

A COMPARISON OF NEGRO AND WHITE RESPONSES
TO THE RORSCHACH INK BLOTS

APPROVED:

Merl E. Boney

Major Professor

Bob S. Winborn

Minor Professor

Witt Blau

Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulouze

Dean of the Graduate School

A COMPARISON OF NEGRO AND WHITE RESPONSES
TO THE RORSCHACH INK BLOTS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Denny D. Corrin, B. A.

Denton, Texas

June, 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Hypothesis	
Significance of the Study	
Subjects and Methodology	
Definition of Terms	
II. RELATED STUDIES	10
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA	21
IV. SUMMARY	29
APPENDIX	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Response Scores Reflecting Significant Differences.	21
II. Male and Female Response Differences.	27
III. Comparative Scores of Male Subjects	31
IV. Comparative Scores of Female Subjects	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was not an attempt to determine causes of behavior. This investigation dealt basically with perceptual differences between Negro and white college students, perception being one inseparable element of behavior in that behavior is the response made to the internal and external environment, and the way a person responds to this environment is determined largely by the way the environment is perceived. The study of perception must also be a study of behavior.

Rorschach's basic assumption was that the way a person perceives is a reflection of patterns ingrained in the individual's personality make-up.

The underlying hypothesis in projective techniques is that an individual, given a neutral, ambiguous, unstructured stimulus, reacts by making something meaningful out of the stimulus in such a way that his unconscious needs, preoccupations, feelings, attitudes, anxieties, and values are called into play.¹

Hypothesis

This study had the following hypothesis: Negroes and whites presented with the same ambiguous stimuli, under the same motivational and environmental conditions, will respond

¹John M. Hadley, Clinical and Counseling Psychology, (New York, 1961), p. 525.

differently because the two groups possess different personality patterns due to influential differences such as ethnic and environmental factors.

Little research has been done in the area of Negro and white comparison with use of projective techniques. Dreger and Miller cited only two in their comparison of psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. "It seems to us that there must be more studies comparing white and negro on the Rorschach, but we have found only two. Morons from both groups were compared by Abel, Piotrowski, and Stone (1944) in terms of specific responses to the ink blots."² In the other study, Stainbrook and Siegel (1944) administered the group Rorschach to high school and college students of both races.

Because of the lack of research done in this area, no formal theories have yet been stated which would have a direct relationship to this study.

Accept the Rorschach for what it is: a sheerly empirical technique. We need not camouflage this basic fact by superimposing equally dubious theoretical structures as an afterthought. The Rorschach as an adaptive task still has novel features, which can be utilized. The history of science is replete with many an empirical discovery which has proved useful despite its refractory nature from the point of view of theory, e.g. the early thermometer, aspirin, weather forecasting, shock therapy, hypnosis. The Rorschach technique may have to be ranked among these.³

²Ralph Dreger and Kent Miller, "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States," The Psychological Bulletin, LVII (September, 1960), 375.

³William Block, "Psychometric Aspects of the Rorschach Technique," Journal of Projective Techniques, XXVI (June, 1962), 170.

This study was not based on a formal theory but on previous research comparing Negro and white differences. The affirmation or refutation of the proposed hypothesis either supports or fails to support antecedent studies in this area.

Significance of the Study

As of today there have been only a few studies of Negro and white personality differences with use of Rorschach's Ink Blot Test. This may be due, in part, to the fact that it is extremely time consuming to properly administer and score enough Rorschachs to produce a representative sample of a population. In the past it has sometimes been difficult to obtain subjects in racial studies but this problem is reduced in a large university environment.

Some of the comparisons of Negroes and whites in the past have been made under inadequate testing conditions. Other studies give evidence of unequal motivation between the two groups to be compared which effected erroneous conclusions.

Only the fellow scientist who has attempted to induce one hundred Southern darkies to offer themselves as subjects in an experiment of this sort can have any conception of the difficulties involved in actually getting the subjects into the laboratory. Threats, cajolery, flattery, bribery and every other conceivable ruse within the bounds of reason and the law were resorted to in order to bring the number of subjects tested up to the desired hundred. During the course of the four months in which the writer was attempting to entice negroes into his laboratory, he gladly provided vocal solos for negro churches, harangued Thanksgiving meetings and delivered formal graduation addresses at negro commencements; but the scheme which proved most productive of subjects was the establishing of a flat fee of 50 cents

to all who would offer themselves as subjects and adding thereto the offer of transportation from and to their homes in a rickety old Ford hired for the purpose. To that old Ford and the outlay of a few dollars in "fees" the writer attributes his success in ultimately obtaining 100 negro subjects. It was a never-to-be-forgotten experience, the humor and zest whereof, however, more than compensated for the many weary and discouraging hours which it cost to witness a subject fleeing over the hill in fright or reversing decision on the foot of the laboratory steps at the last moment.⁴

Good communication is imperative to accurate interpretation of Rorschach responses. The examiner must understand the different dialects of the subjects he examines.

While the Rorschach is ostensibly a perceptual test, operationally speaking it must be considered a verbal task only indirectly getting at the perception via the verbalization. This fact may not cause any consternation until one reflects fully upon the fact that the testee must manifest an extreme sensitivity to the determinants of his perception. He must communicate the importance of form, and in the case of using shading, whether the concept is two- or three-dimensional, whether it involves the perception of "texture" or perhaps "vista" to mention just a few possibilities. But even if a person possesses a keen awareness of the determinants of his perception, does he possess the vocabulary with which to communicate them to the examiner? It is apparent that to convey verbally the nuances of his perception a person needs a precise and extensive vocabulary. One may well wonder whether the dearth of determinants found in low socio-economic class protocols reflects a "simple" perceptual world or a small and limited vocabulary.⁵

Bias can play a detrimental role in studies of Negroes and whites using projective techniques. Psychological examiners are not necessarily exempt from bias or social stereotypes.

⁴Albert Crane, Race Differences In Inhibition (New York, 1923), pp. 5-6.

⁵B. I. Murstein, "Factor Analyses of the Rorschach," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV (June, 1960), 266.

Clarke and Campbell state that "it is a commonplace of social psychology that our impressions of other persons are biased by the social stereotypes which we hold."⁶ The interpretation of a Rorschach protocol is not entirely objective and in the hands of an obstinate examiner the Rorschach loses its value as a research tool.

The purpose of this study is to compare Negro and white responses to the Rorschach. The methods used in this study were proposed to eliminate errors evidenced in previous research and to present a more accurate picture of Negro and white differences.

Subjects and Methodology

The Rorschach was administered to fifty-two Negro and white college students of both sexes. The subjects consisted of twelve Negro male, twelve white male, fourteen Negro female, and fourteen white female students attending North Texas State University and Texas Woman's University during 1963 and 1964. The subjects used for this study were all chosen on a voluntary basis from the two universities in Denton, Texas. Because of this method of obtaining subjects, the motivational differences between the groups have been reduced. Motivational differences between groups have sometimes brought about errors in conclusions of other studies. "Perhaps the

⁶Robert B. Clarke and Donald T. Campbell, "A Demonstration of Bias in Estimates of Negro Ability," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (November, 1955), 585.

most serious single source of error in intellectual measurement can be described under the general heading of motivation in the test situation."⁷ Motivation also plays an important role in personality measurement. An individual who has no desire to take the Rorschach will be very unproductive in responding.

The Rorschach was administered to each subject in a room where the subject could feel at ease and be without the distraction of other people. There was an informal atmosphere for all subjects and the following instructions were given.

You will be given a series of ten cards, one by one. The cards have on them designs made up out of ink blots. Look at each card, and tell the examiner what you see on each card, or anything that might be represented there. Look at each card as long as you like; only be sure to tell the examiner everything that you see on the card as you look at it. When you have finished with a card, give it to the examiner as a sign that you are through with it.⁸

The examiner remained completely non-directive after the instructions were given and recorded the entire test of the subject's statements concerning the ink blots.

It is this absolute assurance that there will be no evaluation, no interpretation, no probing, no personal reaction by the counselor, that gradually permits the client to experience the relationship as one in which all defenses can be dispensed with—a relationship in which the client feels, "I can be the real me, no pretenses."⁹

⁷Hadley, op. cit., p. 394.

⁸S. J. Beck, Rorschach's Test: I. Basic Processes (New York, 1950), p. 2.

⁹Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy (Boston, 1951), p. 208-209.

By accepting all responses to the ink blots on the same level and without evaluation, the subject reduces the tendency to give only those responses which are believed to be approved of by the examiner.

Definition of Terms

Each record was divided into three major divisions: the location of the response, the determinant of the response and the content of the response. If the subject attends to all portions of the blot figure in making a response, W is scored. D responses relate to certain portions in each ink blot figure that are most commonly selected and responded to. Different factors operate to favor one or another detail. "Size, position, and space rhythm play roles of varying importance."¹⁰ The Dd responses are made to certain portions of the card, not attended to regularly in any considerable number of records. Detail and rare detail responses are listed in Beck's first volume.¹¹ Space responses, (S) refers to those responses made when "the person perceives a white space as something with meaning, whether in connection with another detail or by itself."¹² Responses which were determined by the form or shape of the ink on the cards are

¹⁰Beck, op. cit., p. 24.

¹¹Ibid. pp. 137-207.

¹²Ibid. p. 41.

referred to as F responses and are scored F+ if accurate percepts having good form and scored F- if inaccurate percepts having poor form. Movement responses (M) are those in which the subject perceives human movements or activities in the card. "The response, as Rorschach understands it, really reproduces movements or activities that S is carrying on within his mental life."¹³ FC responses are determined mainly by the form with the color having a slight influence. When a response is scored CF the color of the blot had a greater influence than the form although the form was also involved in the perception. A response determined entirely by the color of the blot, the form having no influence, is scored C.

The FC represent feelings which make for an effortless and adequate emotional adjustment to others because the individual's feelings have been socialized properly. At the other extreme, the C indicate impulsive, exclusively self-centered feelings with a disregard for other people's needs, possible reactions, and rights. The CF point to feelings which are self-centered and labile, but still display some, at least intellectual, consideration for others. The average adult is expected to produce no pure color responses, and twice as many form-color as color-form responses.¹⁴

There are nine scoring symbols in the light-determined category. These responses are scored in a similar manner as

¹³Beck, op. cit., p. 24.

¹⁴James Brussel, Kenneth Hitch, and Zygmunt Pietrowski, A Rorschach Training Manual (New York, 1950), pp. 66-67.

the color responses just described. The symbols for these responses are: Y, YF, FY, V, VF, FV, T, TF, and FT. Y is a response to shading, V is the perception of a three-dimensional effect, and T is scored when the subject perceives the ink blot as having texture.

Beck uses a number of symbols to represent the content on a Rorschach protocol.¹⁵ Two of the more frequently used are the symbols for human responses (H), and for animal responses (A). Popular responses (P) refer to any of the twenty-one statistically based responses which are perceived most frequently. These responses and the cards on which they can be found are listed in Beck's first volume.¹⁶

The symbol T/IR refers to the average time it takes for the subject to make a first response after being handed the card and #R is the symbol used for the total number of responses. Experience balance is the relation between the total number of scored movement responses and the total number of scored color responses. All movement responses have the value of one. Color responses have the following values: C 1.5, CF 1.0, and FC 0.5.

¹⁵Beck, op. cit., pp. 217-221.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 208-211.

CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

Klineberg could find little evidence for marked personality differences between Negro and whites as interpreted from experiments and test material.

The differences between Negro and white personality as reflected in tests and experiments seem not to be marked. There is an inconsistency in the findings, and significant differences are rare. This is undoubtedly due in part to the nature of the tests, probably also to the fact that a substantial similarity in cultural backgrounds results in a corresponding similarity in the responses to the tests. We can only repeat that the conclusions obtained through the use of tests cannot be more valid than the test used and that completely satisfactory research in this field will have to wait until psychologists have devised more adequate measures for the study of personality.¹

It was inferred that more adequate personality measures would elicit more consistency in studies involving personality differences. Although the Rorschach technique has some faults, it is considered by many psychologists as the most adequate instrument of personality measurement that has yet been devised.

¹O. Klineberg, Characteristics of the American Negro (New York, 1944), p. 138.

Myrdal stated the impression that all Negroes experience a conflict because of their color.

If the dark Negro accepts the white Man's evaluation of skin color, he must stamp himself as inferior. If the light Negro accepts this evaluation, he places himself above the darker Negroes but below the whites... The conflict produces a personality problem for every single Negro. And few Negroes accomplish an entirely successful adjustment.²

Warner also holds to the conviction that color has an influence in Negro personality development.

While we do not claim that color evaluations have a greater influence than some other factors in developing Negro personality, we do insist that social sentiments organized around color greatly affect this development and that all Negroes, by living in the American Negro system, are forced to adjust themselves to evaluations of this sort.³

Warner believed Negroes of superior quality to be more aware of the differences between Negro and white liberties and more affected by this awareness.

The more intelligent and sensitive, the more cultured and refined a Negro may be, the more completely he assimilates and transmits the national ideals, the more seriously is he made to feel that his race, and race alone, bars him from enjoying the full rights of American citizenship. The paradox is made explicit for him in the disparity he cannot help observing between what he is taught in school about democracy and the "American dream," on the one hand, and the actual discrimination with which he is confronted on the other.⁴

²Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (New York, 1944), p. 699.

³Lloyd Warner, Buford Junker, and Walter Adams, Color and Human Nature (Washington, D.C., 1941), p. 7.

⁴Ibid., p. 295.

In a summary of his case studies of Negroes, Warner states that:

In the case studies analyzed in the foregoing chapters the influence of color on personality has been consistently emphasized with respect to relations both within the Negro world and between the races. Certain clear implications have emerged. They indicate both the force of color as a factor in the social and economic situation of Negroes and also equally marked limitations on the dominance of this factor in personality formation.⁵

Karon used the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test in a study designed to reveal Negro and white differences as well as the causes of these differences. In his conclusion it was stated that:

It was possible to design a program of research which would not only assess the statistical significance of the findings, but also determine whether these same findings would recur consistently from experiment to experiment, which would determine whether the differences between Negroes and whites were hereditary or the result of the caste sanctions, and which would exclude the possibility that the differences in personality might be attributed to and of the plausible alternative explanations.

It has been clearly established that the caste sanctions have an effect upon the personality structures of the people who feel them, and that this effect is reflected in eleven characteristics. The fact that northern Negroes differ from southern Negroes on precisely the same characteristics and in the same way as do northern whites served to eliminate the possibility that these traits represented hereditary differences between Negroes and whites. Thus, the caste sanctions not only have an effect upon personality, but these effects are sufficient to account for the differences in personality between Negroes and whites.⁶

⁵Ibid., p. 293.

⁶Bertram Karon, The Negro Personality (New York, 1958), p. 171.

Individuals are made up of many dynamic interacting variables. No one can be just white or just a Negro because being of a certain race is just one interacting variable of the total self, but an important factor because of the great influence on the behavior and thinking pattern of the individual. The Negro's concept of a Negro, and the perception of himself as a Negro, has an important part to play in his personality development.

Gray inquired vocational preferences of 800 Negro children in the first to six grades. These results were compared with the responses given by white children obtained by Boynton. The Negro and white girls gave similar preferences but the Negro male voiced more interest in professional occupations than the white male.⁷

In 1939, Sicha made a study of the Rorschach "Erlebness-Typus" or M to C ratio using 100 white and 100 Negro subjects. His finding was that both groups were more extroensive than introversive and Negroes were more extroensive than the whites.⁸ No findings were presented other than this and there was no other interpretation to the findings.

⁷Susan Gray, "The Vocational Preferences of Negro School Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXIV (1944), 239-247.

⁸M. H. Sicha, "A Study of Rorschach Erlebness-Typus of Comparable White and Negro Subjects," unpublished master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Columbia University, 1939.

Davie mentioned the results of a study which would give evidence that differences between Negroes and whites are due to environmental factors.

During the First World War the Army testers found that Negro recruits from the North were superior to Negroes from the South and that Negroes from certain Northern states were superior to whites from certain Southern states.

Davie concluded that there are measurable differences between Negroes and whites. He implies that these differences are due to both environmental and hereditary factors with emphasis on the environmental factors.

In conclusion, one can say that there is no proof that Negroes and whites are inherently the same. So many nonracial factors enter into the results that no definitive answer emerges. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the mental-testing technique will ever lend itself to any comparison of native differences between the group. The responsibility for the differences has still to be divided between the two general factors of heredity and environment. So far as heredity, which is a biological factor, is concerned, it is at bottom a matter of individual family stock, not of race, which is an arbitrary classification. That is, heredity is carried by specific organisms and in family lines, not by social groups. There are superior and inferior strains in every grouping of peoples, whether by race or nation or class. What the average incidence of hereditary factors may be, is not known. As to the environmental factor, it has been clearly demonstrated that social and cultural conditioning affect the test scores. There are marked differences depending upon variations in background. As compared with the white's, the Negro 's social background is inferior, and in terms of achievement of the type measured by the tests, the Negro is on the average inferior, but as the environment of the Negro approximates more and more closely that of the white, his inferiority tends to disappear.¹⁰

⁹ Maurice Davie, Negroes in American Society (New York, 1949), p. 372.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 373.

In 1962, Katz and Cohen found that male Negro college students gave fewer correct answers to problems when working with a white teammate than when working alone. The efficiency of the whites was not found to decline in the presence of a Negro. These findings may suggest that whites have a greater influence on the behavior of Negroes than Negroes have on whites.¹¹

In Dreger and Miller's review of comparative studies of Negroes and whites in the United States it was reported that Mussen's study using the TAT and most investigations using Rosenzweig's Picture Frustration Study indicate that there is a tendency for Negroes to project more aggressive responses than do whites.¹²

One of the most controversial articles ever to be published is that of McGurk's. Long and other investigators believed McGurk's article to be an attempt "to lay a scientific basis for increasing racial discrimination in the United States."¹³ In the article McGurk states:

...as far as our knowledge of the problem goes, the improvements in social and economic opportunities have only increased the differences between Negroes and whites. This is because such improvements have

¹¹I. Katz and M. Cohen, "The Effects of Training Negroes upon Cooperative Problem Solving in Biracial Teams," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIV (May , 1962), 319-325.

¹²Ralph Dreger and Kent Miller, "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States," The Psychological Bulletin, LVII (September, 1960), 376.

¹³Howard Long, "The Relative Learning Capacity of Negroes and Whites," Journal of Negro Education, XXVI (Spring, 1957), 121.

been given to both racial groups--not only to the Negroes--and the whites have profited more from them... a fruitful approach to racial equality cannot follow the lines of social and economic manipulation. There is something more important, more basic, to the race problem than differences in external opportunity.¹⁴

Another attempt to lay a basis for racial discrimination is that of George's. His report was prepared by commission of the Governor of Alabama in an effort to give evidence that "The United States Supreme Court's ruling on the school integration cases is potentially one of the most fateful decisions ever made by a court."¹⁵ In George's description of the Negro personality, it is stated that:

These observations of psychologists regarding Negroes in Africa are very similar to the judgments one hears expressed by Americans who have seen much of Negroes. Indolence, improvidence, and consequent pauperism are qualities commonly ascribed to them. The same qualities exist among some whites, but the incidence is much higher among Negroes. Some of us know Negroes who are intelligent, industrious, thrifty, and dependable; but these are not qualities that characterize large numbers of the race.¹⁶

It is unfortunate indeed that so many examiners on both sides of an issue have the "answers" before beginning an investigation and have a tendency to present only that information of consequence that will support their "answers." It is wise to consider the motives of the examiner when interpreting any study of Negro-white differences.

¹⁴Frank McGurk, "A Scientist's Report on Race Differences," United States News and World Report (September 21, 1956), pp. 96 and 92.

¹⁵Wesley George, The Biology of the Race Problem, A Report Prepared by Commission of the Governor of Alabama (University of North Carolina Medical School, 1962), p. 1.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 18.

Kardiner gave the impression of being on the "environmental side" of the issue. There is evidence that Kardiner is in sympathy with the Negro people and his opinion indicates that society as a whole is less efficient because of the stresses under which the Negro lives.

We can summarize the total picture of the personalities that follow in a few sentences. The Negro, in contrast to the white, is a more unhappy person; he has a harder environment to live in, and the internal stress is greater. By "unhappy" we mean he enjoys less, he suffers more. There is not one personality trait of the Negro the source of which cannot be traced to his difficult living conditions. There are no exceptions to this rule. The final result is a wretched internal life. This does not mean he is a worse citizen. It merely means that he must be more careful and vigilant, and must exercise controls of which the white man is free. This fact in itself, the necessity to exercise control, is distractive and destructive of spontaneity and ease. Moreover, it diminishes the total social effectiveness of the personality, and it is especially in this regard that the society as a whole suffers from the internal stresses under which the Negro lives.¹⁷

Kardiner's work and thoughts concerning the Negro's personality is summarized as follows:

Is there such a thing as a basic personality for the Negro? This work proves decidedly that there is. Though he lives in American culture, the Negro lives under special conditions which give this personality a distinctive configuration. Taking as our base line the white middle class, the conditions of life for the Negro are so distinctive that there is an actual alteration of the pressures to which he must adapt. Hence, he develops a distinctive personality. This basic Negro personality is, however, a

¹⁷Abram Kardiner and Lionel Oversey, The Mark of Oppression (New York, 1951), p. 81.

caricature of the corresponding white personality, because the Negro must adapt to the same culture, must accept the same social goals, but without the ability to achieve them. This limitation in social opportunities accounts for the difference in personality configuration.¹⁸

In 1945 Able used the Thematic Apperception Test to compare Negroes and whites and found some significant differences.

With a white female examiner Abel (1945) found that both white males and females and Negro females were more communicative on the TAT than Negro Males, who were of at least equal intelligence to the other groups. Communicativeness was measured by the number of ideas and the number of words, both of which yielded significant differences.¹⁹

When Abel, Piotrowski, and Stone compared Negro and white morons they found little differences between the two groups. "Out of the entire set of comparisons only one showed a real difference between the two groups: Negroes gave more M than whites."²⁰

In a study more closely related to the present one, Stainbrook and Siegel administered the group Rorschach to high school and college students. They concluded that high school and college Negroes are less impulsive, more emotionally stable, and possess less anxiety, but are less mature than high school and college whites.²¹

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 317.

¹⁹ Dreger and Miller, op. cit., p. 376.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 375.

²¹ Ibid., p. 375.

The Rorschach Test responses of twenty-four Negroes of different sex, age and status were studied by Goldfarb.²² These tests were administered by a trained examiner and scored according to Klopfer's method. As interpreted by Goldfarb, 100 per cent of the subjects tested gave evidence of deep anxiety, aggression, suspiciousness, emotional isolation, deficient rapport with others, apathy, passivity, and compliance. He reported that over ninety per cent of the subjects had a reduced intellectual efficiency and a conflict with regard to aggressive urges.

It is important that studies using the Rorschach as a research tool use the data of a single examiner rather than combined data from a group of examiners. Klopfer, Beck, Piotrowski, and others, use different symbols in scoring the Rorschach and place emphasis on different parts of the protocol in their interpretations. Scoring can vary from examiner to examiner. Silver and Derr found:

Systematically offering and withholding oral rewards to youthful subjects from a generally deprived population served to modify their Rorschach protocols in the direction of making them somewhat longer, more spontaneous and more creative. However, these findings varied from one examiner to another and tended to cancel one another when the data for five examiners were combined. The latter finding should serve as a methodological warning against combining data obtained by several experimenters in an investigation.²³

²²Kardiner and Ovesey, op. cit., p. 330.

²³Albert W. Silver and John Derr, "The Effect of Oral Gratification on Children's Rorschach Scores and Differences Between Examiners," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIX (July, 1963), 311.

The number of studies of American Negroes using the Rorschach is quite limited. Klopfer states:

There have been surprisingly few studies of American Negroes with the Rorschach. It is surprising because the Rorschach is the best available technique for evaluating intellectual capacities on a "culture-free" basis, a basis not subject to the biases some investigators feel to be present in the objective intelligence test.²⁴

The studies of Negro and white differences have been done by examiners having a variety of aims and purposes. The purpose of the examiner for doing the study has, in some cases, influenced his conclusions and interpretation of data.

Most of the past studies give evidence for differences between the personality and intellectual functioning of Negroes and whites. The points of disagreement seem to be: in what areas do Negroes and whites differ, how much do they differ in each of these areas, and what are the factors responsible for these differences?

²⁴ Bruno Klopfer, Developments in the Rorschach Technique (New York, 1956), p. 136.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The areas in which the Negro and white students exhibited the most significant differences were space responses, movement responses, animal responses, human responses, anatomy responses, rare details, vista responses, average time for the first response, and the total number of responses. Table I shows the scores having the most significant differences between the Negro and white students.

TABLE I
RESPONSE SCORES REFLECTING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

Group	S%	An%	M%	A%	H%	Dd%	T/1R	#R	#V
Negro	4	5.4	10.5	53	17.5	8.5	24.5	32	13
White	6	3.0	13.5	44	22.5	12.5	18.5	37	30

The four scores having the greatest variance between Negroes and whites are A%, H%, Dd% and An%.

The Negroes who participated in this study gave a lesser number of space responses than did the whites. The Negro students averaged four per cent space responses whereas the white students averaged six per cent. Using the chi square method it was found that in less than one chance

in ten could such a significantly different number of space responses occur simply by accident. Space responses indicate oppositional tendencies, contrariness, and negativism. Beck states that "they reflect an essential ingredient in personality, the holding to a purpose."¹ The difference in total number of space responses given by each group gave the impression that the Negro students express less opposition than do the white students. Ability to express opposition can be a desirable or undesirable personality trait depending on whether the individual is standing up for what he believes to be right or if he is just being stubborn.

Fewer movement responses were given by Negro students than by the white students. The white students gave an average of 13.5 percent movement responses while 10.5 percent of the Negroes' responses were scored movement. This difference is significant at the five per cent confidence level. [Movement is a good indication of creative imagination, fantasy activity, and intelligence, and is often ^{observed in} seen by individuals who are not dependent upon others for an enjoyable life. "The lower one goes in the intelligence scale, the fewer the M."²] In Abel, Piotrowski, and Stone's study it

¹Samuel J. Beck, Rorschach's Test: II. A Variety of Processes (New York, 1945), p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 23.

was found that Negro morons gave more movement responses than white morons. The differences reflected in their study and the present one are most likely due to differences in the subjects being compared.

The greatest difference in response pattern exhibited by the two groups was the difference in total number of animal responses. Forty-four per cent of the white students' responses were animal whereas fifty-three per cent of the Negro student's responses were animal. A difference as great as this has a probability of less than .001 of happening by chance alone.

Characteristically the normal individual who produces a high A% (say 50 per cent or above) has little insight into his own behavior. He tends to express conventional attitudes, leads a routine existence, accepts the mores for his group, lacks introspective tendencies, is not excessively concerned with the future and, in general, is the "average man" in his socioeconomic group.³

Individuals who tend to develop long records also tend to produce a low number of animal responses and are often of above average intelligence. The results of this study show the white students to have both fewer animal responses and a longer record, as measured by the number of responses, given by each group of students was: white males 36, Negro males 31, white females 39, and Negro females, 33. The

³Leslie Phillips and Joseph Smith, Rorschach Interpretation: Advanced Technique (New York, 1953), p. 115.

Negro males gave fewer responses than did the white males, white females, or Negro females. This gives support to Abel's belief that Negro males are the least communicative of the four groups. As was cited earlier, Abel found Negro males to give fewer words and ideas to the TAT than Negro females, white females, or white males.⁴

The white students gave more than twice the number of vista responses that the Negro students gave. According to Beck, the most important meaning of vista is its reflection of feelings of inferiority.⁵ A total of thirty vista responses was given by the white students and thirteen vista responses were given by the Negro students. A chi square of 4.2 indicates that the difference in the total number of Negro and white vista responses is significant at the five per cent confidence level.

The male and female Negroes perceived more anatomy in the ink blots than did male and female whites. The white students gave a total of twenty-nine responses with anatomy content. A total of forty-five responses of anatomy content were given by the Negro students. In light of the fact that all Negroes used in this study were living in a white dominated environment, it appears they may have experienced a hesitancy toward acting out and have

⁴Dreger and Miller, op. cit., p. 376.

⁵Beck, Rorschach's Test: II, p. 33.

a conscious intellectual control over their destructive impulses.

Anatomy content reflects a sensitivity to, and concern with, the expression of destructive impulses. Paradoxically, those individuals who act out their destructive impulses do not develop anatomy content; the records of an assaultive group are conspicuously devoid of any anatomy responses. However, to the extent that an individual is motivated by destructive impulses but is unable to express these directly he is likely to develop anatomy content.⁶

It cannot be stated which group possesses a greater destructive impulse. The Rorschach results only give the impression that the Negroes used in this study were more concerned about this destructive impulse than were the whites. Other evidence exhibited by the Negro students for a hesitancy toward acting out is their increased reaction time to make their first response. The white males had the shortest initial reaction time of seventeen seconds. The white females gave their first response to the cards after an average hesitancy of twenty seconds. The initial reaction times for the Negro males and females were twenty-four seconds and twenty-five seconds respectively.

Small details (Dd) reflect an interest in minute, often over-looked elements. An abundance of small details indicates thoroughness and exactness. The white students used more of the small areas of the ink blots in making their responses than did the Negro students. The average per cent

⁶Phillips and Smith, op. cit., pp. 123-124.

of Dd responses for each group was: white males 12 per cent, white females 13 per cent, Negro males 8 per cent, and Negro females 9 per cent. Phillips and Smith state that:

Experimentally, Dd% was found to be positively related to the ability to withstand stress in a psychomotor learning situation. Clinically an emphasis on Dd is observed to be associated with an intellectualized and methodical ordering of relationships. It is characteristic of persons who are described as cold and reserved rather than warm and spontaneous.⁷

The number of human responses given by both the Negroes and the whites in this study was greater than the number cited by Beck as the mean.⁸ Of the Negro responses, 17.5 per cent were scored human and 22.5 per cent of the white responses were scored human. The average per cent of human responses given by each group was: white male 22 per cent, Negro male 17 per cent, white female 23 per cent, and Negro female 18 per cent. The primary significance of human content is that it implies an interest in and sensitivity to others, although not necessarily an involvement with others. When H exceeds expectancy the subject is likely to be both sensitive and hypercritical of others. The criticalness reflected here may be related to the fact that all the subjects used in this study were young college students. It is interesting that the females gave more

⁷Ibid., pp 14-15.

⁸S. J. Beck, Rorschach's Test: I. Basic Processes (New York, 1950), p. 230.

human responses than the males in this study, and the whites gave more human responses than the Negroes.

The average number of content categories used by each group of students was: white males 10.8, Negro males 9.7, white females 12.5, and Negro females 11.2. The whites had a wider range of content than the Negroes and the females had a wider range of content than did the males. Beck states that "...the fewer the content categories, the less intelligent, or the less intelligently functioning, the individual is--i.e., he is of low endowment, or anxious or depressed, or habitually rigid and inhibited."⁹

TRENDS
TOWARDS

Differences between male and female responses were found which were in keeping with previous studies. Those differences are listed below in Table II.

TABLE II
MALE AND FEMALE RESPONSE DIFFERENCES

Group	Sum C	Sum M	Sum FY	T/IR	#R	Dd%	H%
Males	60.0	80	24	20.5	33.5	10	19.5
Females	110.0	152	76	22.5	36.0	11	20.5

The Negro and white female students responded more to color, movement, and shading than did the Negro and white

⁹Beck, Rorschach's Test: II, p. 42.

male students. These differences give the impression that the female students who participated in this study experience a much more vivid emotional life than do the males.

The Negro and white females gave more than twice as many shading responses as the male students. This response difference between males and females is too significant to be overlooked. Shading responses have been interpreted in a variety of ways by those who have worked with the Rorschach technique and no simple explanation can be offered as to its meaning. It has been said to reflect anxiety, self-control, defensiveness, cautiousness, tolerance, adaptability, and imagination among other things. Work needs to be done in this area before sound inferences can be made from shading responses.

Comparative scores of all the subjects used in this study are included on the first pages of the appendix. These comparative scores are followed by the summaries of each student's Rorschach protocol.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

(This study was a comparison of responses to Rorschach^R Ink Blot Test made by ~~Negro~~^S and ~~white~~^{NS} college students. Fifty-two students were chosen on a voluntary basis from ^{NTSU} the two universities in Denton, Texas, and were administered the Rorschach Ink Blot Test. The Rorschach was administered and scored according to the method suggested by Beck. A comparison was made of the content and statistically derived scores specific to the Rorschach.)

It was hypothesized that there would be ^{no} significant differences between the ^R responses of ~~Negro~~^S and ~~white~~^{NS} students, because of the difference in ethnic and environmental factors which influence their personality formation.

The two groups exhibited significant differences in their responses to the ink blots. The white students gave more space responses, movement responses, rare details, human responses, vista responses, and total number of responses than the Negroes. The Negro students gave more animal responses, anatomy responses, and had a longer average time for the first response than did the whites. These differences in response patterns suggested that the Negro students expressed less

opposition, had a lower level of intellectual functioning, exhibited more control over their emotionality, and had less interest in minute elements than did the white students.

The conclusions of this thesis should not be generalized beyond the college student population. Great caution should also be taken to avoid making individual evaluations or judgments on the basis of these group data. A large variety of individuals presented themselves for testing, few of which could be considered as representative of their group.

APPENDIX

TABLE III

COMPARATIVE SCORES OF MALE SUBJECTS

Subject	Age	SCORES													
		P%	F+	S%	P%	M%	FC%	CF%	A%	H%	W%	D%	Dd%	T/IR	#R
		Sec.													
		White Males													
R.S.	18	73	95	15	31	19	7	0	58	27	23	62	15	13	26
H.O.	18	55	61	4	17	17	11	4	28	36	4	74	21	9	47
R.T.	21	70	87	4	44	19	4	9	44	39	26	52	22	17	23
J.D.	18	74	65	5	23	5	5	14	23	9	17	83	0	10	23
J.G.	18	63	74	3	27	10	13	10	73	13	17	80	3	16	30
R.B.	22	80	72	15	8	6	6	4	49	14	6	61	33	9	125
D.H.	19	69	91	0	25	19	0	0	50	25	25	69	6	37	16
S.H.	18	56	80	0	22	17	11	0	33	22	28	72	0	39	18
N.H.	18	87	80	13	13	0	4	4	37	33	17	67	17	16	24
R.H.	20	78	60	9	26	5	9	9	52	18	11	85	4	19	27
D.S.	18	63	73	0	16	13	6	10	40	19	6	72	22	12	32
T.C.	20	81	73	10	19	10	2	0	35	12	36	62	2	7	42
Average:		71	76	6	23	12	6	5	44	22	18	70	12	17	36
		Negro Males													
M.W.	17	52	87	0	23	29	3	6	32	19	16	77	7	16	31
J.R.	18	77	70	0	23	8	8	0	46	23	15	77	8	10	26
B.P.	18	78	76	0	30	7	4	4	67	7	11	89	0	12	27
J.M.	21	73	74	2	8	16	6	0	59	35	10	84	6	33	51
N.B.	19	72	85	0	9	4	8	4	57	11	15	52	33	41	54
G.J.	17	88	73	4	24	8	4	0	40	20	40	60	0	14	25
J.N.	18	75	75	6	22	19	3	0	34	37	9	81	10	15	32
B.Y.	18	87	85	7	33	0	7	0	80	7	40	53	7	58	15
E.G.	18	77	80	8	23	8	8	0	52	15	38	62	0	37	13
L.E.	22	70	100	0	40	0	10	10	70	0	60	40	0	27	10
R.B.	18	85	72	2	9	9	4	0	67	19	9	74	17	9	54
P.M.	18	89	84	6	23	3	3	3	57	14	14	83	3	12	35
Average:		77	80	3	22	9	6	2	55	17	23	69	8	24	31

TABLE IV
COMPARATIVE SCORES OF FEMALE SUBJECTS

Subject Age	SCORES													
	F%	F+%	S%	P%	M%	PC%	CF%	A%	H%	W%	D%	Dd%	T/IR Sec.	#R
White Females														
F.K. 18	67	82	6	12	18	3	3	45	24	12	79	9	20	33
E.J. 22	59	81	18	23	25	9	0	41	30	32	52	16	8	44
F.D. 20	67	85	0	10	27	10	0	77	17	10	87	3	37	30
S.S. 19	42	88	5	13	24	16	11	29	34	8	76	16	10	38
A.F. 19	53	82	6	12	9	3	12	24	24	9	75	16	14	32
T.A. 18	63	86	14	20	3	20	9	37	11	23	74	3	12	35
B.F. 18	81	88	10	14	5	5	5	33	14	19	62	19	24	21
L.P. 18	56	87	5	19	24	2	9	32	35	7	84	9	34	43
S.N. 18	52	82	0	43	19	10	0	66	28	67	33	0	23	21
D.V. 22	61	68	6	10	21	6	3	34	29	11	76	13	9	67
P.S. 18	57	89	4	17	16	12	2	45	24	13	77	10	12	51
S.S. 21	61	70	7	17	17	12	5	47	25	29	57	14	8	59
P.N. 19	72	84	2	16	0	4	9	44	7	14	65	21	11	43
J.C. 19	78	95	7	18	7	3	0	62	19	15	59	26	60	27
Average:	62	83	6	17	15	8	5	44	23	19	68	13	20	39
Negro Females														
M.E. 19	46	73	1	14	11	14	17	32	18	17	79	4	19	71
R.G. 20	64	91	0	22	8	3	11	42	17	11	83	6	14	36
L.R. 18	71	87	18	18	6	3	9	59	18	15	73	12	13	34
S.H. 18	93	75	0	36	0	0	0	71	0	21	71	8	56	14
L.A. 19	68	77	14	14	5	10	5	41	16	36	57	7	23	44
S.B. 18	72	94	14	27	23	0	0	64	27	4	82	14	30	22
M.F. 18	59	77	8	14	10	4	12	51	18	41	57	2	14	51
L.J. 18	66	74	0	15	17	10	7	41	22	15	68	17	18	41
I.L. 18	67	81	0	12	0	4	17	54	0	17	83	0	25	24
B.P. 18	82	86	0	29	6	6	6	59	6	18	76	6	19	17
S.D. 20	46	98	3	13	16	5	16	49	22	11	70	19	38	37
G.S. 18	65	69	10	20	20	0	0	55	15	5	90	5	16	20
R.M. 19	77	95	0	19	23	0	0	51	35	6	71	23	21	31
M.T. 19	69	67	0	19	23	4	4	50	34	15	81	4	41	26
Average:	68	82	5	19	12	5	7	51	18	17	74	9	25	33

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. S. Date Nov. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	F +	18	A	11	P%	73
Ws	1	M	5	Ad	4	F%	95
D	15	FC	2	Tr	1	F-%	5
Dd	2	F-	1	H	5	S%	15
Dds	2			Gg	3	P%	31
Ds	1	Total	26	Hd	2	M%	19
						FC%	7
Total	26			Total	26	CF%	0
						A%	58
						H%	27
						T/1R	13 Sec.

W% 23
 D% 62
 Dd% 15

Approach: **W (D) Dd!**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **5:1**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student H. O. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	35	F ⁺	16	Ar	3	P%	55
Dd	8	F ⁻	10	Mu	1	F ⁺ %	61
W	2	M	8	Cg	3	F ⁻ %	39
Dds	2	FC	3	H	10	S%	4
Total	47	CF	2	Hd	7	P%	17
		FT	1	A	11	M%	17
		C	1	Se	2	FC%	11
		FV	1	F1	3	CF%	4
		Total	47	Bt	1	A%	28
				Ad	2	H%	36
				Fd	2	T/1R	9 Sec.
				Ab	1		
				Im	1		
				Total	47		

W% 4
 D% 74
 Dd% 21

Approach: **(W) D Dd!**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **8:6**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. T. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 21 Class Sr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	6	F+	14	A	10	P%	70
D	11	F-	2	H	4	F%	89
Dd	5	M	3	Hd	4	F-%	13
Ds	1	CF	2	An	2	S%	4
		FC	1	Mu	1	P%	44
Total	23	FY	1	Tr	1	M%	19
		Total	23	Hd, Sex	1	FC%	4
				Total	23	CF%	9
						A%	44
						H%	39
						T/1R	17 Sec.

W% 26
 D% 52
 Dd% 22

Approach: **W! (D) Dd!**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **3:2.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. D. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F +	11	A	5	P%	74
Ds	1	F -	6	Ls	1	F%	65
D	18	M	1	An	5	F - %	35
Dd	0	CF	3	Na	1	S%	5
		FC	1	H	2	P%	23
Total	23	C	1	Rc	1	M%	5
		Total	23	Fd	2	FC%	5
				Ab	2	CF%	14
				Sc	1	A%	23
				Ge	1	H%	9
				Im	1	T/LR	10 Sec.
				Bl	1		
				Total	23		

W%	<u>17</u>
D%	<u>83</u>
Dd%	<u>0</u>

Approach: **W.DI (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **1:5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. G. Date Nov. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	F+	14	A	20	P%	63
D	23	F-	5	Hd	2	F ₊ %	74
Ds	1	CF	3	Cg	1	F ₋ %	26
Dd	1	FC	4	Ad	2	S%	3
Total	30	M	3	H	2	P%	27
		FY	1	An	2	M%	10
		Total	30	Art	1	FC%	13
				Total	30	CF%	10
						A%	73
						H%	13
						T/IR	16 Sec.

W% 17
 D% 80
 Dd% 3

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 3:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. B. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Male Age 22 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	7	F ⁺	72	Ge	5	P%	<u>80</u>
D	72	F ⁻	28	Bl	2	F ⁺ %	<u>72</u>
Dd	27	FC	8	F1	1	F ⁻ %	<u>28</u>
Ds	4	M	7	An	2	S%	<u>15</u>
Dds	15	FV	4	Re	1	P%	<u>8</u>
Total	125	CF	5	Ad	15	M%	<u>6</u>
		C	1	A	46	FC%	<u>6</u>
		Total	125	Hd	7	CF%	<u>4</u>
				Na	2	A%	<u>49</u>
				Art, Ad	1	H%	<u>14</u>
				Tr	3	T/1R	<u>9 Sec.</u>
				H	11		
				Pr	1		
				Art	4		
				Is, Cl	1		
				Bt	5		
				Is	6		
				Cg	3		
				Ru	1		
				Pd	2		
				Ar	3		
				Im	3		
				Total	125		

W% 6
 D% 61
 Dd% 33

Approach: (W) (D) Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 7:10.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student D. H. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Male Age 19 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	10	A	7	F%	69
D	11	F-	1	Hd	1	F+%	91
Dd	1	M	2	H	3	F-%	9
Total	16	MFV	1	A, Ls	1	S%	0
		FV	1	Ls, F1	1	P%	25
		FY	1	Bt	1	M%	19
		Total	16	Hh	1	FC%	0
				Ls	1	CF%	0
				Total	16	A%	50
						H%	25
						T/1R	37 Sec.

W%	<u>25</u>
D%	<u>69</u>
Dd%	<u>6</u>

Approach: **W! D (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **3:0**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. H. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	FY	3	A	6	P%	56
D	13	F+	8	H	3	F%	80
		M	3	Sex, Hd	1	F-%	20
Total	18	FC	2	Im	2	S%	0
		F-	2	Ls	2	P%	22
		Total	18	Bt	3	M%	17
				Ls, Im	1	FC%	11
				Total	18	CF%	0
						A%	33
						H%	22
						T/1R	39 Sec.

W%	28
D%	72
Dd%	0

Approach: **W! D (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **3:1**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student N. H. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	17	A	9	P%	87
D	13	F-	4	H	4	F+%	80
Ds	3	CF	1	Hd	2	F-%	20
Dd	4	FC	1	Art	1	S%	13
		FY	1	Hd, Sex	2	P%	13
Total	24			Im	1	M%	0
		Total	24	Ls	1	FC%	4
				Cg	1	CF%	4
				As	1	A%	37
				F1	1	H%	33
				Tr	1	T/LR	16 Sec.
				Total	24		

W%	<u>17</u>
D%	<u>67</u>
Dd%	<u>17</u>

Approach: W D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 0:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. H. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 20 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	3	Pa	16	A	12	P%	78
D	22	F-	5	B1	1	F%	76
Dds	1	FC	2	H	3	F-%	24
Ds	1	CF	2	An	1	S%	9
		C	1	Ad	2	P%	26
Total	27	M	1	Sex, Hd	2	M%	5
		Total	27	Pd	2	FC%	9
				My	1	CF%	9
				Na	1	A%	52
				Im	1	H%	18
				Ls	1	T/1R	19 Sec.
				Total	27		

W% 11
 D% 85
 Dd% 4

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 1:4.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student D. S. Date Dec. 1963 Race White
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	2	F +	14	A	11	P%	63
D	23	F-	5	Hd, Sex	1	F%	73
Dd	7	YF	1	F1	1	F-%	27
		CF	3	Ad	2	S%	0
Total	32	FC	2	Hd	3	P%	16
		FV	1	H	3	M%	13
		M	4	An	2	FC%	6
		CY	1	A, Sc	2	CF%	10
		F	1	Im	1	A%	40
		Total	32	Ls	1	H%	19
				Tr	1	T/1R	12 Sec.
				Cl	1		
				Ge	1		
				Fd	2		
				Total	32		
W%	6						
D%	72						
Dd%	22						

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 4:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student T. C. Date July 1964 Race White
Sex Male Age 20 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
Ws	1	P +	25	Rc	3	P%	81
D	24	P-	9	Ge	4	F/%	73
W	14	FV	3	An	6	F-%	27
Ds	2	M	4	La	4	S%	10
Dds	1	FC	1	A	12	P%	19
				H	4	M%	10
Total	42	Total	42	Art	2	FC%	2
				Aq	1	CF%	0
				Ad	3	A%	35
				Mu	1	H%	12
				Im	1	T/1R	7 Sec.
				Hd	1		
				Total	42		

W% 36
D% 62
Dd% 2

Approach: W! (D) (Dd)
Sequence: irregular
Experience: 4:0.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. R. Date Jan. 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F ⁺	14	A	12	P%	77
D	20	F-	6	H	4	F ⁺ %	70
Dd	2	M	2	Art	2	F-%	30
Total	26	FT	1	Hd	1	S%	0
		FV	1	Cg	1	P%	23
		FC	2	Sc	3	M%	8
		Total	26	H, My	1	FC%	8
				La	1	CF%	0
				Rc	1	A%	46
				Total	26	H%	23
						T/1R	10 Sec.

W%	15
D%	77
Dd%	8

Approach: (W) D! Dd

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 2:1

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student M.W. Date Feb. 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 17 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	P+	14	A	8	P%	52
D	24	P-	2	Ad	2	F/%	87
Dd	2	CP	2	An	1	F-%	13
		M	9	Na	1	S%	0
Total	31	PV	2	Ar	1	P%	23
		PY	1	Cg	2	M%	29
		PC	1	H	6	FC%	3
		Total	31	Art	1	CF%	6
				Bt	2	A%	32
				Hh	1	H%	19
				Tr	1	T/1R	16 Sec.
				Mn	1		
				Ls	2		
				Cl	2		
				Total	31		

W% 16
 D% 77
 Dd% 7

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 9:2.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student B. F. Date March 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	3	F+	16	A	18	P%	78
D	24	M	2	H	2	F%	76
		F-	5	Cg	1	F-%	24
Total	27	FY	2	An	3	S%	0
		CF	1	Sc	1	P%	30
		FC	1	Fd	1	M%	7
		Total	27	Cl	1	FC%	4
				Total	27	CF%	4
						A%	67
						H%	7
						T/1R	12 Sec.

W%	11
D%	89
Dd%	0

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 2:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. M. Date April, 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 21 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	M	8	H, A	1	P%	73
D	42	F+	28	A	22	F%	74
Dd	3	F-	10	Ad	6	F-%	26
Ds	1	MY	1	Hd	6	S%	2
Total	51	FV	1	Hd, Sex	1	P%	8
		FC	3	H	8	M%	16
		Total	51	A, Ls	1	FC%	6
				An, Sc	1	CF%	0
				An	1	A%	59
				Na	1	H%	35
				Sc	1	T/LR	33 Sec.
				Total	51		

W%	<u>10</u>
D%	<u>84</u>
Dd%	<u>6</u>

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 8:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student N. B. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 19 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	8	F+	33	A	21	P%	72
D	28	M	2	H	2	F%	85
Dd	18	F-	6	Ad	10	F-%	15
Total	54	FYC	1	So	1	S%	0
		FY	5	Ay	1	P%	9
		FV	1	Fd	2	M%	4
		CF	2	Ge	2	FC%	8
		FC	3	Tr	1	CF%	8
		C	1	Hh	2	A%	57
		Total	54	Bt	2	H%	11
				Hd	4	2T/1R	41 Sec.
				La	2		
				Mu	1		
				Cl	1		
				Im	1		
				Art	1		
				Total	54		

W% 15
 D% 52
 Dd% 33

Approach: (W) (D) Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 2:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student G. J. Date July, 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 17 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	10	F +	16	A	6	P%	<u>88</u>
D	14	F -	6	Ad	4	F + %	<u>73</u>
Ds	1	M	2	Al	1	F - %	<u>27</u>
Total	25	FC	1	Pi	1	S%	<u>24</u>
		Total	25	Hh	1	P%	<u>8</u>
				An	5	M%	<u>4</u>
				Hd	2	FC%	<u>0</u>
				Hd, Sex	1	CF%	<u>40</u>
				H	2	A%	<u>20</u>
				Ls	1	H%	<u>14</u>
				Art	1	T/IR	<u>See.</u>
				Total	25		

W%	<u>40</u>
D%	<u>60</u>
Dd%	<u>0</u>

Approach: **W1 (D) (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **2:5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. N. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	2	F+	18	H	9	F%	75
Ws	1	F-	6	A	7	F+%	75
D	25	FV	1	Sc	2	F-%	25
Ds	1	FC	1	An	5	S%	6
Dd	3	M	6	Ad	4	P%	22
Total	32	Total	32	Bt	1	M%	19
				Hd	3	FC%	3
				Ab	1	CF%	0
				Total	32	A%	34
						H%	37
						T/LR	15 Sec.

W% 9

D% 81

Dd% 10

Approach: (W) D! Dd

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 6:0.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student B. Y. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	F+	11	A	8	P%	<u>87</u>
Ws	1	F-	2	Ad	3	F%	<u>85</u>
D	8	FCV	1	Hd	1	F-%	<u>15</u>
Dd	1	FY	1	Im	1	S%	<u>7</u>
Total	15	Total	15	A, Ls	1	P%	<u>33</u>
				Ls	1	M%	<u>0</u>
				Total	15	FC%	<u>7</u>
						CF%	<u>0</u>
						A%	<u>80</u>
						H%	<u>7</u>
						T/1R	<u>58 Sec.</u>

W% 40
 D% 53
 Dd% 7

Approach: W1 (D) (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 0:0.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student E. G. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F +	8	A	7	P%	<u>77</u>
Ws	1	F-	2	An	2	F/%	<u>80</u>
D	8	M	1	H	1	F-%	<u>20</u>
Total	13	FY	1	Hd	1	S%	<u>8</u>
		FC	1	Bt	1	P%	<u>23</u>
		Total	13	Ad	1	M%	<u>8</u>
				Total	13	FC%	<u>8</u>
						CF%	<u>0</u>
						A%	<u>52</u>
						H%	<u>15</u>
						T/1R	<u>37 Sec.</u>

W%	<u>38</u>
D%	<u>62</u>
Dd%	<u>0</u>

Approach: **W! (D) (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **1:0.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student L. E. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 22 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	6	F+	7	A	7	P%	70
D	4	FC	1	An	1	F%	100
		CF	1	Fd	2	F-%	0
Total	10	FY	1	Total	10	S%	0
		Total	10			P%	40
						M%	0
						FC%	10
						CF%	10
						A%	70
						H%	0
						T/1R	27 Sec.

W%	<u>60</u>
D%	<u>40</u>
Dd%	<u>0</u>

Approach: **W! (D) (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **0:1.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. B. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	32	A	30	F%	85
Ws	1	F	1	Re	1	F + %	72
D	40	F-	13	A, H	2	F-%	28
Dd	9	FY	1	Ad	4	S%	2
		M	5	H	6	P%	9
Total	54	FC	2	An	1	M%	9
		Total	54	Art	1	FC%	4
				Cl	1	CF%	0
				Hd	2	A%	67
				Ls	1	H%	19
				Cg	1	T/1R	9 Sec.
				Pi	1		
				Na	1		
				Sc	1		
				Bt	1		

W% 9
 D% 74
 Dd% 17

Approach: (W) D Dd! Total 54
 Sequence: irregular
 Experience: 5:1

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student P. M. Date July 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Male Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	5	F+	26	A	16	P%	89
D	28	F-	5	H	3	F ₁ %	84
Ds	2	M	1	An	4	F-%	16
Total	35	FC	1	Bt	1	S%	6
		CF	1	F1	2	P%	23
		FY	1	Ad	4	M%	3
		Total	35	Mu	1	FC%	3
				Hd	2	CF%	3
				Sc	1	A%	57
				Pr	1	H%	14
				Total	35	T/LR	12 Sec.
W%	14						
D%	86						
Dd%	0						

Approach: (W) D1 (D4)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 1:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student F. K. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	18	A	14	P%	67
D	24	F-	4	Art	2	F%	82
Dd	3	C	1	B1	1	F-%	18
Ds	2	FC	1	Tr	1	S%	6
Total	33	CF	1	H	6	P%	12
		M	6	H, Art	1	M%	18
		FY	2	Hd	1	FC%	3
		Total	33	Bt	2	CF%	3
				Ad	1	A%	45
				Aq, Ro	1	H%	24
				Ab	1	T/IR	20 Sec.
				Ge	1		
				Sc	1		
				Total	33		

W% 12
 D% 79
 Dd% 9

Approach: (w) D! Dd

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 6:3

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student E. J. Date April 1961 Race White
 Sex Female Age 22 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
Ds	4	M	11	H	9	P%	59
W	14	F+	21	H, A	1	F ⁺ %	81
Dd	3	FY	2	Ad	3	F-%	19
Dds	4	F-	5	Hd, F1	1	S%	18
D	19	FC	4	Art	1	P%	23
Total	44	FYV	1	Ls, F1	1	M%	25
		Total	44	A	14	FC%	9
				Hd	2	CF%	0
				Ro	1	A%	41
				Ls	3	H%	30
				Cg	1	T/LR	8 Sec.
				Ab	2		
				An	1		
				Hh	1		
				Fd	1		
				Im	1		
				Bt	1		
				Total	44		
W%	32						
D%	52						
Dd%	16						
Approach:	W! (D) Dd!						
Sequence:	irregular						
Experience:	11:2						

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student F. D. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 20 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	26	F+	17	A	23	P%	67
W	3	F-	3	H	4	F%	85
Dd	1	M	7	Hd	1	F-%	15
Total	30	FCM	1	So	1	S%	0
		FC	2	Tr	1	P%	10
		Total	30	Total	30	M%	27
						FC%	10
						CF%	0
						A%	77
						H%	17
						T/IR	37 Sec.

W% 10
 D% 87
 Dd% 3

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 8:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. S. Date Feb. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	3	F+	10	A	10	P%	42
D	28	F-	2	H	9	F%	88
Ds	1	CF	4	Sc	4	F-%	22
Dd	5	FC	6	Art	1	S%	5
Dds	1	M	8	Bl	1	P%	13
Total	38	FY	2	H, My	2	M%	24
		MFY	1	Tr	1	FC%	16
		FV	1	Ge	1	CF%	11
		Total	38	An	1	A%	29
				Cg	1	H%	34
				Bt	1	T/IR	10 Sec.
				Ad	1		
				H, Ay	1		
				La	3		
				Hd	1		

W% 8
 D% 76
 Dd% 16

Approach: (W) D! Dd!

Total 38

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 9:7

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student A. F. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	22	F+	14	Ad	4	P%	53
Dd	5	F-	3	Hd	4	F%	82
W	3	CF	4	B1	1	F-%	18
Ds	2	FY	4	Ls	5	S%	6
Total	32	M	2	H	4	P%	12
		FV	2	Bt	3	M%	9
		FVY	1	A	4	FC%	3
		FC	1	F1	1	CF%	12
		MV	1	Hh	1	A%	24
		Total	32	Cl	1	H%	24
				Ge	1	T/1R	14 Sec.
				Fd	1		
				Sc	2		
				Total	32		

W% 9
 D% 75
 Dd% 16

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 3:4.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student T. A. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
Ws	2	F+	19	Rc	3	P%	63
W	6	CF	3	Ad	1	F%	86
D	23	FC	6	A	12	F-%	14
Dd	1	M	1	Bl	1	S%	14
Ds	3	FY	2	Sc	1	P%	20
Total	35	F-	3	Hd	2	M%	3
		FCV	1	Tr	2	FC%	20
		Total	35	H	2	CF%	9
				Hh	5	A%	37
				Cg	2	H%	11
				Ls	1	T/1R	12 Sec.
				Fd	1		
				Bt	2		
				Total	35		

W% 23
 D% 74
 Dd% 3

Approach: W D (Dd)
 Sequence: irregular
 Experience: 1:6.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student B. F. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
Ws	1	F+	15	Ls	2	F%	81
D	12	F-	2	Cs	2	F+%	88
Ds	1	FC	1	Cl	1	F-%	12
W	3	CF	1	Art	1	S%	10
Dd	4	YF	1	An	1	P%	14
		MPY	1	A	6	M%	5
Total	21	Total	21	Hd	2	FC%	5
				H	1	CF%	5
				Ad	1	A%	33
				Fd	1	H%	14
				Tr	1	T/IR	24 Sec.
				Pr	1		
				Im	1		
				Total	21		

W% 19
 D% 62
 Dd% 19

Approach: **W (D) Dd!**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **1:1.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student L. P. Date April 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	34	F+	20	H	9	P%	56
W	3	M	10	Cg	2	F+%	87
Ds	2	FC	1	Ad	1	F-%	13
Dd	4	FV	3	Hh	2	S%	5
		FCY	1	Pd	2	P%	19
Total	43	F-	3	Bt	1	M%	24
		CF	4	Ab	1	FC%	2
		F	1	Ls, R1	2	CF%	9
		Total	43	Hd, R1	1	A%	32
				Ar, R1	1	H%	35
				Hd	6	T/LR	34 Sec.
				A	13		
				Ls	2		
				Total	43		

W% 7
 D% 84
 Dd% 9

Approach: (W) D! Dd

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: 10:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. N. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	14	F+	9	A	8	P%	52
D	7	F-	2	H	6	F ₁ %	82
		M	4	Ad	4	F ₂ %	18
Total	21	FV	3	A, La	2	S%	0
		FY	1	Im	1	P%	43
		FC	2	Total	21	M%	19
		Total	21			FC%	10
						CF%	0
						A%	66
						H%	28
						T/IR	23 Sec.

W% 67
 D% 33
 Dd% 0

Approach: **W! (D) (Dd)**

Sequence: **Methodical**

Experience: **4:1**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student D. V. Date Feb. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 22 Class Sr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	7	F+	28	Ar	1	P%	<u>61</u>
D	50	F-	13	Rc	1	F+%	<u>68</u>
Dd	6	M	14	Ab	1	F-%	<u>32</u>
Ds	1	FY	4	Hh	1	S%	<u>6</u>
Dds	3	FV	1	Ad	4	P%	<u>10</u>
		Y	1	H	11	M%	<u>21</u>
Total	67	FC	4	Hd	7	FC%	<u>6</u>
		CF	2	Bt	3	CF%	<u>3</u>
		Total	67	Ls	6	A%	<u>34</u>
				A	19	H%	<u>29</u>
				AH	1	T/1R	<u>9 Sec.</u>
				An	2		
				At	3		
				Na	1		
				Sc	1		
				Pr	2		
				Fd	3		
				Total	67		

W% 11
 D% 76
 Dd% 13

Approach: (W) D! Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 14:4

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student P. S. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	7	F+	26	Ro	3	P%	61
D	38	M	7	H	8	F%	70
Dd	4	Y	1	Ad	8	F-%	30
Ds	1	FY	3	Ab	1	S%	7
Dds	1	FC	6	A	15	P%	17
Total	51	MY	1	Ay	1	M%	17
		F-	3	Bt	2	FC%	12
		FVY	1	Ls	3	CF%	5
		YF	1	F1	1	A%	47
		CF	1	Na	1	H%	25
		FCY	1	Art	1	T/1R	8 Sec.
		Total	51	Total	51		
W%	29						
D%	57						
Dd%	14						

Approach: **W! (D) Dd!**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **13:6.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. S. Date Jan. 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 21 Class Jr. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	17	M	10	H	12	P%	<u>61</u>
D	31	F+	25	A	24	F+%	<u>70</u>
Dd	7	F-	11	Tr	1	F-%	<u>30</u>
Ds	3	FCM	1	Hd	3	S%	<u>7</u>
Dds	1	FC	6	Bt	3	P%	<u>17</u>
Total	59	FT	1	Ad	4	M%	<u>17</u>
		MV	1	Le	1	FC%	<u>12</u>
		T	1	An	2	CF%	<u>5</u>
		CF	2	Fi	2	A%	<u>47</u>
		Total	59	Is, A	1	H%	<u>25</u>
				Hh	1	T/IR	<u>8 Sec.</u>
				Ab	2		
				Rl	1		
				Mn	1		
				Sc	1		
				Total	59		

W% 29
 D% 57
 Dd% 14

Approach: **W! (D) Dd!**

Total 59

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **13:6.5**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student P. N. Date May 1964 Race White
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	6	F +	26	Bt	4	P%	72
D	28	FY	5	Hd	2	F-%	84
Dds	1	F-	5	Ar	1	F-%	16
Dd	8	YF	1	A	17	S%	2
Total	43	CFV	1	Le	8	P%	16
		FCV	1	Cl	1	M%	0
		FC	1	Art	1	FC%	4
		CF	3	Tr	2	CF%	9
		Total	43	H	1	A%	44
				Rc, A	2	H%	7
				Hh, Pd	1	T/LR	11 Sec.
				An	1		
				Sc	1		
				Pd	1		
				Total	43		
W%	14						
D%	65						
Dd%	21						

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 0:4

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student J. C. Date April 1961 Race White
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	20	A	13	F%	78
D	15	FY	2	H	4	F / %	95
Dd	6	FV	1	Tr, F1	1	F-%	5
De	1	M	2	Ad	4	S%	7
Dds	1	FC	1	An	1	P%	18
Total	27	F-	1	Bt	2	M%	7
		Total	27	Hd	1	FC%	3
				Cl	1	CF%	0
				Total	27	A%	62
						H%	19
						T/1R	60 Sec.

W%	<u>15</u>
D%	<u>59</u>
Dd%	<u>26</u>

Approach: (W) (D) Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 2:0.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student M. E. Date April 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	12	F+	24	A	17	P%	<u>46</u>
D	56	FY	5	An	3	F+%	<u>73</u>
Dds	1	FV	2	Ad	6	F-%	<u>27</u>
Dd	2	CF	11	Hd	1	S%	<u>1</u>
		FC	10	Cl	5	P%	<u>14</u>
Total	71	FVY	1	H	10	M%	<u>11</u>
		F-	8	Ls	4	FC%	<u>14</u>
		FY	1	H,Rl	1	CF%	<u>17</u>
		M	7	Fi	1	A%	<u>32</u>
		MCF	1	Ab	1	H%	<u>18</u>
		Total	71	B1	1	T/LR	<u>19 Sec.</u>
				Bt	3		
				Pr	4		
				Ay	1		
				Rc	1		
				Fd	3		
				Na	1		
				Mn	1		
				Cg	3		
				Sc	1		
				Bt,Hd	1		
				Ge	1		
				Hh	1		
				Art	1		
				Fd,Cl	1		
				Total	71		

W% 17
 D% 79
 Dd% 4

Approach: **W D! (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **8:17.**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. G. Date Mar. 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 20 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	30	F+	21	Im	1	P%	64
W	4	F-	2	A	14	F ₁ %	91
Dd	2	CF	4	An	4	F-%	9
		M	3	Ad	1	S%	0
Total	36	FC	1	Hd	2	P%	22
		FY	3	Ay	1	M%	8
		CT	2	H	4	FC%	3
		Total	36	Hh	1	CF%	11
				Art	2	A%	42
				Cl	1	H%	17
				Ls	1	T/1R	14 Sec.
				Fd	2		
				Na	1		
				Fi	1		
				Total	36		

W% 11
 D% 83
 Dd% 6

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 3:7.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student L. R. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	21	F+	20	A	11	P%	71
W	5	F-	3	H	2	F/%	87
Ds	4	F	1	Ls	2	F-%	13
Dds	2	M	2	Ab, Bl, H	1	S%	18
Dd	2	C	1	Re	1	P%	18
		CF	3	Ad	7	M%	6
Total	34	FY	3	F1, Ls	1	FC%	3
		FC	1	Hh	1	CF%	9
		Total	34	Hd	4	A%	59
				A, An	2	H%	18
				Fd	1	T/1R	13 Sec.
				Cg	1		
				Total	34		

W% 15
 D% 73
 Dd% 12

Approach: (W) D Dd

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: 2:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. H. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	3	F+	9	Tr	1	P%	<u>93</u>
D	10	F-	3	A	9	F%	<u>75</u>
Dd	1	FY	1	Hh	1	F-%	<u>25</u>
		F	1	Ad	1	S%	<u>0</u>
Total	14	Total	14	Cl	1	P%	<u>36</u>
				Ls	1	M%	<u>0</u>
				Total #		FC%	<u>0</u>
						CF%	<u>0</u>
						A%	<u>71</u>
						H%	<u>0</u>
						T/1R	<u>56 Sec.</u>

W%	<u>21</u>
D%	<u>71</u>
Dd%	<u>8</u>

Approach: W D Dd

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 0:0

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student L. A. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Fresh Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	13	F+	23	A	18	P%	68
D	23	F-	7	Ro	4	F%	77
Ws	3	FC	4	Hd	3	F-%	13
Ds	2	M	2	H	4	S%	14
Dd	2	FV	3	Ge	1	P%	14
Dds	1	FY	3	Bt	4	M%	5
		CF	2	Ls	4	FC%	10
Total	44			Cl	1	CF%	5
		Total	44	Hh	1	A%	41
				Art	2	H%	16
				Cg	2	T/1R	23 Sec.
				Total	44		

W% 36
 D% 57
 Dd% 7

Approach: **W! (D) (Dd)**

Sequence: **irregular**

Experience: **2:4**

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. B. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
Dd	2	FY	1	A	13	F%	72
D	16	F+	15	Tr	1	F ₁ %	94
Ds	2	M	5	H	6	F-%	6
Dds	1	F-	1	Ad	1	S%	14
W	1	Total	22	Hh	1	P%	27
Total	22			Total	22	M%	23
						FC%	0
						CF%	0
						A%	64
						H%	27
						T/IR	30 Sec.

W% 4
 D% 82
 Dd% 14

Approach: (W) D! Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 5:0

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student M. F. Date May 1964 Race NegroSex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
						F%	59
W	18	F+	23	A	22	F ₁ %	77
Ws	3	FY	8	An	2	F-%	23
D	29	M	5	Hh	2	S%	8
Dds	1	F-	7	Re	2	F%	14
		CF	6	H	7	M%	10
Total	51	MFC	1	F1	1	FC%	4
		FC	1	Bt	3	CF%	12
		Total	51	Ad	4	A%	51
				Ar	1	H%	18
				H, Art	1	T/1R	14 Sec.
				Pr	1		
				Ls	1		
				Cl	1		
				Cg	1		
				Hd	1		
				Mn	1		
				Total	51		
W%	41						
D%	57						
Dd%	2						
Approach:	(D) (Dd)						
Sequence:	irregular						
Experience:	5:4						

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student L. J. Date May 1964 Race Negro

Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	6	F+	20	A	13	F%	66
Dd	7	F-	7	H	7	F ₁ %	74
D	28	M	6	An	2	F-%	26
Total	41	MCF	1	Hd	2	S%	0
		CF	2	B1	1	P%	15
		FC	4	Ad	4	M%	17
		FY	1	Hh	2	FC%	10
		Total	41	Pr	2	CF%	7
				Cl	1	A%	41
				Im	2	H%	22
				Cg	1	T/1R	18 Sec.
				Ls	1		
				Bt	2		
				Fd	1		
				Total	41		

W%	15
D%	68
Dd%	17

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 7:5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student I. L. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
W	4	F+	13	A	8	F%	67
D	20	CF	4	An	1	F ₁ %	81
		F-	3	B1	1	F ₂ %	19
Total	24	FT	1	Art	2	S%	0
		FY	1	Ad	5	P%	12
		FC	1	La	3	M%	0
		C	1	C1	1	FC%	4
		Total	24	F1	1	CF%	17
				Bt	2	A%	54
				Total	24	H%	0
						T/IR	25 Sec.

W%	17
D%	83
Dd%	0

Approach: W D! (Dd)
 Sequence: irregular
 Experience: 0:6.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student B. P. Date April 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant	Content	Analysis
W	3	F+ 12	A 8	F% 82
D	13	CF 1	So 1	F- % 86
Dd	1	F- 2	Art 1	F- % 14
		FC 1	An 1	S% 0
Total	17	M 1	Hd 1	P% 29
		Total 17	Ad 2	M% 6
			Is 1	FC% 6
			Cl 1	CF% 6
			Ge 1	A% 59
				H% 6
			Total 17	T/IR 19 Sec.

W% 18
 D% 76
 Dd% 6

Approach: W D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 1:1.5

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student S. D. Date April 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 20 Class Soph. Testing Conditions Good

Location	Determinant	Content	Analysis
W 4	F + 16	A 10	F% 46
D 25	FY 6	H 6	F-% 98
Dd 7	F- 1	Tr 1	F-% 2
Ds 1	FC 2	Ad 8	S% 3
	M 6	An 3	P% 13
Total 37	CF 6	Pr 1	M% 16
	Total 37	Ge 1	FC% 5
		H, Tr 1	CP% 16
		Mu 1	A% 49
		F1 1	H% 22
		La 1	T/LH 38 Sec.
		Fd 1	
		Sc 1	
		Hd 1	

W% 11
 D% 70
 Dd% 19

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 6:7

Total 37

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student G. S. Date May 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 18 Class Fresh Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	16	M	4	H	3	P%	65
Dd	1	FY	3	A	11	P-%	69
Ds	2	F+	9	Bt	1	S%	31
W	1	F-	4	Ar	2	P%	10
Total	20	Total	20	An	1	M%	20
				Fi	1	FC%	0
				La	1	CP%	0
				Total	20	A%	55
						H%	15
						T/1R	16 Sec.

W% 5
 D% 90
 Dd% 5

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 4:0

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student R. M. Date April 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant		Content		Analysis	
D	22	M	7	H	8	F%	77
W	2	F+	23	An	2	F+%	95
Dd	7	F-	1	Bt	1	F-%	5
				A	11	S%	0
Total	31	Total	31	Hd	3	F%	19
				Ad	5	M%	23
				Cg	1	FC%	0
				Total	31	CF%	0
						A%	51
						H%	35
						T/1R	21 Sec.

W% 6
 D% 71
 Dd% 23

Approach: (W) D Dd!

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 7:0

RORSCHACH SUMMARY

Student M. T. Date Mar. 1964 Race Negro
 Sex Female Age 19 Class Fresh. Testing Conditions Good

Location		Determinant	Content	Analysis
W	4	F +	H 8	F% 69
D	21	F -	A 10	F% 67
Dd	1	M	Cg 1	F- % 33
		CF	Hd 1	S% 0
Total	26	FC	Ad 3	P% 19
		Total	Pd 1	M% 23
			Bt 1	FC% 4
			Na 1	CF% 4
				A% 50
				H% 34
			Total 26	T/IR 41 Sec.

W% 15
 D% 81
 Dd% 4

Approach: (W) D! (Dd)

Sequence: irregular

Experience: 6:1.5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Beck, Samuel J., Rorschach's Test, I, Basic Processes, third edition fully revised, New York, Grune and Stratton, 1961.
- Beck, Samuel J., Rorschach's Test, II, A Variety of Personality Pictures, New York, Grune and Stratton, 1945.
- Brussel, James, Kenneth Hitch, and Zygmunt Piotrowski, A Rorschach Training Manual, third edition, New York, State Hospitals Press, 1950.
- Crane, Albert Loyal, Race Differences In Inhibition, New York, G. E. Stechert and Co., 1923.
- Davie, Maurice R., Negroes in American Society, first edition, New York, Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.
- Hadley, John M., Clinical and Counseling Psychology, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Kardiner, Abram, and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1951.
- Karon, Bertram P., The Negro Personality, New York, Springer Publishing Company, Inc., 1958.
- Klineberg, O., Characteristics of the American Negro, New York, Harper, 1944.
- Klopfer, Bruno, Developments in the Rorschach Technique, New York, World Book Company, 1956.
- Myrdal, G., An American Dilemma, New York, Harper, 1944.
- Phillips, Leslie, and Joseph G. Smith, Rorschach Interpretation: Advanced Technique, New York, Grune and Stratton, 1953.
- Rogers, Carl R., Client-Centered Therapy, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Articles

- Block, William E., "Psychometric Aspects of the Rorschach Technique," Journal of Projective Techniques, XXI (June, 1962), 162-172.
- Clarke, Robert B., and Donald T. Campbell, "A Demonstration of Bias in Estimates of Negro Ability," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (November, 1955), 585-588.
- Dreger, Ralph Mason, and Kent S. Miller, "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites In The United States," Psychological Bulletin, LVII (September, 1960), 361-402.
- Gray, Susan, "The Vocational Preferences of Negro School Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, LXIV (1944), 234-247.
- Katz, I., and M. Cohen, "The Effects of Training Negroes upon Cooperative Problem Solving in Biracial Teams," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIV (May, 1962), 319-325.
- Long, Howard Hale, "The Relative Learning Capacity of Negroes and Whites," Journal of Negro Education, XXVI (Spring, 1957), 121-134.
- Mc Gurk, Frank C., "A Scientist's Report on Race Differences," United States News and World Report, (September 21, 1956), 92-98.
- Murstein, B. I., "Factor Analyses of the Rorschach," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV (June, 1960), 262-275.
- Silver, Albert W., and John Derr, "The Effect of Oral Gratification on Children's Rorschach Scores and Differences Between Examiners," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIX (July, 1963), 310-311.

Reports

George, Wesley Critz, The Biology of the Race Problem,
(a report prepared by commission of the Governor of
Alabama), University of North Carolina Medical
School, 1962.

Warner, Lloyd W., Buford H. Junker, and Walter A. Adams,
"Color and Human Nature," Washington, D. C., American
Council on Education, 1941.

Unpublished Materials

Sicha, M. H., "A Study of Rorschach Erlebness-Typus of
Comparable White and Negro Subjects," unpublished
master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Columbia
University, 1939.