.

Fifteen of the 22 hypotheses proved valid. Three more showed a tendency toward validity. Each of the four invalid hypotheses predicted a significant difference between the two groups which did not materialize. None of the invalid hypotheses showed even a tendency toward significance in the opposite direction. The 12 hypotheses predicting no significant difference all proved valid. It should be recalled from the section of the thesis dealing with the establishment of the hypotheses, that some of the hypotheses were conditioned by the validity of some other hypothesis. For example, the hypothesis concerning $W$ depended upon the validity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Status of hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>6.599</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>3.683</td>
<td>.10-.05</td>
<td>Tending to validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>.10-.05</td>
<td>Tending to validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>.10-.05</td>
<td>Tending to validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>8.684</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F%</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-plus%</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>10.447</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(C)</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>8.538</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum C</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>2.637</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII-IX-X%</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>6.036</td>
<td>&lt;.02</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a In this column, "Con." indicates that the control group was predicted to excel in the variable; "Exp." indicates that the experimental group was predicted to excel; "nsd" indicates that no significant difference between the groups was predicted.

(Table continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Status of hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A%</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H%</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>10.112</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>10.847</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Invalid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the hypothesis concerning \( R \) (that is, that the two groups would not differ significantly in the production of \( R \)). It may simply be stated here that all the conditions laid down were fulfilled.

**Discussion of Results and Conclusions**

A number of factors make it imperative to draw conclusions that are somewhat tentative and hypothetical in character. First of all, care must be taken not to assume a one-to-one correlation between Rorschach variables and behavioral characteristics. Secondly, individual conclusions must be tempered by the fact that the experimental group and the control group do not compare favorably—especially in the area of socio-economic background and probably in intellectual ability. As pointed out above, the experimental group might be assumed to be even a bit below normal in intellectual ability, while the control group, for the most part, is definitely known to be somewhat above average in intellectual ability (see pp. 36–38). It may well be true that intellectual maturation is dependent on social and general emotional maturation and that deprivation in the latter areas can lead to subnormal development in the former. But it remains true that level of intellectual ability was an uncontrolled variable in the present study, and this fact must modify the conclusions drawn. Finally, the possibilities of guarded Rorschach protocols and examiner influence should not be lost sight of.

The first thing to be noted is that the eight hypotheses predicting no significant difference were verified. Add to this the
fact that four hypotheses predicting significant differences proved invalid, while another three indicated only tendencies toward validity. Thus, at least according to the general findings of this study, the two groups do not differ in any really definitive way in over two-thirds of the Rorschach variables tested. Therefore, the Rorschach does not lead us to suspect noticeable deviant tendencies in the dependent group. Furthermore, the divergent backgrounds and suspected intellectual inequality of the two groups led to the assumption that the differences in Rorschach performance would be more pronounced than if the two groups had been more equally matched. Evidence validating this assumption did not materialize. Below an attempt is made to interpret the differences that actually did occur in Rorschach performance.

Both Gesell et al. (1956) and Ames et al. (1959) see sixteen as a characteristically happy age. They see the sixteen-year-old as well-balanced, tending to like people, and tending to get along with people rather well. The adolescent at this age not only wants to be more independent, but he actually is more independent than at any other age. The expansion of the sixteen-year-old appears in the Rorschach in the increase in the number of responses, greater diversification of content, greater elaboration of the individual response, increased $M$, increased color, fewer refusals, and lower $F%$. The dependent group did not manifest the same degree of expansiveness as measured by the above constellation of Rorschach variables. The dependent group paralleled the
family-reared group in R, color, lower F%, and, generally speaking, in diversification of content. However, in the dependent group, M is significantly lower, refusals are significantly higher, and the subjects tended to be much more laconic in developing the individual response. However, lower M might well be a function of lower initial intellectual ability and not refer directly to the "expansiveness" noted by Gesell and Ames. Card refusal and lack of individual response elaboration might be a function of lower intellectual ability, and guarded protocol, examiner influence, or a combination of all three. It might be hypothesized that the emotions of the dependent adolescent are deepened (increased color response), but his inner drive (reflected in M) has not developed sufficiently to have him emerge as completely as his family-reared counterpart from the restriction characterizing earlier years. It may also be hypothesized that the dependent adolescent is somewhat reluctant to become involved with others, that he is unwilling to reveal himself (or was he just unwilling to reveal himself to this examiner?), that he is comparatively more insensitive to the feelings of others, that he is over-cautious, that he has a deeper need for certainty, and that he wants to keep feelings that pain him at a distance. The present study seems to place such hypotheses on a scientific footing, but it does not verify them.

The subjects in the control group are described by the examiners (Ames et al., 1959) as interested and cooperative. The sub-
jects of the experimental group, for one reason or another, did not manifest the same seeming spontaneity. These latter often gave the impression that they were fulfilling another obligation, and perhaps they thought that things would go better for them if they took the test (though they were told that they were at liberty to take it or not). These internal variables, however, remain hidden, and the examiner is left with the fact of adequate but minimal cooperation and laconic responses. It seems that it may at least be hypothesized that such test conduct reinforces the impression that the dependent adolescent does not want to commit himself, that he does not want to reveal much about himself. But the variables mentioned above (basic intellectual ability, etc.) could also, at least in part, account for such test conduct, so that even this hypothesis remains substantially unverified.

Color is said to indicate the ability of the subject to receive from the environment. At first glance, it would seem that the emotional expansion of the dependent adolescent parallels that of the family-reared youth. The overall overt emotional reactivity of the two groups (as expressed in Sum C) is not significantly different, nor is there any significant difference in the patterning of color responses (FC, CF, and C). We might expect a tendency to act out on the part of the dependent adolescent to appear in fewer FC and more CF responses, but this tendency to act out might be countered by the necessity to conform
in order to remain secure. If such were the case, the overt emotionality of the two groups, as registered by the Rorschach, would not differ. However, we do see a difference in Rorschach terms in what might be called covert emotionality. The dependent child does differ significantly in the percentage of responses to cards VIII, IX, and X. His percentage is significantly higher and this might point to a more hidden emotionality. The dependent child rejects card II more frequently (to a significant degree); this could well be an indication of shock and thus another indication of greater emotional turmoil coupled with a hesitancy to let this turmoil be known. But, of course, the present experiment did not investigate the reasons why this card was rejected more frequently and we must allow of the possibility of another type of shock as the factor behind the rejections. The emotions of the dependent adolescent, although deepened, could also be more turbulent, even though this turbulence does not always break through the surface. His conformity to environmental situations (as reflected in FC) might not be completely the product of a natural developmental process, but rather the conformity demanded by the more or less authority-bound world in which he finds himself. Another possibility is that the records of the dependent group are in general guarded and that the actual color production is not a real indication of the group's emotionality or emotional response. At least the Rorschach evidence does not preclude these possibilities, and the reasoning above might form the basis
of further hypotheses to be verified.

The most striking significance between the experimental and the control group, at least at first glance, is in $M$. This is all the more interesting in that the two groups do not differ significantly in $H%$. However, $M$ is especially sensitive to the intellectual ability of the group, and the poverty of $M$ responses in the experimental group might well be a function of lower intellectual ability. $H%$ is not as sensitive to intellectual level as is $M$. Therefore, the conclusions below are more in the nature of hypotheses, for it is possible that $M$ deficiency has more than one cause. Phillips and Smith (1953) indicate that human content implies interest in and sensitivity to others; it does not, however, necessarily imply involvement with others. $M$, on the other hand, connotes not only empathy with others but also the resources necessary for effective involvement with others. The significant difference between the two groups in $M$, although it might merely indicate a difference in intellectual level, might also mean that the dependent adolescent, for one reason or another, does not know how to or cannot involve himself effectively with others. This may be true despite the fact that he is as aware of others ($H%) as his family-reared counterpart.

$M$ is said to indicate the ability to give to the environment. The qualities indicated in the $M$ response—empathy and involvement, richness of imaginal processes, high level of ego-functioning, the ability to bridge the gap between inner resources and
the outer world, integration of a value system into one's mode of living, diversity of active interests, self-acceptance, self-assertiveness—are a gauge of how effectively one is becoming a person. The difference in $M$ may indicate that the dependent adolescent is lagging behind in these areas. The reason why he is lagging behind may be, at least partially, his slower and more impoverished intellectual development, for many of the factors noted above depend upon adequate intellectual functioning. Again, we should not overlook the possibility that lack of $M$ is partially due to the guarded nature of the protocols.

The two groups did not differ significantly in $FM$. This might mean that the dependent adolescent is not less aware of impulses to immediate gratification, and generally speaking, he is not less aware of his natural, unacculturated drives. If the dependent adolescent is, at the same time, lacking in important inner controls (represented by $M$), it might be assumed that he would be more prone to conflict. He could feel these urges toward immediate gratification of natural drives, and since control is necessary, even though it does not come as naturally as it should from within, a more artificial type of repressive control should or could be adopted. However, this is merely an hypothesis, and it should be noted that it is not backed up by any significant increase in the production of $m$, a tension indicator.

The two groups tend to differ in their general mode of perception, and this could be principally due to a basic difference
in intellectual ability. The dependent adolescent's thinking might well tend to be more global (increased $W$ of a global nature). But the dependent adolescent also seems to approach reality in a different way (increased $dr$), that is, his mode of perception has a more arbitrary flavor than that of his family-reared counterpart. If this is true, and if this increase in $dr$ is not just a function of lower intellectual ability or disinterestedness in the test, then this mode of perception could be a factor contributing to his lack of easy communication with people, especially those not of his "world." The source of this "different" mode of perception, if it exists, is another question, and would have to be sought in the developmental history of the dependent child. Another aspect of the dependent adolescent's mode of perception is that it is not as accurate as that of the family-reared child. This is manifested in a significant difference in $F-$plus%. Again, this could be merely a reflection of lower intellectual ability or it could be a result of a haphazard approach to the test itself. But it has also been postulated that the emotional stress of adolescence affects accuracy of perception (Beck, 1954; Thetford, Molish, and Beck, 1951). If this is true, then reduced $F-$plus% on the part of the dependent sixteen-year-old could be an indication that he is undergoing relatively greater stress in his attempt to adjust to the problems of adolescence. At least this is an hypothesis worth considering. Other implications might be that the dependent adolescent has
less control over his perceptual powers, that he puts forth less intellectual effort (if he has something to put forth), that he is more confused, that he is less capable of delaying discharge of impulse (and this results in poor form quality), or that he has a greater tendency to deny whatever he finds threatening. Again, none of these possibilities seem to be excluded by the Rorschach evidence, and there seems to be enough evidence to warrant considering them as hypotheses and thus starting points for further investigation.

The significant difference between the two groups in C (the dependent adolescent producing a significantly greater number of these responses) poses a problem. Ames et al. (1959) found this response so rare as to be an indication of some disorder and worth investigating in each individual case. However, if C can be considered as a toned-down response analogous to the color response (Klopfer et al., 1954), then this difference might merely highlight what has already been pointed out in the section dealing with color. It might be a sign of a more covert type of emotionality on the part of the dependent adolescent. However, this type of response might also point up a deeper awareness of authority as threatening and give some insight into the more dysphoric nature of the life he is leading. At any rate, the dependent adolescent's relationship to authority figures specifically and to adults in general would seem to constitute a fertile area of research. Finally, if we may look upon C as signifying some
kind of "inhibition of motility" (Phillips and Smith, 1953), the
difference noted might also suggest the greater need the depen-
dent adolescent has to inhibit a tendency to act out. In view
of the scarceness of the C response in Ames' study, it would
seem fruitful to investigate its meaning in the protocol of the
dependent child. However, since the control group is not compa-
rable to the experimental group in all respects, it would first
be advisable to see if the C response is as rare as Ames found
it to be.

Rorschach content may also give us some insight into the
differences of personality structure existing between the two
groups. The two groups do not differ in the two major content
variables—animal and human content. If the two groups differ
significantly in intellectual ability, we might expect that the
dependent group would score higher in animal content. But they
do not. But this might be explained by the fact that both groups
are at an age when animal content is still relatively high when
compared to the animal content level of the adult. Thus animal
content would not be an effective means of distinguishing the
two groups on the variable of intellectual ability. On the other
hand, we do have the fact that these two groups do not differ sig-
nificantly on this variable. This might suggest that the two
groups are not as far apart as might be thought in intellectual
ability. At least this area needs further investigation.

The dependent adolescent produces significantly fewer ob-
jects in his Rorschach record. This could argue for a lack of intellectual productivity based on a lack of diversification of intellectual interests. On the other hand, this difference might simply be a function of a basic difference in intellectual ability. However, we might offer for verification the hypothesis that the dependent adolescent does not find his world as interesting and as stimulating and thus does not perceive the same variety of objects actually existing in the world.

The dependent adolescent does not produce a significantly greater number of responses which would indicate passivity and dependency (e.g., plant responses). The evidence from the Rorschach is too meager to make any real judgment in this matter. Both the family-reared adolescent and the dependent adolescent "depend" on others for the satisfaction of many needs. We may even hypothesize that the dependent adolescent might feel a deeper or stronger need for independence than the normally-reared child in that he might feel and resent his dependence more than the family-reared adolescent. Further data are needed before any judgment could be made, but this seems like a profitable area of research.

The dependent adolescent's production of a significantly greater number of anatomy responses might point to a number of factors: a general cautiousness and hesitancy (anatomy as a toned-down refusal), feelings of insecurity, feelings of intellectual inferiority or intellectual indolence, a sense of frustration,
preoccupation with the self, a concern with a tendency to act out.
The literature presents such a wide spectrum of meaning for this
category, that it is difficult to pinpoint any specific meaning
and apply it to the dependent adolescent. If it does point to
a general cautiousness and hesitancy, it would reinforce a gener-
al impression culled from other scoring categories and from gen-
eral test behavior. Higher anatomy production as a sign of feel-
ings of intellectual inferiority might also corroborate the as-
sumption of lower intellectual ability on the part of the depen-
dent adolescent. Some hypotheses are strengthened, and others
are seen to be worthy of investigation, but the evidence still
remains inconclusive.

The areas in which the two groups do not differ significant-
ly might possibly throw some light on personality structure. The
two groups do not differ in \( m \); this could mean that the dependent
adolescent is subject to no greater inner tension than is his
family-reared counterpart, but the difference could also be a
function of the guarded nature of the protocols. The groups do
not differ in \( F \), and this seems to be a fairly reliable index of
the degree of general personality constriction. There is no rea-
son to suppose that the dependent adolescent is constricted to
a marked degree, and the Rorschach offers no conclusive evidence
indicating the invalidity of such a supposition. General pro-
ductiveness (reflected in \( R \)) is about the same, even though what
is produced is not as rich and diversified (e.g., lack of \( M \), poor
response elaboration, etc.). This lack of richness and diversification could, of course, reflect a basic difference in intellectual ability. But it could also reflect the dependent adolescent's cautious attitude toward the world and perhaps increased inner turmoil. Any definitive conclusion would have to be the fruit of further investigation.

It might seem surprising that the two groups did not differ significantly in shading responses. We might expect the dependent adolescent to manifest affectional anxiety arising from lack of satisfaction of affectional needs by some sort of disturbance in the shading category. However, various possibilities lie open to us. The dependent adolescent might not be as "affection-hungry" as we make him out to be, that is, the institution might actually be doing an adequate job in satisfying these needs. However, this possibility would probably be unacceptable to many of the investigators whose opinions are put forth in the review of related literature. Another possibility is that some adolescents would react to a lack of affection by denying their need for it while others would react by a heightened realization of an unsatisfied need. If this were the case, then we might expect very high and very low scores in the shading categories on the part of the dependent adolescent group. These scores would tend to cancel out each other and the Rorschach would not give an accurate picture of group affectional needs. This is another area in which investigation would prove very worthwhile. The inves-
tion should probably start with an examination of the individual Rorschach records.

Because the two groups are not too comparable, we are left with few if any really definitive conclusions. However, the study has produced a number of hypotheses which are scientifically based and worth further investigation. We are left with a definite impression that the dependent adolescent is more cautious and more hesitant about revealing himself than his family-reared counterpart, but we are not certain as to the source of this hesitancy.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Rorschach tests were administered to 50 dependent sixteen-year-old adolescents (25 girls and 25 boys) in an attempt to determine the principal characteristics of the personality structure of the dependent adolescent. The control group consisted of 100 family-reared adolescents (50 girls and 50 boys)—the sixteen-year-old population from the study Adolescent Rorschach responses by Ames, Metraux, and Walker. The two groups were not adequately comparable for a study of this nature. The control group was above average in intelligence (and it is also likely that the experimental group was slightly below average, though this was never accurately determined) and in socio-economic background. The two groups were compared on 22 different Rorschach scoring variables: card refusal, R, W, D, Dd, M, FM, m, F%, F-plus%, shading, C', Sum C, FC, CF, C, VIII-IX-X%, A%, H%, At, Obj, and Pl. Significant differences were discovered in the following categories: card refusal, M, F-plus%, C', VIII-IX-X%, Obj, and At. Tendencies toward a significant difference were found in the following categories: W, D, Dd.

These results were then discussed in light of the literature dealing with the behavioral correlates of the various Rorschach
scoring categories. Most of the conclusions drawn had to remain largely hypothetical because of the areas of incomparability between the experimental group and the control group.

The dependent adolescent does not seem to have achieved the same degree of personality expansion as his family-reared counterpart. However, this impression may derive from his comparatively lower level of intellectual ability. The dependent adolescent's perceptions do not seem to be as accurate as those of his normally-reared counterpart, and they also seem to have a more arbitrary flavor. His emotions seem to have deepened, but there is the possibility that they are somewhat more turbulent than those of the normally-reared child.

It is suspected that the main difference between the two groups lies in the area of socialization, though many of the Rorschach findings which serve as the basis for this supposition may be attributable to other factors—examiner influence, test reluctance resulting in guarded protocols, and lower intellectual ability. Some working hypotheses in this area are that he is less capable of warm relationships with others, that he tends to be over-cautious in dealing with others, and that his attempts at socialization are more emotionally turbulent than those of his normally-reared counterpart. Though the literature would lead us to suspect that he has a greater tendency to act out, this was not substantiated by Rorschach findings, though such a tendency might have been veiled by the guarded nature of the proto-
cols.

The Rorschach did not show the dependent adolescent more overtly anxious and concerned with his affectional needs, but this does not mean that he does not have problems in this area. An attempt was made to explain why such problems would not be reflected in the Rorschach data, if they exist. It was also hypothesized that the dependent adolescent has a tendency to conceal his problems and to be much less self-revealing than his normally-reared counterpart. Data from the Rorschach helped to place such an hypothesis on a more solid footing, but the data did not lead to any definitive conclusions. The dependent adolescent did not appear to be more dependent or passive than any other sixteen-year-old, but here again Rorschach data is scanty. There is some evidence to support the assumption that the dependent adolescent is intellectually less gifted and that his intellectual powers do not possess the same richness as those of his family-reared counterpart.

In sum, the tests led mostly to inconclusive impressions concerning the personality structure of the dependent adolescent. However, the study suggested a number of well-founded hypotheses concerning his personality that would bear further investigation.
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