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Chapter I

Problem and Purpose

The most general principle underlying Rorschach's conception of the meaning of the M can be formulated as follows according to Piotrowski (1957):

All action tendencies which do not find a vent without turn inwards; as a result of repression, they become internalized and change into creative ideas. There is no culture without the M. Since culture has been growing, there has been a growing "internalization" of man... According to him (Rorschach), the varieties of M determined not the direct relationships with others but the subject's attitude toward his inner life, i.e., his fantasies and daydreams (Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 130-131).

Schachtel (1950) gives the following discussion of the absence of M:

The capacity for kinesthetic perception and imagery is not restricted to those who give kinesthetic responses in Rorschach's test, but is part of everybody's equipment....Rorschach mentions that giving no M responses is only a relative measure of the capacity for kinesthetic perception, since the seeing of movement purposely has been made somewhat difficult in his ink blots. Most people who don't give M responses in Rorschach's test see human movement on the Levy Movement Blots in which kinesthetic perception has been facilitated by the design of the blots and by the task given to the subject in which he is asked to say what the figures on the blots are doing....in the state of depression one is temporarily cut off from the capacity for creative experience since one is both not open toward the stimuli around one (absence of color responses) and incapable of projecting oneself in empathic understanding of the environment. The absence of M in those coerced records which are characteristic of the rigidly defensive and repressing personality does not mean that these people are not potentially capable of both openness toward the world and intensive, creative rapport. Their rigidity is a safety device which may lead to the kind of muscular armature that blocks even the slight, involuntary motor innervations which are
necessary for empathic, kinesthetic experience. Not sufficiently developed differentiation of the capacity for experience may be another reason for the absence of M. The question whether such a lack of differentiation may not have some relation to the educational background and socioeconomic status of the person has not even been raised in the literature. Yet comparative Rorschach data from low-income groups and from educated middle-class groups are suggestive of such a possibility. This would be consistent with the assumption that the absence of M responses says something about the apparatus for experience that is actually available to the person at the period of his life when the test was given, but does not say whether the limitations and the lack of differentiation of this apparatus are constitutionally inherent characteristics of the person and how the potentialities of the person might have developed under different conditions (Schachtel, 1950, pp. 96-97).

Several studies (Grauer, 1953; Piotrowski & Bricklin, 1961; Piotrowski & Lewis, 1952) have found M to be one of the Rorschach signs which can be used as a predictor of improvement in schizophrenia. Piotrowski and Lewis (1952) state that "Absence of the human movement response points to lack of creative imagination and lack of a systematized conception of the world and of one's place in it" (Piotrowski & Lewis, 1952, p. 60).

Although there is considerable disagreement in the literature concerning the value of any Rorschach signs as predictors of success in therapy, some authors believe that M is one of the signs which is of value for this purpose. Cartwright (1958) has found M to be one of the Rorschach signs which is useful in predicting success in client-centered therapy as measured by the counselor's rating of the case at posttherapy. Cartwright found that apparently the most important factors for treatment of a client-centered nature is concern with human relations, the
ability to empathize with others, controlled emotional responsiveness, and sufficient contact with reality. Rogers and Hammond (1953) found, when attempting to predict improvement in therapy, that using rules which include M is useful. However, when predicting unimprovement, M did not contribute to the evaluation. They also found that there was a relatively high frequency of extensor M in the records of the group which was successful in therapy. Kirkner, Wisham, and Giedt (1953) say that M is one of the Rorschach "variables" which is a good predictor for responsiveness to psychotherapy. Bloom (1956), commenting on the underproductive R group on the Rorschach, found a good treatment history characterized by the least guarded individuals and those with a greater degree of available resources and fantasy living.

It would seem, then, that if few or no M are given in the Response Proper, if one could elicit M in the Testing-the-Limits Phase, this might be an indication of the potential resources of the personality; at least this is a view held by some authors. It would also seem to be useful to compare the specific M content in the Response Proper, Inquiry, and Limits in order to analyze the apparent defensive and integrative factors that have been aroused in the various phases. This comparison would seem to have practical value since part of Rorschach interpretation is based on content as are predictions from the Rorschach concerning response to psychotherapy.
It has frequently been found that the Rorschach records of many psychiatric patients contain few or no M responses. Therefore there would seem to be a need to test the limits for ability to perceive M in order to give a basis for drawing a conclusion with regard to M when interpreting these records. The reason for this is that a statement concerning the patient's ability to respond to psychotherapy is a frequent request in a referral for psychological testing.

The primary purpose of this study was to show that a method of testing the limits for M on the Rorschach using pictures of human beings in self-initiated action or lifelike posture is more effective in eliciting quantity of M responses as compared to the Response Proper and Inquiry than the usual method of testing the limits for M. (The usual method referred to is Klopfer's general to specific delimitation.) The latter was also to be compared to the Response Proper and Inquiry. It was also predicted that more M would be produced by the method of using pictures than would be produced by the usual method of testing the limits. Both of the above hypotheses had to show an increase in M when the method of using pictures was administered as compared to the usual method significant at 0.05% level of confidence (p=0.05). An additional purpose was to study and compare the content, qualitatively only not quantitatively, of the M responses when they were given in each method of testing the limits to the content of M given in the Response Proper and Inquiry for each group.
Chapter II

Review of Pertinent Literature

The review of the literature was grouped under three headings: 1) A general discussion of the material produced in response to the Rorschach according to various authors and resulting from experimental procedures. 2) Significance of M responses as related to different types of psychopathology. 3) A discussion of experimental manipulations of instructions in giving the Rorschach. 4) A summary of literature reviewed including evaluation and relation to this study.

General Discussion of the M Response

Holt and Havel (1960) gave the following discussion of primary thinking which involves: preoccupation with instinctual aims, autistic logic, loose and nonsensical types of association, distortion of reality, condensation, displacement, and symbolization. The Rorschach is of value in assessing primary process in that it offers a presentation of a series of visual images in which there is less demand for organizing and synthesizing. A complex stimulus is offered which can evoke and support almost any kind of image latent in the viewer's mind. It illustrates the characteristic response of the person to the emergence of primary material into consciousness as their character defense against emergency.
Schafer (1954) states:

It is through this complex process that the patient's network of both self-expressive, conflictful imagery and impersonal, conflict-free imagery is exposed to and interacts with the test stimuli. This network of imagery is played on by the forms, colors, and shadings of the inkblots, but also it selectively emphasizes certain of these forms, colors and shadings. The response process is therefore one that is the reverse of that described in Freud's formula for repression—the push from above (from the repressing ego) and the pull from below (from the repressed memories and tendencies). Here there is a pull from above (from the inkblots and the wish to respond) and a push from below (from the impulse- and affect-charged imagery). The defensive ego functions are operating all the while to maintain basic repressive security; the adaptive ego functions are operating simultaneously to find, shape, formulate, and revise responses; and the inkblots contribute to and limit the possibilities. Rorschach responses appear to be the final precipitates of all these partial processes. It is for reasons such as these that the Rorschach test is so often so dramatically revealing of the adaptive and defensive strengths and weaknesses of the patient, his pathological trends, his conscious and unconscious values, yearnings, fears, wrath, guilt and joy, and the overall color and tone of his personality (Schafer, 1954, p. 113).

Schafer (1958) also states:

The primary process, which is genetically and formally the more primitive, operates with unneutralized drive energies and its regulative principle is tension reduction (the pleasure principle); it strives toward immediate discharge of energy accumulations by a direct route and through the mechanisms of displacement, condensation, substitute formation, and symbolization. The secondary process operates by the principle of least effort; its energies are relatively neutralized, i.e., relatively bound in motives and structures of a highly socialized nature, and freely available for whichever ego activities of the moment may require energetic support; it is oriented toward objective reality; it follows the safest course toward the sought-for object in reality, using delays of impulse, detours, and experimental action in thought, until the suitable object and modes of action have been found (Schafer, 1958, p. 123).
Piotrowski gives the following view of the M:

"The M represent the conception of life according to which the individual makes his adjustment to reality. The M stand for the most individual and integrated strivings which dominate the individual's life. Thus the M indicate traits stabilizing the relation between the individual and his environment" (Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 140-141).

Rorschach originally observed that the capacity for voluntary motor inhibition is a behavioral correlate of the human movement response. Rorschach and most of his followers concluded from their observations and Vold's experiments on dreams that the psychological mechanism indicated by the M restrain or inhibit motor behavior in real social interactions and create a preference for inner fantasy living over external overt action. Piotrowski (1957), however, challenged this stating:

To argue that the M reveal repressed action tendencies because suppression of overt motor activity at the time of the examination results in an increase of M produced is to confuse two distinct concepts. One is the relation of the amount of motor activity at the time of the examination to the number of M produced during the examination. The other concept is the psychosocial meaning of traits indicated by the M. Rorschach and many other writers argue implicitly as if there were no logical difference between the two. I believe there is a difference and that consequently the argument is fallacious....If a plan for vigorous social action develops best in a state of calm reflection and isolation from others does it follow that the plan will cause its executor to become calm, reflective, and asocial? Certainly not. Hence, the facilitation of the production of the M through suppression of overt motor activity does not argue against the idea that the M reveal psychological traits, serving as a steering mechanism which prompts the individual intermittently but decidedly to play a definite role in important interhuman relationships (Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 148-149).
Meltzoff, Singer, Korchin, and Sheldon (1952-53) tested Werner's Sensory-tonic field theory of perception as it relates to the Rorschach method. They found that in their sample of 32 college students consistent results were generally in keeping with the experimental hypothesis that there was an increase in movement responses following motor inhibition. The emphasis in the theory, however, is upon human movement specifically.

Meltzoff and Litwin (1956) extended the findings of previous experiments showing that motor and cognitive inhibition are behavior correlates of M. When using a sample of college students, they found that the relationship of M and inhibition ability further includes the control of affective impulses as well. Their subjects were induced to laugh and instructed to refrain from any affective expression. In support of this hypothesis, more high-M than low-M subjects (those producing a larger number of M as compared to those producing relatively few M) were successful in inhibiting any overt expression of experimentally induced affect.

In a study by King (1958) in which he considered the implication of his results in terms of the possible relationship of M to behavior in psychotherapy and between M and the psychology of thinking, the following descriptive statements were made: High-M producers showed a greater tendency to recognize their problems as involving disturbances in interpersonal relationships than low-M producers, a greater tendency to project themselves backward in time in accounting for the origins of their problems, the
ability to utilize interpersonal fantasy related to the M restricted to that involving problem solving or reality processes as opposed to daydreaming or nonreality types, and a greater tendency to project themselves beyond their present problems into the future.

Baron (1955), in a study of the M threshold in a sample of 100 military officers, found that the M threshold was uncorrelated with measures of intelligence, originality, and associational fluency but that the subjects who displayed considerable readiness to give human movement responses were considered by staff psychologists to be more intelligent, inventive, introspective, and contemplative. It was concluded that the human movement tendency is a stylistic variable and that it does relate, as Rorschach thought, to a preference for "intrapsychic living" as opposed to interest in action, practical affairs, etc.

O'Karski (1958) studied 82 apparently normal male military recruits to examine the assumption that the movement response, as observed in projective tests, represents something basically stable in individual personality and behavior. It was concluded from these results that the concept of movement in all three common categories, M, FM, and m, might well be related to deep rooted, stable characteristics in some but not for the great majority of Ss.
Rorschach (1942), when describing the influence of volition on the factors of the test stated:

Those subjects who, in the ordinary experiment give numerous M's, can increase the number of good kinaesthetic responses with relative ease. On the other hand, those who interpret few M's in the usual test, produce few or very poor ones in the control. Kin-aesthesias represent, therefore, a function, which can be increased in effect by the setting up of a goal only if present as a definite tendency in the personality (Rorschach, 1942, p.68).

Thompson (1948), in a study using 100 college students and correlating M responses in Dd areas with Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scores, found that when comparing the two groups there were no differences significant at the 1% level. It was found, when those Ss giving M in Dd areas were separated from those that did not, that on all MMPI scales those giving M in Dd areas showed a relatively greater general maladjustment as indicated by consistently higher scores on the MMPI.

Luchins (1946-47), in a study of patients referred to a neuropsychiatric service but having a negative record, concluded from a summary of the S's comments that the absence of M was found in literal minded Ss. These subjects, after finding one object, could not recombine its features so that they would form anything else. They looked for shapes and not for movement because there is nothing moving on the card.

Significance of M Responses as Related to Different Types of Psychopathology

Rorschach (1942), in discussing M and pathological types stated:
Stereotyped and feebleminded subjects have no M's. The rule is the same for schizophrenics; the more productive the associative life of the patient, the more M's; the more stereotyped the thinking, the fewer M answers. Elated mood increases, depressed mood decreases the number of M's, so that in psychotic depressions, there are no M answers. In depressions in a schizophrenic setting, a few M's appear; in psychogenic depression, the number may remain rather large. More M's occur in hypomanics than manics, but in the hypomanic states of organic cases, there is little or no increase. Depressed and pedantic subjects are again found together, showing few or no M's. The results with epileptics are extraordinary. The most demented of them show the highest number of M answers, while cases in which the dementia has developed slowly over the course of many years, produce the least...... In organic cases, the results are identical with the normals; the poorer the forms, the fewer the M's...... The normal relation, i.e., the better the forms, the more M's, is entirely inverted in all cases in which there is mood disturbance. In elated or depressed moods of normals, in manic-depressive insanity, and in arterio-sclerotic depressions, the proportion reads, the better the form, the fewer the M's. The reverse of this is also true in these cases; the poorer the forms, the more M's. Epileptics show this inverse proportion also (Rorschach, 1942, pp. 26-27).

McReynolds (1951) presented 50 Rorschach concepts, half of which were scored plus and half scored minus according to Beck, to 214 Ss including normals and six groups of abnormals. Nineteen populars were included and for each plus concept with a given type of determinant there was a corresponding minus concept for that determinant. The subjects were required to judge whether each concept could or could not be representative of the indicated blot area. For all variables, the overall differences in means for the several groups was significant at the 0.01 level or better. The results implied that perception, at least in the area considered in this study, is related to personality.
Singer and Sugarman (1955) divided 60 hospitalized schizophrenic adult males into high- and low-M-producing groups. Their protocols for part of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) cards were rated in categories relating to the identity of parental figures and positive or negative characteristics ascribed to parents or to the atmosphere of the parent-child relationship. Results revealed that high-M Ss tended more frequently to identify older female figures as mother and generally ascribed either somewhat more positive or less negative characteristics to fathers or to interpersonal relationships between parents and children in these cards. The marked trend for these schizophrenic Ss to perceive mother figures as cold and rejecting and to ascribe negative characteristics generally to the parent-child relationships in their stories confirmed an earlier finding with another sample of patients. Despite this general assignment of negative traits to parental figures, the emergence of somewhat more positive parental characteristics in the stories of high-M Ss confirmed earlier results of Shatin that neurotic Ss with relatively numerous M tended to portray parental figures in TAT stories as benign or nurturant.

Mirin (1955) compared the quality of Ms of 30 hospitalized chronic schizophrenics to their role-taking behavior in an experimental interpersonal situation. It was found that the patients who give self-assertive Ms were unable to cooperate with the interlocutor in order to reconcile the discrepancy
between two stories. These Ss were rigid, unyielding, and independent in actions. Those schizophrenics who gave both self-assertive and compliant Ms were, in the beginning, rigid and independent. Toward the end of the experimental situation, however, they cooperated in order to accomplish the task. The majority of schizophrenics who did not give any M were self-assertive although some of them showed both self-assertive and compliant behavior. The findings suggested the generalization that the quality of M is directly reflected in the social role-taking behavior when the person is ego-involved in the social situation.

King (1960), in a study of 62 Paranoid Schizophrenics, some having interpersonal delusions and some having somatic delusions, found that those with interpersonal delusions produce more M than those with somatic delusions.

Hobart (1955) attempted to test the hypothesis that one of the variables determining the production of movement on the Rorschach is the individual's readiness to utilize projection as a defense mechanism. The criterion of projection used in the study was the manifestation either of hallucinations or delusions at the time of testing. The movement responses of a group of schizophrenic patients meeting this criterion were compared with the M responses of nonhallucinatory, nondelusional groups of schizophrenics. M responses of groups of normals, neurotics, Paranoid Schizophrenics, and nonparanoid schizophrenics were also compared. It was found that the hallucinatory-delusional group
produced significantly more M than the nonhallucinatory-nondelusional group. It was also found that Paranoid Schizophrenics produced significantly more M, FM, and m responses than nonparanoid schizophrenics. None of these groups, however, produced more movement responses than normals and neurotics. The results seemed to suggest a relationship between movement responses and the mechanism of projection. However, the movement responses on the Rorschach in terms of quantity alone are not sensitive enough indicators to differentiate groups in which projection is manifested to an extreme degree from groups in which this is not the primary mechanism of defense.

Friedman (1952), in a comparison of groups of Hebephrenic and Catatonic Schizophrenics with normals, found the schizophrenics to have less M than normals although this finding was apparently not significant. In a study by Rickers-Ovsiankina (1937-41), using 37 schizophrenics contrasted to 20 normals, it was found that in schizophrenic apperception there results an overemphasis on general and, at times, insignificant aspects. Schizophrenics give more whole responses than normals and these are often based on poor form. Large, normal details are relatively scarce and rare and small details are prominent. One conspicuous result of quality is a prevalence of color over M interpretations in schizophrenics. In normals, the two are equally represented. An analysis of content reveals considerable variety in width but a lack in depth. Outstanding is a characteristic dearth of ideas. In
individual cases, there is pertinent information with respect to particular content of patients’ preoccupation. Skalwelt was cited in Klopfer and Kelley (1946) as having studied 23 acute cases of schizophrenia with repeated Rorschach administration over a period of years. Only 21% of the cases showed any M at all and these, in most instances, gave only one.

Beck (1960), in discussing detection of paranoid ideation in the Rorschach test, states:

The principal themes are: hostility and activity of the eyes, especially if these recur. . . . When any of these activities, scoreable as fantasy (M in accordance with Rorschach’s criteria), are perceived as being in animals, the paranoid thinking is being screened. The patient is repressing the meaning of his idea more deeply, defending against his unhealthy defense. Whether such a repression is a relieving feature, a promising finding for treatability, depends again on the total mental health of the patient. . . . When the test record liberates signs of deeper regressions (M-, unique originals, personal themes) that are far from the known norms for the figure being attended to, the paranoid thought as structured in animal content is only more bad news.

The usually more repressed ideas, those in the deepest unconscious, are being released. Unconscious and conscious are too nearly a single stream. Among other paranoid themes are: the devil, religious ideas in which omnipotence is a motif, plotting, concealing, masks. While their probability of being of paranoid flavor is the stronger if produced as fantasy (M), any of these ideas may also emerge in nonfantasy determinants. More than one of these topics is likely to appear, and some will be of fantasy source. The very important, confirming finding in that of any paranoid patient must be sought in structured processes. These processes are manifest in the Rorschach test picture in the following triad: high Z score, unique F-responses, a high average to above average white space count. . . . When with the above triad the test record includes much fantasizing and especially fantasizing in which the percept is inaccurate (M-) we may look for delusional trends (Beck, 1960, pp. 216-217).
Experimental Manipulation of Instructions on the Rorschach

According to an article by Hutt and Shor (1946) in which rationally for routine testing of the limits is discussed, the spontaneous first level is typical of the ego-projective function of the person. The second and third levels give the ego-integrative function under various degrees of support and reorientation. The effects of therapy can be more accurately estimated by consideration of the quantity and quality of data elicited in the limits as compared with the preceding performance. Data obtained on the supportive level seems to indicate facets of personality immediately available for treatment. That obtained in the limits, however, indicates the present probable limits of treatment. A consideration of the special types of Rorschach factors obtained and especially the symbols significant for S as well as the nature of the resistance encountered is of importance. Values of Testing-the-Limits include the following: 1) It brings you closer to the resources of the personality. 2) One can see the person at work organizing on a range of stimuli when specifically requested. 3) One can challenge the subject to deal with something directly. 4) One gives the S the opportunity to express proof and explain choices. This is particularly rich because you can compare the subject's initial reaction with later reactions and also the defensive and integrative factors that may have been aroused.

According to Piotrowski (1957): "The most important condition for the validity of any component is that it be produced
spontaneously. If it is produced on request and by a deliberate and consciously controlled effort, the M cannot be considered valid" (Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 123-124).

In a study of normals by Fosberg (1938) in which he used four different types of instructions, "everything you see, best and worst impression, and looking for certain things, M, FM, etc.," there was found to be basically little variation in all four sets. He then concluded that under normal circumstances there is sufficient elasticity and stability under strong pressure of social ambitiousness so that the total personality is not influenced.

Norman, Liverant, and Redlo (1952), using normals, made an attempt to verify the hypothesis that an immediately preceding superficial set will not markedly influence the number and kind of responses to the Rorschach. Two such sets were used consisting of magazine advertisements as stimuli. One was a food set; the other a movement set. With 20 Ss, it was found that responses which might be expected to alter because of the nature of the "set" remained stable when compared to responses in a normal situation. (Only the free association stage was used.)

Allen and Dorsey (1954) reported testing 19 college students under standard Rorschach conditions and then requesting them to see a person or persons doing something with modified instructions. Total productivity decreased 50%. The human movement percepts increased significantly. This study highlights the continued need to focus on the interrelationship between tester
and testee and supports the hypothesis that the Rorschach test taps more permanent aspects of personality. Therefore it is not susceptible to suggestion unless suggestion has been assimilated into an individual system of values.

In a study by Hutt, Gibby, Milton, and Pottharst (1950) in which 92 college students were compared under standard and various experimental instructions (one of which included asking the S to tell everything he saw and to find as many human movement responses as he could), the M experimental groups shifted from a mean M score of 6.85 to 13.61, a gain of almost 100% in M. This difference in comparison with the control group was significant at the 0.01 level. Moreover, the increase in Ms did not occur as a result of cheap, hazy, or otherwise inferior Ms. They studied Ms in W, D, and Dd locations, M-plus and M-minus, Ms in H and Hd, centripetal and centrifugal Ms, and Ms in profiles. All the studies support the conclusions that Ss in this group were able to increase Ms with comparative ease. The increase was one in which good, healthy Ms were given. Moreover, there was no concomitant increase or decrease in other variables. Neither anxiety nor hostility was generated as a defense and finally there was no concomitant increase in Sum-C. The reliability of the M for the control group (N=21) in test-retest reliability yielded a rho of 0.66. It was concluded that instability on Rorschach variables suggests that the "normal" experimental population has the
capacity to shift. This conclusion would seem to have far reaching theoretical implications. Hutt et al. (1950) state:

> It is our belief that the healthy organism is sufficiently sensitive to variations in situations which confront him, and is sufficiently capable and adaptive to these variations, so as to be able to modify his response pattern to deal most effectively with them. A mature ego perceives "accurately" the field in which it is a part, and, in addition, then, has available a variety of integrated, or "ready-to-be-integrated," patterns with which to respond. Such an ego is highly differentiated, and hence highly perceptive. It is also integrative, that is, malleable and adaptive, but not integrated. The pathological ego is much more rigid in its defense system. It is either insensitive to variations in situational structure, because of unconscious ego needs, or is lacking in integrative capacity, because it has failed to develop a working interrelationship in its separate patterns, or both (Hutt et al., 1950, pp. 185-186).

Thus Rorschach's original hypothesis which states that Ss who consciously wish to produce movement responses will produce hazy interpretations, that introversive and extraversive features are not acquired but are inherent primary qualities of the constitution, and proportion of M and C varies little was not confirmed for normals in this study. However, it may be substantiated for abnormalities. Many clinical validations studies point to such a probability. If this is the case, a measure of capacity to shift on the Rorschach can become an important differentiating criterion of mental health. The more pathological the subject the lower would be the score in capacity to shift. At the same time, this would mean that prediction from the Rorschach is much more complex than generally recognized. It would also seem that the less
pathological the Rorschach record the less valid is the simple, unrefined Rorschach psychogram when taken at face value.

Lord (1950) reports a study of situational stimuli in which 36 college males were given Rorschachs at 4-6 week intervals, each by a different examiner. Administrations were standard, negative, and positive. Positive administrations were warm and appreciative and negative ones were harsh and rejecting. Of the 23 Rorschach elements subjected to statistical analysis, only three were relatively unaffected by extra-test or "situational" stimuli. Thus the hypothesis of stability does not hold. Stability, as a function of individual differences reflected in the M:Sum-C ratio, proved, as predicted, to isolate approximately 30% of the cases. Also fulfilled was the prediction that of the more stable personality records, those of the M-type of individuals would show more situational stability than the records of the C-type persons. Thirty-nine percent of the Ss retained a stable experience type throughout the experiment. Approximately three-fourths of these were M-typed personalities and one-fourth C-type.

The increase in movement responses (M and FM) on the positive administrations occurred as predicted. Both scoring categories achieved their highest mean with the positive administration. The lowest mean frequency on FM occurred as predicted. It was found that this lowest mean frequency on FM occurred with the negative administration; on M with the neutral administration.
Barron (1951) used 155 superior adults to study the constancy with which adults envisaged human movement percepts in inkblot responses in three group-test situations. First, eight achromatic blots which evoked M to varying degrees, the M-Limits Blots, second, the usual group Rorschach, and third, the testing the limits for M, Limits Phase, were given. In the latter phase, the Ss were asked to give their very first response to the whole of each blot. Cards IV and VIII of the M-Limits Blots and I and III of the Rorschach served to divide the group significantly with respect to coarctiveness in the projection of human movement. The Limits Phase provided an opportunity to study features that were associated with the apparent repression of human movement. Chief among such features were: failure to see M in any one or more of the most M evocative blots of both series, seeing FM or movement other than human where M is ordinarily seen, and oligophrenic details. The main objective in testing the limits for M is the determination of the action of the repressive forces in these areas. The findings of this experiment indicate how this objective may be achieved by a proper analysis of movement percepts in the performance proper and of the responses to the M-Limits Blots. Thus the disadvantages of the usual limits procedure may seem obvious.

Miner (1956), in an attempt to establish a relationship between perception of empathic motion and personality characteristics, presented ten pictures suggestive of motion
tachiscopically to a group of undergraduate students. The TAT was then administered to the extreme groups. The major difference between the high- and low-motion perceivers occurred in dealing with the future. While the high-M group exhibited great freedom in treating conditions in the future, the low-M group seemed to be inhibited in this respect. In addition, the low-M group was found to be more preoccupied with the death and sickness of loved ones, more frequently described parents as domineering and rejecting, and less frequently attributed love and understanding to the parents. These characteristics suggest the theory that movement in the present situation and possibly in the Rorschach is a function of freedom in making a bet on the future and that inhibition in this respect leads to inhibition of motion responses. The fact that a motion response involves a commitment as to the future state of the perceived object seems to be consistent with this interpretation. Furthermore, the preoccupation with the death and sickness of loved ones as well as with rejecting parents among the low-M group suggests a basis in insecurity and anxiety for their inhibition in dealing with the future and in the perception of motion. The high-M group, on the one hand, with its greater freedom in dealing with the future seemed to have no difficulty in ascribing motion to stationary stimuli. This suggests that they may possess one of the important characteristics required for creative work—the ability to visualize in the present an outline of what the completed productivity will be
like in the future. Such capacity seems to be lacking in the low empathic movement group.

Summary of Literature Reviewed Including Evaluation and Relation to This Study

First, a general discussion of the M response has been presented. This discussion included a description of its value in that it taps primary thinking, a controversy over whether high-M producers tend to inhibit motor behavior in preference for fantasy and related experiments suggesting that M responses increase with motor inhibition and inhibition of overt expression of induced affect. Studies suggesting that high-M producers may have characteristics thought valuable for improvement in psychotherapy were cited. These characteristics included a greater tendency to recognize problems as involving disturbances in interpersonal relationships. They were also considered more intelligent, inventive, and introspective. A study in which M was not seen to be related to stable characteristics in most subjects was discussed as this was in contrast to a statement by Rorschach in which he believed that the M must be present as a definite tendency in the personality.

The significance of the M response as related to different types of psychopathology was next discussed beginning with Rorschach's statement about quantity of M in the different pathological types. In more recent studies of schizophrenia, it was found that high-M producers usually described interpersonal
relationships involving parents and children, on the TAT, as being more positive than low-M producers. It was also found that those schizophrenics who gave self-assertive Ms were unable to cooperate in an experimental situation while those giving compliant Ms were. The latter illustrated that the quality of M is directly reflected in social role-taking behavior. Another cited study indicated that those Paranoid Schizophrenics having interpersonal delusions produce more M than those having somatic delusions. It was also found that Paranoid Schizophrenics produce more M, FM, and m responses than nonparanoid schizophrenics. Other cited studies included the findings that schizophrenics produce fewer M than normals. They give more general and sometimes insignificant aspects of the blots and there seems to be a prevalence of color over M whereas in normals the two are equally represented. A discussion by Beck was mentioned in which he states that qualitative detection of paranoid ideation on the Rorschach is said to be shown mainly by the recurrence of hostility and activity of the eyes.

Finally, a discussion of experimental manipulation of instructions on the Rorschach was presented. The value of testing the limits for predicting the effects of psychotherapy was felt to be, according to two authors, that the first level of testing the limits is typical of the ego-projective function of the individual. The second and third levels give the ego-integrative function under various degrees of support. Thus the quantity and quality of the data in the limits can be compared with the preceding
performance. In contrast to this, another author stated that if M is produced by conscious, controlled effort it can't be considered valid. In various experimental manipulations of instructions with normals, it was shown that the total personality is not influenced by these variations. This finding supports Rorschach's belief that introversive and extravertive characteristics are not acquired but are inherent, primary qualities. However, other studies of normals showed that Rorschach variables were affected by situational stimuli. These findings indicate that normals may have the capacity to shift on Rorschach variables although it was suggested that the abnormal population may not.

While the general discussion of the M response was mainly theoretical, the cited studies are only suggestive of certain characteristics correlated with M and are not strongly validated. Whether or not the M represents stable characteristics was inconclusive from the studies presented. Rorschach's statements about various pathological types and quantity of M produced for each would seem logical though not validated. According to the studies mentioned, there are certain characteristics of schizophrenia reflected in the M which seem suggestive. However, not enough studies or large enough samples were used to strongly support these findings. Theoretically, according to the studies mentioned, M would seem to have value as an aid to predicting improvement in psychotherapy.
Therefore, in relation to this study, it can be said that theoretically the M is of value in that it taps primary process thinking. Certain characteristics of schizophrenic M responses (the majority of subjects used in this study were schizophrenics) mentioned in the cited studies may be useful for qualitative study of the content of the M responses of these patients. It was suggested by some authors that the M is of value in predicting outcome in psychotherapy. The practical situation in which psychologists are often asked to give this prediction was part of the reason this study was done. Another justification for this study was that, according to some authors, the first level of the limits represents ego-projective function and the second and third levels represent ego-integrative function under various conditions of support. This discussion lent support to the viewpoint that testing the limits is of value in predicting the effects of psychotherapy. The original hypothesis was based on the premise that the limits phase, with emphasis on the M response, was of value for predicting results in psychotherapy. From there a modification of the standard method was used with the idea that it would be more effective in eliciting M.
Chapter III

Experimental Procedure

Table 1 presents the matched characteristics of the control and experimental groups, each consisting of 15 patients.

Table 1

Matched Characteristics of Control and Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>32.67 yrs.</td>
<td>33.20 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average educational level</td>
<td>9.47 yrs.</td>
<td>9.87 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of hospitalization</td>
<td>1.78 mos.</td>
<td>1.19 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1.00 Student</td>
<td>1.00 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 Artist</td>
<td>14.00 Unskilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00 Unskilled</td>
<td>labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>8.00 Males</td>
<td>8.00 Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 Females</td>
<td>7.00 Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>6.00 Negroes</td>
<td>6.00 Negroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00 Whites</td>
<td>9.00 Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>5.00 Single</td>
<td>4.00 Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 Separated or</td>
<td>5.00 Separated or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or divorced</td>
<td>or divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 Married</td>
<td>3.00 Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>13.00 Schizophrenic</td>
<td>11.00 Schizophrenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reactions</td>
<td>reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 Paranoid</td>
<td>3.00 Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychotic reaction</td>
<td>disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 Chronic brain</td>
<td>1.00 Acute drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>syndrome psychosis</td>
<td>intoxication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two groups were matched in pairs in so far as possible in age, education, diagnosis, socioeconomic status, sex, race, marital status, and length of hospitalization. Diagnoses used were those given by staff psychiatrists at a staff conference. The matching of the two groups was subject to the patient population in Marion County General Hospital during the time that the testing was done. This time period extended over about two months.

Each patient was approached initially on the ward with the statement, "I am a psychologist and I would like to have you take some psychological tests." If the patient consented, he was taken to a private office outside the ward for the testing. After the testing was over, he was taken back to the ward. Part of the subjects in this study had been referred for psychological testing by one of the psychiatric residents or interns. If this was the case, the Rorschach and experimental or control limits phase was administered before any other tests. The rest of the subjects were chosen from the psychiatric ward and the Rorschach was the only test given. Testing was done during a psychology internship at Indiana University Medical Center.

The Rorschach test was administered to each patient according to standard Klopfer procedure. Both the experimental and control methods of testing the limits involve proceeding at different levels from general to specific delimitation of M. When the specific M which was being delimited for each card was obtained, the E stopped testing the limits for M for that particular card.
regardless of the level on which it occurred. All responses were recorded on all levels for both groups. Immediately following the Inquiry, these two methods of testing the limits for M were used:

Group 1 (Experimental)

Level 1. Review of responses given by that subject for that card followed by the question, "Now that you look at the card again are you reminded of anything else?"

Level 2. Independent Variable Presentation of picture depicting human being in motion with the question, "What is happening in this picture?" The picture was then removed and the Rorschach card was presented. The question, "What might this be?" was then asked about the Rorschach card.

Level 3. E outlined with finger the specific area in the Rorschach card where the M depicted in the picture was located saying, "What does this part remind you of?"

Level 4. E asked, "How about a ________?" (stating the specific person depicted in the picture—a woman, two men, etc., with the action or human posture—raising hands, playing instruments, etc.)

Level 5. E states, "Here are the ________, ________, and ________." (pointing out specific parts of the person and the action attributed to the person.)

Group 2 (Control)

Level 1. Same as for Group 1

Level 2. The independent variable (the picture) was not given to the control group. However, the Rorschach card was again presented with the question, "What might this be?"

Level 3. Same as for Group 1

Level 4. Same as for Group 1

Level 5. Same as for Group 1
Immediately following this phase of testing the limits, the testing of the limits for populars was administered to all subjects in both groups.

The pictures were chosen to depict commonly perceived M responses on the Rorschach cards when this was possible. In several cases, the M depicted is considered a popular or almost popular response. Table 2 gives norms for content of frequent M according to Phillips and Smith (1956). The size of the sample used for these norms was not stated specifically. In other cards where there was no commonly perceived M, an M was arbitrarily chosen by the author in a D or d area. All photographs were in black and white, five by four inches in size, glued on white cards approximately nine and one-half by six and one-half inches in size. The size of the cards was the same as the standard Rorschach cards. All pictures except 4 and 10 were taken from Steichen, E. The Family of Man. New York: published for the Museum of Modern Art by Maco Magazine Corporation, 1955. Picture 4 was taken from H. R. Luce (Ed.) Life. Chicago: Time Inc., November 17, 1961, p. 196. Picture 10 was taken from G. Cowles (Ed.) Look. Des Moines, Iowa: Cowles Magazines and Broadcasting Inc., November 7, 1961, p. 39.
Table 2

Normative Data for Frequent M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in order of frequency with which M is elicited</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Universal</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III, D 1</td>
<td>(1) male</td>
<td>(2) &quot;looking at&quot; or &quot;facing each other&quot;</td>
<td>(1) &quot;lifting&quot;</td>
<td>(4) &quot;warming hands&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) neuter</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) &quot;pulling&quot;</td>
<td>(5) &quot;bowing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, W (D 1)</td>
<td>(1) neuter</td>
<td>(1) &quot;dancing&quot;</td>
<td>(2) &quot;patting hands&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;playing patty-cake&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, W (or D 2)</td>
<td>(1) female</td>
<td>(1) &quot;dancing&quot;</td>
<td>(2) &quot;talking&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;arguing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) neuter</td>
<td>(3) &quot;facing&quot; or &quot;looking at each other&quot;</td>
<td>(4) &quot;gossiping&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;balancing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX, D 3</td>
<td>(1) female</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) neuter</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, D 4</td>
<td>(1) male</td>
<td>(2) &quot;standing&quot;</td>
<td>(1) &quot;hands up&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;arms raised&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X, D 9</td>
<td>none common</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>(1) mouth functions e.g. &quot;smoking&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;blowing&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—(Phillips & Smith, 1956, p. 66)
Chapter IV

Results

The significance of the difference between changes, shown by two groups for the situation involving paired persons, using the small sample, t test, was tested. The mean change for \( M \), experimental group, Response Proper minus Limits minus the control group, Response Proper minus Limits yielded an obtained \( t \) of 0.98. The difference between correlated means using a small sample was then tested with the \( t \) test. The difference between means for \( M \), experimental-group Limits minus the control-group Limits yielded an obtained \( t \) of -0.98. The \( t \) required for significance at the 0.05 level, using a one-tailed test since direction of change was predicted, for both the differences between changes and the difference between means was 1.76. Therefore, both of the experimental hypotheses had to be rejected. Confidence limits for the population mean at the .01 level of confidence were established for each obtained sample mean. The 0.99 level was chosen since according to McNemar (1955), "If we wish to be surer of our inferences, we might choose the .99 level of confidence, which in practice can be attained by taking \( M \pm 2.586_M \) as limits." (McNemar, 1955, p.98). Thus this chosen level of confidence (.01) seemed to be a surer method of establishing that the inferences that the obtained means did, in fact, fall within the range which includes the population means than the .05 level.
would. Table 3 gives the four obtained means, estimates of the standard error of each mean, and the confidence limits for each mean.

Table 3

Means for Number of M Responses, Estimates of the Standard Error of the Means, and Confidence Limits for Each Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Obtained Mean for M Responses</th>
<th>Estimate of Standard Error of the Mean</th>
<th>Confidence Limits for Mean (P=.01 level of confidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Group (N=15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Proper</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.48--0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-0.63--5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group (N=15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Proper</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.69--1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.66--6.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this study, it was concluded that the method of testing the limits for M using pictures of human beings in motion was not significantly more effective in eliciting quantity of M than the standard method of testing the limits according to Klopfer. This conclusion was based on the following findings: The mean change from the Response Proper to the Limits Phase comparing both
experimental and control groups on number of M revealed no significant difference between the two groups. When the mean number of M in the Limits Phase in the experimental group was compared with the mean number of M in this phase for the control group, there was also no significant difference when using the t test.

Content of M was compared in the Response Proper and Inquiry with the Limits Phase for both groups. Table 4 gives the content for the Response Proper and Inquiry for the experimental group. Table 5 gives the content for the Limits Phase for the experimental group. Table 6 gives the content for the Response Proper and Inquiry for the control group. Table 7 gives the content for the Limits Phase for the control group. In the experimental group, the content appeared to be more hostile and aggressive in the Response Proper than in the Limits Phase. Examples of this hostile content include, "choking", "mashing on the head", and "cannibals at the fire". In the Limits Phase for the experimental group, there were only seven instances of the Ss spontaneously giving the M response suggested by the picture without prompting from the examiner. In the control group, the content for the Response Proper was seemingly more bizarre than in the Limits Phase. Examples of this bizarre content are, "a split personality--pulling away", "they're shoving in at each other--really one person, two people pushing in at him--mother and brother, me in the middle". Only one response was given at level 2 (comparable to the experimental level) in the control group while
four were given at this level in the experimental group immediately after seeing the pictures. Only M responses have been included in this discussion of content. There did not seem to be any marked difference in content when comparing experimental and control groups in both phases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It's sort of like someone choking you with their hands (the person being choked is not there)</td>
<td>Two people sort of bended over, holding something</td>
<td>Two men mashing on a head</td>
<td>Two men standing there, shaking hands</td>
<td>Two people holding something, facing each other</td>
<td>Two cannibals at the fire, trying to get their hands warm</td>
<td>Two angels smiling at each other</td>
<td>Two little children facing each other, holding something in the middle</td>
<td>Two men standing, holding something in their hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Experimental Group M Content in Response Proper and Inquiry
(For each M response given at the first level good form was used)
Table 5
Experimental Group M Content in Testing the Limits
(For each M response given at the first level good form was used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Could be</td>
<td>Could be a</td>
<td>ballerina</td>
<td>dancer with</td>
<td>arms stretch-</td>
<td>ed out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code> | children    | or people    | playing a    | game         |              |             |             |             |             |              |
</code></pre>
<p>| 2     | Two men     | supporting  | something    |              |              |             |             |             |             |              |
| playing     | playing      | musical in-  |              |              |             |             |             |             |              |
| musical      | instruments  |              |              |              |             |             |             |             |              |</p>

(Table continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two people, heads here, facing away, backs here</td>
<td>Two girls talking to each other</td>
<td>Could be a man thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The entries in the table represent counts or descriptions of something, possibly related to visual observations or data collection.
Table 6
Control Group M Content in Response Proper and Inquiry
(For each M response given at the first level good form was used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>(Additional response given in the inquiry)</td>
<td>Two people</td>
<td>Two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holding a</td>
<td>holding a child's hand</td>
<td>dancing</td>
<td>different kinds of persons standing,</td>
<td>pushing in at him--mother and brother--me in the middle</td>
<td>looking at each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child's hand</td>
<td>Two Moslems, talking, holding</td>
<td>Two Moslems, talking, holding</td>
<td>looking at each other, holding on to something</td>
<td>two people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>hands</td>
<td>A split personality pulling away--two people pulling at one another--it's really the same person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dancers--jitterbug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two people bending over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1 2 4 2 1
### Table 7

Control Group M Content in Testing the Limits

(For each M response given at the first level good form was used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Card</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shape of making love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>woman's legs--standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could be two people laying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter V

Summary and Conclusions

Literature was reviewed which included a general discussion of the Rorschach and M response, material relating to M and pathological types with emphasis on schizophrenia (since the majority of subjects in this study were schizophrenics), and finally a review of studies in which experimental instructions were manipulated with the Rorschach. Generally speaking, the studies presented were inconclusive. However, from the review of the literature, a theoretical basis could be found for the assumptions underlying this study, according to certain authors. These assumptions, supported by some writers mentioned in the review of the literature, are: The presence of M in a Rorschach record can be used to predict success in psychotherapy. The Limits Phase is also useful for predicting such success since the first level is said to indicate the ego-projective functions and the second and third levels the ego-integrative functions under various degrees of support.

The purpose of this study was to test the hypothesis that showing pictures of human beings in motion in the Limits Phase of the Rorschach would elicit more M responses than the standard method of testing the limits according to Klopfer. Two groups of 15 hospitalized psychiatric patients were used. These groups consisted of matched pairs according to age, educational level,
sex, race, length of hospitalization, marital status, socioeconomic group, and diagnosis, in so far as possible.

The t test did not reveal a significant mean change from the Response Proper and Inquiry to the Limits Phase between these two groups. The t test was also not significant when comparing the mean number of M responses in the Limits Phase for both groups. This study, then, suggests that the method of using pictures of human beings in motion is no more effective in eliciting number of M from psychiatric patients than the standard method of testing the limits according to Klopfer.

Examination of content reveals more apparently hostile and aggressive content in the experimental group and more apparently bizarre content in the control group for the response proper and inquiry as compared to the limits phase. The latter phase seemed to consist of more conventional and socially acceptable content for both groups than the earlier phases. This finding suggests that, as mentioned in the cited literature, perhaps under the social pressure of testing the limits defenses are used to a greater degree. The limits phase may then represent the ego-integrative functions whereas the relatively unstructured free-association phase, Response Proper, represents the ego-projective function, at least from this particular sample.

The fact that the experimental method of testing the limits used in this study was no more effective in eliciting number of M than the standard method may be explained theoretically by
either of two writers mentioned in the review of the literature. One explanation cited is that the M do represent stable characteristics of the personality which cannot be changed by situational manipulations in giving the Rorschach. This belief was expressed by Rorschach himself. Another possible explanation, mentioned previously but contradictory to the first explanation to some degree, is that flexibility in approach to determinants such as M is an integral part of normal, healthy perceptual processes. However, the inability to shift perceptions and determinants, even under pressure, may be representative of emotionally disturbed patients. Both of these explanations are merely speculations as to why the experimental hypotheses were not confirmed.
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