

# A COMPARISON OF RORSCHACH AND HOWARD INK BLOT TESTS ON A SCHIZOPHRENIC POPULATION FROM A CONTENT POINT OF VIEW

EDWARD M. SCOTT

*Oregon State Board of Health  
Portland, Oregon*

## INTRODUCTION

In a former paper<sup>(1)</sup> the significant differences based on scoring determinants between the Rorschach and the Howard Tests on a schizophrenic population were presented. In view of the growing interest in content it was felt that an investigation on this topic would prove interesting.

One of the first workers in the area of content was Lindner<sup>(6)</sup> who used a list technique and an interpretive system. At first his hypothesis was so revolutionary that Abt and Bellak<sup>(1)</sup> attached a note of warning to an article of Lindner's in their text. Other investigators<sup>(3, 8)</sup> have either added to, or altered this original list. More cautious investigators on this topic are Klopfer<sup>(6)</sup>, Beck<sup>(2)</sup>, Lubar<sup>(7)</sup>, and Sandler and Achner<sup>(9)</sup>. Recently, Schafer<sup>(10)</sup> has "reworked" the existing literature and outlined his own beliefs, with an accompanying list. Rorschach himself held that content "offers little indication as to the content of the psyche".

## PROCEDURE

The present investigation is based on a population of 50 routine, testable schizophrenics of at least normal intelligence admitted to the Eastern Oregon State Hospital. On one half of the population the Rorschach was first administered, and the following day the Howard; on the other half of the sample the process was reversed. Following this a list of responses was constructed and each response was entered into like categories of content. The total expanded list grew to 139 separate content response categories. However, 49 of these categories consisted merely in different kinds of animals, 14 in various anatomical responses, and 10 in various humanlike (H) responses. A summary sheet was constructed and tabulations computed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The significant differences are presented in Table 1. Our results do not support Phillips and Smith's<sup>(8)</sup> assertion that "responses to the Rorschach are not primarily stimulus determined", but rather favor Schafer's<sup>(10)</sup> opinion of partial stimulus determination. The Rorschach seems to stimulate more animal responses; whereas the Howard lends itself more to (H), vague responses (clouds and leaves), and flowers. Whether these results would be substantiated on a different population needs investigating. The present author feels that the distinction between content and symbolism has not been adequately delineated.

TABLE 1. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RORSCHACH AND HOWARD TESTS BASED ON CONTENT

CONTENT	NUMERICAL VALUE		CHI-SQUARE
	HOWARD	RORSCHACH	
Human-like	43	19	1%
Clouds	24	5	1%
Leaves	25	5	1%
Frogs	9	0	1%
Hd (eyes)	14	4	2%
Flowers	37	18	2%
Hide	0	16	1%
Rabbit	0	9	1%
Snake	0	7	1%
Sheep	1	14	1%

Regarding symbolism which is derived from content, Jones<sup>(4)</sup> speaks of (a) unconscious complexes, (b) inhibitory influences, and (c) sublimated tendencies. It is his opinion that the "material of the symbol is taken from the third group", but that the "very existence of the symbol—is taken from the first group". Whereas, if the symbolic image is used to refer to the second or third group, "it is a metaphor, not a symbol". This distinction could account for some of the confusion and inconsistencies in the published content lists. Additionally, consideration of ego and id responses has not been accomplished.

#### SUMMARY

Fifty schizophrenic patients were given the Rorschach and Howard Tests and a comparison of the contents was made. The significant differences were presented. The results indicate that (a) the stimulus does influence responses, (b) mere lists are apt to be misleading, and (c) a distinction between content and symbolism is necessary.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ABT, J. E. and BELLAK, L. *Projective Psychology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.
2. BECK, S. J. *Rorschach's Test. III. Advances in Interpretation*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1952.
3. BROWN, F. An Exploratory Study of Dynamic Factors in the Content of the Rorschach Protocol. *J. Proj. Techn.*, 1953, 17, 251-279.
4. JONES, E. *Psychoanalysis*. Baltimore: Wm. Wood, 1938.
5. KLOPFER, B. *Developments in the Rorschach Technique*. II. New York: World Book 1956.
6. LINDNER, R. The Clinical Uses of Content Analysis in Rorschach Testing. *J. Psychoanal. Psychol.*, 1955, 3, 12-17.
7. LUBAR, G. H. Rorschach Content Analysis. *J. clin. Psychopath.*, 1948, 9, 146-152.
8. PHILLIPS, L. and SMITH, J. G. *Rorschach Interpretation: Advanced Technique*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1953.
9. SANDLER, J., and ACKNER, B. Rorschach Content Analysis: An Experimental Investigation. *Brit. J. Med. Psychol.* 1951, 24, 180-201.
10. SCHAFER, R. *Psychoanalytic Interpretation in Rorschach Testing*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954.
11. SCOTT, E. M. and DOUGLAS, F. A. Comparison of Rorschach and Howard Tests on a Schizophrenic Population. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1957, 13, 79-81.

---

### EXAMINER, EGO DEFENSE, AND THE H-T-P TEST

ROBERT H. CASSEL, ANNA P. JOHNSON AND WILLIAM H. BURNS<sup>1</sup>

*Dixon State School, Dixon, Illinois*

#### PROBLEM

One of the popular projective techniques is the House-Tree-Person drawing test devised by Buck<sup>(1)</sup>. But as yet evidence for the validity of some of the H-T-P assumptions is lacking and the possible influence of *E* on the drawings has not been determined. The present study deals with the influence of *E* on the protocols and presents evidence relevant to Hammer's<sup>(2)</sup> hypothesis that the Tree and the Person drawings, although both representing a psycho-sexual self concept, are at different depths of personality integration.

In the course of his regular clinical work, one of the authors (W. H. B.) became interested in what happens if *E* leaves the room while *S* is drawing. He gained the clinical impression that with *E* absent the drawings tended to be more bizarre. It was to confirm this clinical impression that the present study was conceived.

<sup>1</sup>Acknowledgement is made to Miss Boone Todd and to Mr. R. J. Ferber for aid in collecting data and to Dr. R. Metzger for statistical assistance.

Copyright of Journal of Clinical Psychology is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.