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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

It is generally assumed that feelings of fear may be somewhat alleviated by an understanding of the feared object or situation. It would follow that the ability to erect a defense, such as acquiring feelings of some degree of adequacy in confronting that which is feared, even if it cannot actually be coped with, is valuable in fear and anxiety reduction. Cameron(l, p. 147) implies that anxiety develops as the individual feels unable to deal with a situation.

We designate as anxiety the predominantly covert skeletal and visceral reaction which, for an unhampered and uninhibited person, constitutes the normal preliminary phase of emotional flight, but which for some reason is prevented from going on into its consummatory phase.

Thus, in fear reactions, the consummatory phase is carried out, whereas this phase has been interfered with, in the anxiety reaction. In the case of persons awaiting trial, anxiety would mount and it might be expected that repeat offenders would experience less intense anxiety while being held than would first offenders.

Just how effective prior experience would be in educating the repeater as to how to cope with the series of events constituting apprehension, trial and imprisonment
is not precisely known. Sutherland and Cressey(3) say that some prisoners accept imprisonment philosophically, as a calculated risk. Repeaters have found that they may sometimes "make deals", such as pleading guilty to a less serious charge in return for a reduced sentence. They have learned that certain considerations may be obtained for turning state's evidence. Promising to restrict their activities to a district outside that in which they had been operating may have served to gain leniency. Hence, their long experience in running afoul of the law could have taught them many ways of obtaining special considerations.

There are other ways in which the repeat offender would more easily accept his situation. Jail routine, its sights, sounds and smells, the special language, the "characters", all would have become familiar to these habituals. They would have learned how to get along best with guards and jail personnel. Important lessons in self-survival would have been learned in dealings with other prisoners.

First offenders would be in a very impressionistic condition. Just as knowledge of what might be expected would serve to bolster the feelings of the repeater, a lack of such knowledge would serve to induce more anxiety in the first offender. He would feel more keenly the loss of prestige that is brought on by being in jail, and it is likely that his self-esteem would be lowered. In the popular terminology, he would be less the "hardened criminal".
The overt signs of anxiety would be suppressed, in many, and these would affect bravado. It was also recognized that others would actually manifest outward signs of anxiety. Some were likely to have been anxiety-ridden even before arrest. This might have constituted a part of a syndrome which drove these individuals to a series of acts eventually leading to apprehension by the police. In order to study deeper lying anxiety as well as that aroused by the stressful situation, an instrument would need to be used which employed a projective technique.

Statement of the Problem

This study was concerned with an evaluation of anxiety levels in jailees awaiting trial in a county jail. Detecting anxiety which had been overtly controlled, and apparently hidden called for the use of a projective technique. Such an instrument would have the additional advantage of minimizing the effect of the observer upon the observed.

The Rorschach Ink Blot Test had been used by Schwartz and Kates(2) to study the influence of psychological stress upon the responses elicited in groups of high and low anxiety subjects as defined by the Taylor Anxiety Scale(4). The study had been conducted under experimental conditions in college, wherein artificial stress conditions had been set up. It was expected that the stress imposed by arrest and imprisonment would induce a situational anxiety which was likely to be even more readily detected. The problem
consisted of selecting certain Rorschach anxiety indicators, then administering the Rorschach to the prisoners chosen, and then inspecting the summaries for significant differences between the first offender group and the recidivists.

Need for the Study

The Rorschach Ink Blot Test is a tool for research in the hands of the psychologist only when the results are made a part of a permanent record available to others. This research must include gathering of data from the field as well as in the laboratory, library and clinic. Many areas must be tapped in natural settings, permitting behavior observations on the spot. The logical follow-up to sampling and theorization in the laboratory has traditionally been application to field situations. One need for such a study as this is that of adding to the body of research already begun in applying the Rorschach to stressful situations.

A second consideration arises with respect to the rapidly increasing scope of criminology. If classification of prisoners is ever to be able to accomplish more than mere separation of the sexes, or categorizing according to types of crime, it must be designed to effect understanding of attitudes and concomitant behavior expectations. One of the attitude determinants likely to be viewed as of extreme importance is anxiety. A comprehensive classification system would require measurement of anxiety levels. Especially
valuable would be some sort of measurement of situationally-induced anxiety. Some of the circumstances which might arise during a term of imprisonment could be more fully understood by use of a valid diagnostic aid for recognizing this anxiety. Applications of such an instrument might include aid in determining readiness for parole, evaluation of the appropriateness of various forms of therapy, aid in discovery of good trusty risks, and progress in the individual's socialization within the prison.

Procedure

The Rorschach was administered to fifteen jailees being held for the first time, and to fifteen repeat offenders or recidivists. Because of the constantly changing membership of these groups, the number subject to sampling was limited. This made it necessary to select testees on the basis of availability rather than on that of randomness in the strict sense. The thirty protocols were obtained during a period of several months.

All Rorschach responses were classified according to the Beck method of scoring. Rationale for the thirty selected signs appears in Chapter IV. Summary sheets were prepared, and the number of anxiety signs for each group were counted. The t-test for significance was applied to these frequencies.
Hypotheses

The first hypothesis was an extension of those advanced by other investigators who have compared anxiety levels in stressful situations. It stated that the Rorschach Ink Blot Test cannot be successfully used to differentiate between situationally aroused anxiety levels.

The second hypothesis was more specifically related to the conditions of the study. It stated that imprisoned persons awaiting trial for the first time would not respond with more Rorschach signs of anxiety than would recidivists under similar circumstances ("Recidivists" and "repeat offenders" were synonymously applied).
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CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES AND BACKGROUND

The term "anxiety" is usually so broadly interpreted that its referent becomes rather ill-defined, often spilling over into another equally poorly differentiated area. "Fear" and "anxiety" are still used quite commonly as synonymous. However, the recent trend is toward a distinction between the use of these words, with agreement that fear is more focalized than anxiety.

Fear has been described as a reaction to a specific danger, or as object-attached. If it is so defined, then anxiety may then be characterized as a feeling of diffuseness and uncertainty and the experience of helplessness toward the perceived threat, i.e., not object-attached. But Carpenter(2) has pointed out that definition is merely for the purpose of establishing a common guidepost for investigation and in itself cannot adequately describe an event or object. A definition is merely an abstraction which focuses upon points of saliency within the definer's frame of reference at the time of defining, and it must necessarily omit more than it explains. Explanatory fictions sound plausible upon superficial examination, but closer inspection reveals that they add nothing to the fund of knowledge.
In connection with anxiety, Carpenter(2, p. 3) analyzes the statement "Emotional behavior that does not promote efficient adjustment is the result of anxiety". In order to determine whether anxiety is present, a form of behavior would be noted, such as inefficient emotional activity. But if "emotional behavior" is substituted in our statement for "Anxiety", the statement becomes: "Emotional behavior that does not promote efficient adjustment is the result of inefficient emotional behavior". This alone provides very little useful information about what is meant by anxiety. There is a need for further explanation.

May(3) says that anxiety is not a single simple state, but it may be described as having various aspects. One aspect of this state is of primary interest in the present study. It is a situational or reactive, peripheral, justified kind of anxiety. It can be alleviated somewhat by a foreknowledge of future situations. This situational anxiety is somewhat similar to Horney's(6) "fear". It may also be seen as a conversion from a fear response to punishment and deprivation. When fear is no longer a reaction to a definitely known immediate threat, but is referred to the future, it becomes that diffused state called "anxiety". However, when anxiety is attached to no apparent external threat, or is aroused over possible loss of self control, or is generated by long-circuiting of any goal satisfaction courses, it may be referred to as inherent or central anxiety. It is more dependent
on the individual personality than it is upon the external situation.

Some studies of anxiety, such as those of Schwartz and Kates (6) have been designed after the nature of a controlled experiment. This permits more careful population choice and selection of conditions and units of observation. Independent variables may be introduced and effects observed in the traditional fashion. It may be objected that there are distorting effects injected when laboratory conditions are imposed upon field conditions. Skinner (7), a proponent of reinforcement theory, would break anxiety down into the simplest units that might be manipulated and observed. His behavioristic approach would require that inference be reduced to a minimum and a premium placed upon the "facts", as observed in the antecedents and consequences of behavioral configurations.

Yet there is a need for observation in the field, in which stresses are not intentionally induced in a controlled manner, but arise as elements of the life situation. May (3) studied persons in a crisis situation, i.e., patients in a shelter for unwed mothers. Presence of examiner, degree of rapport, the means of observation used, and the segment of behavior sampled (i.e., with respect to the time of sampling and its position in the chain of life events) may affect accuracy of data gathering. It is felt that laboratory
techniques, however, have not yet been perfected sufficiently for such atomistic observation.

The present study was an attempt to observe effects of situational stress upon individual perception of the situation as anxiety producing. Presumably, an anxiety state develops which is situational in that it is attached to the entire complex of trial, possible sentencing, and imprisonment. Values held by the prisoner as essential to his worth and prestige as a personality are threatened. Thus, he is not merely afraid, as of an object, but suffers a devaluation, a feeling of helplessness and inadequacy to meet a series of events in his immediate future. Thus, a situational anxiety is expected to be present in most prisoners.

Valuable as data accumulated via field research may be, this kind of study is even more subject to errors interposed by the measuring instrument than is laboratory research. Selection of an instrument that will prove reasonably reliable and valid is important. It should not be either transparent or perceived as threatening by the subject. Innocence of instrument should be combined with relevancy of data gathered.

If first offenders are likely to sustain a higher level of situational anxiety than recidivists, how may it be possible to determine degrees or levels of this induced anxiety? May(8) says that "In anxiety the individual is proportionately less able to see himself in relation to
stimuli and hence less able to make adequate evaluation of the stimuli". This constriction of perception is extended to test situations in general and to The Rorschach Ink Blot Test in particular. The Rorschach is well adapted to those aspects of clinical examination wherein the patient exposes processes of which he is unaware. Coleman(3) suggests not only that degrees of anxiety exist, but that the level reached is a function of the person's evaluation of severity of threat, and that this evaluation may not be a conscious process. For these reasons, the Rorschach may be a valuable instrument as a means of gathering data about anxiety levels in the two prison populations described.

Practical limitations prevented the use of an additional testing instrument, such as the Taylor Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety. There is little advantage in utilizing an instrument as a criterion, if that instrument itself has such questionable validity as the Taylor Scale. This questionnaire is subject to the criticism presented by May(8):

The subject can protect himself from the overwhelming effects of anxiety only by trying to persuade himself that he is not afraid! Small wonder, then, that check-lists on which the subject reports conscious data about his "anxieties" are of such indifferent value.

The Taylor Scale is just such a check-list, abstracted from The Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory. Another reason for not applying a different testing criterion was
that it was not at all feasible under the conditions imposed. Taking even the Rorschach records was not an easy accomplishment.

The efficacy of the Rorschach in clinical diagnosis is still largely a function of the skill of an examiner. Yet, sufficient studies have been conducted in connection with anxiety that certain classical "signs" or indicators of anxiety have been widely accepted. Most of these are based on the rationale that anxiety acts as a constrictor of mental functioning. For example, Schwartz and Kates(6) found that W, F, m and ShF(Y nuances) changed significantly as a result of stress. W was restricted, F, m and RT increased, shading responses were increased, along with more card rejections. These examiners did not note one of the usually accepted effects of constriction, however, viz. a high percentage of popular responses. That shrinking of awareness that is characterized by constriction is accompanied by stereotypy, and stereotypy is exemplified by high production of those responses which are popular.

Haimowitz(5) listed the "Customary Signs of Anxiety":

M in Hd
Hd plus Ad equal to or greater than H plus A
Dd ten percent or more
Adx or Hdx
Y or combinations of it
Y-shock
High percentage of Hd
High percentage of Ad, An, and Sex
Qualitative analysis (by the subject)

Beck(1) says that ten percent Dd is in the normal range.
Phillips and Smith(10) describe the "guarded" record, and they note that the criteria for guardedness are the classical Rorschach signs of anxiety:

- R below expectancy
- F% beyond expectancy, i.e., few determinants other than form
- P% beyond expectancy
- F-plus beyond expectancy
- Elaboration below expectancy

(Notice that elaboration and qualification are not synonymous. Qualification is elaboration of a sort which reveals the individual's doubting of the adequacy of his own responses. It may ask for the examiner's support of the blot interpretation in a subtle way. Elaboration per se is merely an extended explanation of a response.) They not only base their scoring system on that of Beck, but they include those anxiety signs discussed by Beck and others. Because they provide rationale for at least thirty anxiety indicators which include virtually all those discussed by other Rorschach researchers, Phillips and Smith were used as guides for the present study. Their interpretations are based more on observables than on inferences, so that they are not so subject to the circular, closed-system type of reasoning mentioned previously. No analysis fulfills its critical function unless the negative aspects are also considered. The Rorschach has been criticized, often rather severely. In their paper concerned with effects
of stress on human behavior, Funkenstein et al. (4, p. 264)
tried the Rorschach and found it wanting:

The Rorschach, included because of its common usage as a personality test, proved disappointing in its contribution to our understanding of stress reactions. This may possibly have been due to the use which was made of the test results rather than the test itself, for, in most of the analysis, comparisons were made between the stress groups on the basis of the standard Rorschach scores. Had it been made by an intensive interpretation of each protocol we might have shown differences between the stress groups. However, inasmuch as interpretation depends partly on a consideration of the scoring categories, where there were no striking differences between the groups, it is not clear whether an exhaustive qualitative analysis would have been helpful.
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CHAPTER III

GATHERING THE DATA

Selection of a randomly distributed population was complicated at first by frequent reassignments, with prisoners being moved to other jails or prisons, being released on bail, being moved to sick bay, etc. While a man might be a test prospect one day, he might not be one on the following day. Whenever possible, the officer in charge of the identification office examined the files, searching out the cards of new arrivals, to find test prospects. However, many selections were made by a trusty who canvassed the floors for those who would volunteer for testing. (This again upset the randomness of sampling, of course.) It was necessary to convince jail personnel that the examiner was not interested in merely testing "odd-balls", "goofs", and "crackpots".

Physical arrangements for testing were usually good, though on some occasions it was necessary to vacate the examining room to make way for a lawyer-client conference. Once, the top of a large rubbish can was used for a desk. Again, one test was completed while both examiner and prisoner sat on a corridor floor. A few records were taken while examiner and examinee sat on a bench in an area accessible to several other prisoners. Whenever prisoners
gathered about to kibitz, a solicitous trusty moved them out of earshot.

All responses were first written verbatim, with little loss of side comments. Scoring followed Beck, because of the convenience of the form tables. There may have been some differences in F-plus %, since Phillips and Smith have added a scoring guide for assigning plus or minus to those responses which Beck merely scores F. M was scored if noted during free association, though in some cases, when inquiry seemed to reveal M as explanation of the original percept, not merely afterthought or extensions, it was also scored as M.

Little or no attempt was made at full diagnosis, in the usually accepted sense. That some prisoners might have been diagnosed as at least borderline cases of abnormality, was not expected to distort comparisons. Phillips(1, p. 184) says

We have seen that guarded records tend to look very much alike regardless of the diagnostic and personality groups from which they are obtained... guardedness appears to take precedence over all personality variables.

Another factor which might have distorted the data was that it was carried out over a period of about six months. Thus, the population sampled was an ever-changing one. The types of crimes furnishing samples might vary, for example, as the weather varied. Crimes against property as opposed to crimes against person increase proportionately during cold weather(2).
Subjects were assured that interviews would have no bearing on pending trials. However, the overly suspicious may not have accepted this at face value. This factor, if a disturbing one, was likely to have decreased in importance throughout the weeks of testing, since the word spread rapidly that an erstwhile "Doc" was merely working on a study.

Neuropsychological disabilities were likely to have produced many of the constricted, immature responses. While this consideration is appropriate under "interpretations", it also has bearing on gathering data. Such impairments would also have been noted in distractibility, unusually long (temporally) or precipitate records, or even explosive outbursts. These are discussed in a later section.
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CHAPTER IV

DATA AND INTERPRETATIONS

The thirty Rorschach anxiety signs taken from Phillips and Smith(6) are listed below:

**TABLE I**

**RORSCHACH ANXIETY SIGNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response No.</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(DW, DdW, DdD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dd initial response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W cut off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F-plus 90% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M absent or in Hd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F responses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F-minus only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Primitive C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M in A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ab—turbmoil; nightmare; depression; death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neuroanatomy responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Insignia types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>H dominant over M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(H) humanlike response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hd exceeds H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A content exceeds 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sex; morbid; fabulized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P over 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hdx or Adx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ghosts; apparitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Excessive turning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Refusal to hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Describing; ordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Qualifying remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Card rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Uneven tempo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale for the Anxiety Indicators
Listed in Table I

**Location**

*Details emphasized.*—This location factor was considered to have been emphasized if more than 70 per cent of the response total consisted of detail responses. Beck(1) used 70 per cent as the norm, and this is generally accepted by most Rorschach authorities. Phillips and Smith(6) note that the anxious individual becomes increasingly cautious, and is therefore more likely to emphasize the common details. These writers also speak of "social anxiety"(p. 280) as well as "situational anxiety", which restricts the individual's aspirations, resulting in D emphasis.

*Whole responses restricted.*—If whole responses comprised less than 20 per cent of the record, this was considered W restriction. This restriction was found by Phillips and Smith to be accompanied by restriction of social activity and a generalized anxiety about social intercourse stemming "from the disruption of a critical interpersonal relationship"(6, p. 29).

*DW, DdW, DdD or confabulation.*—Haimowitz(4) modified the Harrower-Erickson Neurotic Signs, but included these indicators of anxiety. The DW process consists of putting together what is known to go together rather than what is seen together on a blot. Phillips and Smith consider the DW sign an index of shock(6, p. 199). The individual is utilizing an immature mode of perception.
The Cut-Off Whole.—Beck does not use this sign, but Phillips and Smith agree with Klopfer and Kelly(5) that it differs from D. "In general, the extent of the cut-off is a rough index of the severity of anxiety"(6, p. 13). Again, this represents a restriction of the individual's perception.

As commented on previously, the extent to which the cut-off W response is restricted, both in verbalization and in the area used, is a rough measure of the intensity of immediate anxieties in interpersonal relations, i.e., of the extent of social restriction(6, p. 14).

**Determinants**

**Form factor 90 per cent or more.**—This amounts to requiring relatively complete correspondence between blot structure and percept, an aspect of the subject's processes which is similar to his restriction of responses to those most popular. The subject is trying to stay within "safe" bounds in his interpretations, and he overdoes it.

M absent or in Hd.—Empirically, M is the determinant which becomes most markedly restricted as anxiety increases. "The MHd response is a contraindication both to maturity and social adjustment and, in the Hd component, reflects anxiety in dealing with people"(6, p. 72). M seems to require a freedom of perception and expression which has been curbed in the anxious, and, coupled with Hd, is even more indicative of constriction and withdrawal of expansive contacts with the social environment.
Y types.—This classical Rorschach sign of anxiety received the designator "Y" because the final letter of the word "anxiety" is y. Black shock, of which the Y response is one indicator, is an especially popular sign of anxiety with psychologists. "Fear of what is unknown and new to the individual...if it is at all pervading, shows the individual is suspicious and distrustful not only to the unknown and new but of others" (6, p. 196).

Form Responses Only, To a Card.—The guardedness reflected here is like that suggested by an extremely high Form percentage in the total summary. However, in some instances, 90 per cent may not be exceeded in the summary, yet one or more cards may have elicited nothing but responses based upon form only.

F-minus Responses Only, To a Card.—Phillips and Smith describe four different levels of this "perceptual distortion", or violation of the criteria for form adequacy. This study, however, followed Beck's(1) tables in determining what constituted F-minus. When inadequate form level is expressed in all responses to a card, it suggests shock, with a tense, agitated, depressed state (6, p. 210). No attempt was made to determine F-minus levels.

Primitive C, With Sensitivity to Bodily Injury.—The "flesh", or "open wound" type of response, which is a borderline deterioration C, is most often associated with schizophrenics, but they may also occur in acutely anxious
neurotics (6, p. 43). Beck says little about this, and Phillips and Smith merely mention that such responses are given by the acutely anxious.

**M in A.**--Phillips and Smith include animal movement responses as immature reactions, which are indices of shock. However, animal movement alone, may not necessarily indicate shock, though the immaturity reflected suggests a kind of withdrawal. Beck sees it as significant for what the individual avoids seeing, i.e., he avoids seeing human movement, because of "personal needs more critically meaningful than those involved in many true M" (2, p. 25).

In connection with both the above indicators, the concept of immaturity is important. This is because early patterns of behavior are likely to be reactivated, and this lack of flexibility and adaptiveness may even be noted in the usually mature individual, when he is beset by anxiety.

**Content**

AB--Turmoil, chaos, nightmare, depression, death.--An anxious to dysphoric mood is associated with these responses, and the feeling tone is expressed rather directly when these terms are used.

An--neuroanatomical designs; neuroanatomy drawings; tissue section; An cross-section types.

Typically persons who develop responses of this type are intellectuals whose interpersonal relationships are mediated largely through their intellectual agility and interests. They tend also to be extremely
hostile but in a disguised intellectual manner and often they become critical, captious, trivial and offensive. Anxiety is almost always associated with this hostility and is expressed in a variety of ways (6, p. 125).

**X-ray.**—Those who develop this type response are likely to be persons who are apprehensive about bodily harm, so much so that anxiety grips, pervades, and, figuratively, paralyzes them.

*Em—coat-of-arms; officer's insignia; escutcheon.*—These symbols represent the external forms of manliness which are necessary to the facade which the individual perceiving them erects to cover unexpressed feelings of fear. The person developing these responses depends on outward appearances for social survival.

**H dominant over M.**—"To the extent that H is dominant over M manifest anxiety is likely to be present" (6, p. 138). The individual is likely to be restricted in social mobility, and is even likely to restrict his fantasy in connection with those social contacts which do occur.

**(H), the humanlike response.**—Though this response, of the animated cartoon type may imply interest in others, it also implies anxiety about interpersonal relations, and a tendency toward social isolation. This would be closely concerned with situational type anxiety.

**Hd exceeds H.**—Again, social anxiety is indicated. Hd implies awareness of others, and a sensitivity in dealing with them. The individual feels unable to cope with his everyday social contacts.
A content exceeds 60%.--The constricting effects of anxiety are evidenced by higher than normal animal content. Beck(2) noted this, and Phillips and Smith(6) confirmed it. The subject restricts expression to genetically early percepts.

Sex; morbid and fabulized content.--Direct expression of sexual anatomy, or of visceral descriptions are included in Phillips and Smith's indices of shock(6, p. 199). Fabulized content may not be simply defined, but rather, must be generally described. In general, the response will be unique or at least very rare. However, a superior elaboration is also rare, yet is not a fabulized response. An additional aspect of the fabulized response is that it is likely to reflect "motives, feelings and/or attitudes which cannot reasonably be inferred from the blot"(6, p. 154), i.e., "wise", "sad", etc. A third sign of the fabulized response is that it conveys intensity beyond the usual description. For example, instead of perceiving a person as merely talking, the subject states that the individual is yelling angrily. If a response is characterized by rarity, unreasonableness and intensity, it is likely to be classed as fabulized. The kind of fabulized elaboration of interest in this study is that which denotes body parts that are missing, thus suggesting the subject's "preoccupation over integrity of the body and the pressure of manifest anxiety"(6, p. 157).
P over 33%.--Excessive development of popular responses indicates that the individual is seeking the "safety" of stereotypy. He seems to feel that as long as his expressions remain within the confines of the obvious, he is less likely to be required to cope with threat. High "popular" percentage is one of the criteria for a "guarded record" (6, p. 183).

Hdx or Adx.--The essence of this type of response is that the subject perceives only a part of a human or animal where most people see a whole organism. This response is most likely to be given by children of six or seven years old. It has been found that acute anxiety is indicated in adults who give the x type response (unless there is a neuropsychological disability). "X reaction on Card III implies acute anxiety centers on relations with men" (6, p. 292).

Activity

Excessive turning.--This was scored if the individual turned a card more than four times. The individual is likely to be apprehensive, so much so that his "nervousness" affects his adequacy of adjustment. This is a kind of guardedness, as noted by Beck (2, p. 60). "Turning beyond normal expectancy is found where there is manifest anxiety..." (6, p. 276).

Refusal to hold; throwing.--These are indicators of shock. No such responses were found during this study.

Card description; counting; ordering.--These are grouped because they are all attempts at mastering anxiety by
breaking things into details and ordering them. They are compulsive techniques, usually recognizable in other aspects of the subject's behavior.

**Qualifying remarks.**—When these remarks take the form of a modified response requiring support from the examiner, they indicate doubting and hesitation. Examples are: "A bat--isn't it?" "You know what I mean"? If the remarks consist of mere flat, unelaborated percepts, such as "bat", "face", etc., the implication is similar. Such remarks are characteristic of three groups:

1. young children,
2. persons with organic impairment and
3. persons in immediate situational difficulties, often with the law, who are pessimistic about the possibility of resolution(6, pp. 166, 167).

**Whole card rejection.**—This does not refer to throwing or refusal to hold cards. The subject merely states that he is unable to respond to the card, and even persists in this refusal when the card is presented a second time, perhaps even after the inquiry period. Preoccupation with his personal problems is restricting perception and expression.

**Uneven tempo; T/LR exceeds 45"**.—Beck(2) and Phillips and Smith(6) both consider irregular tempo an indicator of shock. "A marked imbalance (unevenness) in tempo is associated with feelings of inner turmoil, with intense anxiety and with the struggle to control restiveness, hyperactivity and often, explosive outbursts"(6, p. 232).
Beck, Klopfers, Oberholzer, and others describe "shading shock" and "color shock", and suggest differential effects. Phillips and Smith have not found it necessary to assign specific accompaniments to the two types of shock. Rather, they merely list thirteen "indices of shock" (6, p. 199). These have been included in the foregoing list of anxiety signs. For clarification, whenever the term "expectancy" is used in connection with these signs, it refers to the intra-record norm. For example, if an individual has responded with five percepts on each of six cards and then gives only one response on the seventh, he has deviated from his expectancy.

**Statistical Procedure**

It was decided that a method which works with the data provided by the population sample itself should be used, rather than to base significance on some other population parameter. Such a technique is used in the t distribution. When there are fewer than thirty cases per group the t test of significance is considered to be a preferable technique. However, even with this technique, care must be taken not to accept as significant any confidence level greater than 5 per cent, since the majority of such differences reported in Rorschach studies are probably due to chance.

For small samples, t distribution does not quite follow the normal curve. The smaller the sample, the
greater the peaking of the curve, though with thirty sub-
jects the curve approximates the normal. Since there is a
different distribution for different degrees of freedom,
tables have been developed which indicate the different
distributions.

Each record was summarized and the summaries were
examined as to presence of the signs listed in Table I.
After all thirty records had been checklisted in this man-
ner, a frequency table was drawn up, indicating the number
of anxiety responses for each subject. Table II presents
this breakdown.

TABLE II

ANXIETY RESPONSES IN EACH GROUP OF JAILEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Repeater</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jailee A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jailee A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; B</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot; C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot; D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot; E</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot; F</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; G</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot; G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot; H</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; J</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; J</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; K</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; K</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; L</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; M</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; O</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; O</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 160        Total 144
In general, the statistical approach was to assume zero difference between the first offenders and the recidivists, and then to calculate $t$ to see how many times out of a hundred a difference of the size calculated could have occurred by chance alone. If this probability turned out to be less than .05, it was decided to reject the null hypothesis, and to assume that significant differences in anxiety as measured by the thirty Rorschach signs did exist between the two groups of jailees.

The mean number of responses for each group of subjects was found first. From Table I, the total number of responses for first offenders is 160. The mean for this group would be 160/15 or 10.66. Similarly, the mean for the repeater group is 144/15 or 9.6. Each deviation from these means was found, by subtracting individual numbers of responses from the mean. These results appear in Table III.

### TABLE III

**DEVIATIONS FROM EACH GROUP MEAN AND SQUARES OF DEVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Offenders (M = 10.66)</th>
<th>Repeaters (M = 9.6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case #</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D²</th>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  111.29  Total  81.60

With equal population sizes, a simplified form of the \( t \) formula is used:

\[
t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{x_1^2 - x_2^2}{N_1(N_1-1)}}}
\]

where \( N_1 \) represents the size of either samples, \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) represent the means of the two samples, and \( x_1^2 \) and \( x_2^2 \) represent the sums of the squares of deviations in the two samples.

Substituting in the formula:

\[
t = \frac{10.66 - 9.6}{\sqrt{111.29 - 81.16}} = 1.01.
\]

The degree of freedom for each group was one less than the number in the group, or fourteen for each. Therefore, a table of \( t \) was entered with twenty-eight degrees of freedom.
The level of significance shown there was greater than .30, which was well above the .05 necessary for rejection of the null hypothesis. Using the t test, it was not possible to show significant differences in anxiety levels between first offenders and repeaters in this jail population. However, the application of statistical techniques to clinical instruments such as the Rorschach has thus far been rather limited in scope, and findings are often supplemented by qualitative analysis or at least some discussion which does not "lose" the individual scores.

Neither group contained any member who responded with **Refusal to Hold** (Sign #26). This extreme form of anxiety response, often precipitating hostile activity, arises from shock, and such responses are rare in any population. No one in either group perceived any blot so threatening as to refuse to hold it.

The **Cut Off Whole** (Sign #5) appeared on only one first offender record and one repeater record. This, too, is a sensitive indicator of anxiety. The more of the blot the individual refuses to perceive, while responding with a whole type percept, the more anxiety this reveals. It has been used as a rough index of immediate anxieties in interpersonal relations(6, p.14). Its almost complete absence in these population samples would seem to indicate that though anxiety levels may have been high, a certain amount
of socialization had been accomplished within the jail environment. A further aid to jailees in this particular setting is the relatively progressive visiting privileges granted in this jail, thus preventing complete "prisonization".

However, that both groups contained many individuals highly constricted by anxiety was indicated by fourteen first offenders and thirteen repeaters who responded with shading (Y) type (Sign #8) percepts. This almost unanimous response to the nuances of light and dark gives strong evidence of basic anxiety. It may be recalled that this shading or black shock, wherein the individual bases his blot interpretation on the depths of black or gray hues, indicates distrust of the unknown and new, as well as of other people. This indicator seems especially sensitive to anxiety, but because of its pervasiveness throughout both groups it did not serve as a means of differentiating them.

Fourteen first offenders and thirteen repeaters responded with F Responses Only (Sign #9). High anxiety is indicated here, since the testee does not venture to perceive anything outside the "safe" limits of a sure thing. He can point out definite outlines, backing up his interpretation quite securely. When he requires such complete correspondence between blot structure and percept, and continues to produce nothing but such percepts throughout a
blot interpretation, he lays bare his anxious, insecure feelings. Once again, this sign was evidenced by so many in each group that it failed to furnish diagnostic power for a special kind of anxiety, viz., situational.

Uneven Tempo (Sign #30) was recorded for twelve first offenders and an equal number of repeaters. This was scored either if the testee delayed his first response to a blot forty-five seconds or more, or if a marked unevenness in times to respond occurred throughout the record. The anxious person is beset by inner turmoil and tries to control his tendency toward restiveness. If he cannot then be physically active, (sometimes even explosive) this shows up in uneven tempo on Rorschach performance. Thus, anxiety is again strongly revealed in both population samples, and again, the sign failed to separate the groups, since they responded to it in equal numbers.

Three Rorschach signs generally accepted as indicative of anxiety were frequently exhibited by both groups of jailees. Strong feelings of anxiety would seem to be prevalent, but thus far, no signs have been considered which might permit prediction that one group had greater anxiety than did the other, and further, that this anxiety was of a specific type, rather than "basic" or general.

However, as a possible implication for further study, attention should be directed to those signs which did appear more frequently in one group's records than in the
other. Five such signs were found which show first offenders leading by 33% or more. (Only two were found which show repeaters leading, by 7/5 and 11/7 ratios.)

Nine first offenders and only six repeaters responded with DW (Sign #3). This confabulation type of response consists of adding to the blot those parts which the testee knows should be there to complete the picture, but which actually are not present. The mature person does not often respond this way, but anxiety causes one to take refuge in immature modes of perception.

Fourteen first offenders and nine repeaters perceived Animal Movement (Sign #12). This is another immature reaction in which human movement percepts are avoided and instead, animal movements are seen. Those who respond in more mature mode see human movement instead of animal movement. However, even the usually mature person may respond this way, when beset by anxiety.

Six first offenders and only three repeaters indulged in Excessive Turning (Sign #25) of the Rorschach cards. This is a good indicator of anxiety overtly expressed, or "manifest anxiety". The testee is nervous and apprehensive. He also turns the cards more often than the usual "once over" because he needs to feel safe in not having overlooked anything.

Seven first offenders, but no repeaters responded by Describing and Ordering (Sign #27). This is an act of the
person with compulsive tendencies. He fights off overwhelming anxiety by the neurotic defense mechanism of setting up a "safe" situation (ordering) which will leave few possibilities for failure. In the Rorschach, this takes the form of commenting on symmetry of the card, stating how many little spots are seen, noting that there are some black dots near the edge and a line through the middle, etc. This indicator had a greater differentiating power than any of the thirty signs.

Finally, nine first offenders and six repeaters gave Qualifying Remarks (Sign #28). These are remarks which require the examiner's support, and indicate doubt and hesitation. The testee typically says "You know what I mean?" "Isn't that a bat?" etc. Again, this is a sign of immaturity. Other Rorschach investigators have found this sign most frequently in young children and in the brain-injured. It is also found in people such as these jailees, who are in trouble with the law, and are pessimistic about the outcome.

A generality noted throughout the foregoing signs, all predominantly exhibited by the first offenders, may serve as an implication for further study. Immaturity characterizes responses such as DW, Animal Movement, and Qualifying Remarks. Immature type of responses from mature persons indicate either fixation at an immature level or regression to that level. Though the foregoing interpretation leads to a kind of hypothesis building, as a
post-facto procedure, it seems worthy of notice, and perhaps follow-up. Does facing trial and imprisonment for the first time bring out immature reactions not generally expressed by repeaters, and can these reactions be discovered by selected Rorschach signs, including the three mentioned above?

There are still the negative interpretations to be considered, though they were meager. Signs showing only one more response for repeaters than for first offenders were not considered. Seven repeaters and five first offenders responded with *H Dominant Over M* (Sign #17). This meant that respondees perceived non-moving humans more frequently than they did moving humans. It is an indication of manifest anxiety which restricts voluntary social contacts. The other sign, *Sex, Morbid, Fabulized* (Sign #21) was given by eleven repeaters and four first offenders. Frequency count was based only on *Morbid* and *Fabulized* responses. These reflect the subject's preoccupation over body integrity, and result from pressure of manifest anxiety. *Sex* was included in this sign originally but finally was not considered to be appropriately grouped with the *Morbid* and *Fabulized* responses, even though *Sex* responses also reflect preoccupation with bodily processes. In fabulizing, the testee characteristically reports intensity not inherent in the blot. For example, two talking figures are reported as screaming at each other.
These two indicators have in common manifest anxiety. Again, the evidence is meager, but a consequent study might add these two signs to the five which reflected immaturity and test their predictive value.

In the preceding discussion it has been shown that DW; M in A; Excessive Turning; Describing; Qualifying Remarks appeared mostly in first offender records, and perhaps might be found to predict immaturity and regression or fixation as first offender responses to threat. H Dominant Over M, and Morbid-Fabulized appeared mostly in repeater records. These might predict manifest anxiety in repeat offenders.

Summarizing, though the full set of thirty Rorschach signs which were originally applied were not found to differentiate significantly between first offenders and repeat offenders, some interesting saliences were noted. All jailees gave some evidence of deep anxiety. First offenders exhibited more of the thirty signs of anxiety, and gave at least 33 per cent more responses to five selected signs, while repeaters gave at least 16-2/3 per cent more responses to two selected signs.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

In order to reject the null hypothesis, it would have been necessary to discover indicators which have been widely accepted as Rorschach signs of anxiety, but which are at the same time exhibited mostly by one population and not by the other. It might be tempting to postulate that those signs appearing frequently in both populations would indicate an underlying anxiety not necessarily aroused by the prison situation. Even so, it would not necessarily follow that the selected signs would therefore predict situationally aroused anxiety. Such anxiety might not be independent of the effects of types of crime, specific educations, experience, and in general, of an atypical cultural background.

Inspecting the data for $t$ as previously mentioned implies that "amounts" of anxiety may be determined by counting the total number of anxiety indicators provided by each group of protocols. If this had been the only consideration, then little further discussion would have been necessary. However, as might have been expected from considerations of material developed in Chapter I, interpretations are likely to be based on complex patterns rather than on simple factors.
Even if the null hypothesis had been rejected, and if a cluster of "signs" had been noted which differentiated between the groups, it could not have been certain that these differentials were predictors of situational anxiety. How could this be tested further? It is suggested that a skillfully constructed sentence-completion test may be developed which is not too transparent, and which adroitly directs the subject into statements centered around anxiety connected with his immediate situational difficulties.

Though the statistical technique applied did not reject the null hypothesis, further considerations could be fruitful. The study suggests the following extensions:

1. Testing prison populations according to crime hierarchies (intellectual requirements, levels of skill, moral implications, etc.)
2. Inclusion of larger population groups.
3. Sampling from city, county, Federal prisons.
4. Establishment of a research program which would include routine but voluntary testing of all prisoners upon jail entrance. Test results would be retained as part of the jail records, but would be available to approved researchers.

Subjects in other crisis situations, such as in homes for unwed mothers, persons awaiting trial, soldiers facing battle, patients awaiting serious operations, such as for cancer, etc., might be tested by the Rorschach, with special attention given to selected signs, in order to test validity. To test the predictive value of any signs, a control group, i.e., persons not involved in a crisis situation, might be included, and examiners asked to determine which individuals
were situationally disturbed, on the basis of test results. Though the results of this particular study have not been conclusive, they can have heuristic value.

It will have been noted that the term "jailees" appears in the title where "prisoners" might have been expected. Since this study was conducted in a county jail, and not in a state or federal prison, "jailees" was considered more appropriate. Though conditions in the Dallas County Jail are above average, the facilities, funds, public attention, personnel, and general organization of most jails simply do not measure up to standards met in most prisons. Jails are more likely to be rather neglected institutions. This is partly because they are local institutions established and maintained by people who have not yet caught up with newer objectives brought about by a changing philosophy toward crime and criminals. "Cultural lag" forces development to creep along behind the more advanced practices beginning to be inculcated in prisons.

The present study has been of the nature of a "ground-breaking" exercise, admittedly. Populations sampled were small, variety of instruments limited, testing conditions restricted, and observations permitted only tentative conclusions. Since it was in the nature of an exploratory study in a new area, it was necessary to feel out the way. It is hoped that this study will at least encourage follow-ups and furnish suggestions as to what is needed and what may be avoided.
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