to identify possible antecedents of such behavior and there is evidence to suggest that the phenomenon might reflect an attitude of learned negativism. The relatively low incidence of evasive responses suggests that experiential antecedents of this type will elucidate only one etiological aspect of mental deficiency.
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A STUDY OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE H-T-P TO CHILDREN WITH RESPECT TO THE DRAWN HOUSE*

HARRY S. BECK
Illinois Department of Public Instruction

Introduction

In working with mentally handicapped children, one frequently finds that they omit what may be considered as essential details in their drawings. Buck (1) indicates that the omission of essential details may be indicative of intellectual deterioration in one known to have been of normal intelligence. The question that arises at this point is whether or not essential details, as defined by Buck for adults, have the same significance in the case of children, and if so is his interpretation valid for children. Very little has been done by way of standardizing or validating the H-T-P with children. Jolles (2, 3) and Jolles and Beck (4, 5) did a series of studies in this area which to date appear to be the only studies using fairly large samples of a school population. The present study was attempted as a means of furnishing further objective evidence regarding the applicability of Buck's interpretations of H-T-P drawings when applied to children.

The problems to be investigated are: (1) Does Buck's definition as to what constitutes essential details apply to children? (2) Does Buck's interpretation of the omission of essential details apply to children? (3) Do mentally handicapped organic children differ in their drawings from mentally handicapped non-organic children? As indicated by the title, the present investigation is limited to the drawing of a house rather than the House, Tree, and Person together.

*The writer wishes to acknowledge his appreciation to Mr. Isaac Jolles for the use of the drawings collected for an earlier study.
**A STUDY OF THE APPLICABILITY OF THE H-T-P**

**THE SUBJECTS**

The normal population, or control group, was composed of 212 five year old boys and girls and 593 six year old boys and girls. Only five and six year old children were used in the control group, because it was felt that if children at this age drew houses that were recognizable and complete in the matter of essential details, normal children of older ages would do as well or better. The control group population is the same as described and used by Jolles\(^4\) except that it includes only the five and six year olds. Inasmuch as most of the sample was obtained from school systems having Special Education facilities, it is likely that the control group has less than the expected 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) to 2\% mentally handicapped, since these children would be enrolled in Special Education classes which were not included in the sample. The organic group was composed of twenty-five boys and girls, ranging in age from six to nineteen years. The term "organic" as used here is defined as: "any involvement of the central nervous system resulting from disease, injury, or malformation occurring before, during, or after birth." This group was diagnosed as such by means of psychological and neurological examinations, and in some cases E. E. G.'s were obtained.

The non-organic mentally handicapped group was composed of thirteen boys and girls who were diagnosed as mentally handicapped by means of psychological examinations, but from whom no organic signs could be elicited on neurological examination. Table 1 indicates the makeup of the experimental groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Mean IQ</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>2.98 yr.</td>
<td>56.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9-8</td>
<td>2.95 yr.</td>
<td>69.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCEDURE**

In spite of the fact that the experimental groups are older than the control group chronologically, the mean mental ages are approximately six years as determined from the mean chronological ages and mean IQ's. This would make them roughly equivalent to the six year old section of the control group, since the mean mental age of this group should be approximately six years also, if it is a normal population as we have assumed it to be.

The drawings were rated for the following things: was it recognizable as a house, was it recognizable but unrealistic or bizarre in appearance, was it unrecognizable, were all essential details present, i.e., wall, roof, door, window, and chimney; was one essential detail missing, were two essential details missing, were three or more essential details missing, or were irrelevant details present.

The control group was then compared with the organic group on the basis of these criteria using chi square. The reason for using the organic group was that the writer was interested in this particular group in the beginning and the non-organic group was brought in later. A later comparison of the two experimental groups using chi square indicated that there were no significant differences between them. In fact, the differences between the organic and non-organic mentally handicapped groups was so slight as to be considered entirely chance.

**RESULTS**

Table 2 refers to the recognizability and bizarreness of the drawings and indicates the obtained frequencies, with the expected frequencies being in parentheses. It will be seen that organsics have a significantly higher number of unrecognizable houses than either five or six year olds and that a significantly smaller number of organsics draw houses that are both recognizable and lacking in bizarreness. It should
be noted, however, that the latter probably results from the large number of unrecognizable houses as the organics obtained the expected frequency on the "recognizable but bizarre" item.

**TABLE 2. RECOGNIZABILITY OF DRAWINGS OF NormALS AND ORGANICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Recognizable but Bizarre</th>
<th>Unrecognizable</th>
<th>Recognizable and not Bizarre</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year olds</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62 (54.70)</td>
<td>5.0 (3.82)</td>
<td>145.0 (153.49)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year olds</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>145 (152.99)</td>
<td>2.0* (10.67)</td>
<td>446.0 (429.33)</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0 (6.45)</td>
<td>8.0* (0.45)</td>
<td>10.0* (18.10)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>601.0</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significant differences beyond .01 level. Chi Square = 140.26

With regard to inclusion of irrelevant details there were no significant differences between the groups. Table 3 reports the number of essential details omitted with the expected frequencies in parentheses. Five year old boys and girls and organics differ significantly from six year olds in all categories except that the five year olds have the expected number of obtained frequencies in the "two details missing" column, as do the six year olds.

**TABLE 3. ESSENTIALS DETAILS OMITTED BY NormALS AND ORGANICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All Essential Details Present</th>
<th>1 Detail Missing</th>
<th>2 Details Missing</th>
<th>3 or More Details Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 year olds</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>146* (165.75)</td>
<td>50* (33.15)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8* (5.10)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 year olds</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>494* (464.10)</td>
<td>75* (92.84)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5* (14.28)</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10* (19.50)</td>
<td>5* (3.90)</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>7* (0.60)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significant differences beyond .01 level. Chi Square = 102.36

**DISCUSSION**

It would seem from these findings that Buck's definition of what constitutes essential details is applicable to children of six years of age and above but not to children below six years. Ideally, however, a study should be made to determine whether or not normals will deviate from these norms somewhere between six years and adulthood as a result of developmental factors. The addition of irrelevant details apparently is a chance factor associated with the individual's need to structure the situation. Since the two experimental groups did not differ significantly, the absence of essential details or unrecognizability in the drawing of a house could not be used as a means of differential diagnosis with mentally handicapped individuals. It might, however, be useful in providing clues to mental deficit or organicity with individuals beyond the age of six years. It would seem that an unrecognizable house, or one with three or more essential details missing in a child of six years and over,
and of normal intelligence would at least be suspected of organicity. The fact that there were no demonstrable differences in the experimental groups should not be taken as conclusive evidence, since the non-organic group was particularly small. Further study of these groups is indicated with larger samples and with more inclusive medical test batteries, especially with the non-organic group. It would have been desirable to have had E.E.G.'s on all the non-organic group, but this was not possible for various reasons.

**Conclusions**

1. Buck's definition of what constitutes essential details in a house is applicable to six year old children in Illinois schools.
2. Buck's interpretation of the omission of essential details is also applicable to this group.
4. The inclusion of details in the drawing of a house is, to some extent, a developmental process which seemingly matures at about the age of six years insofar as essential details are concerned, and therefore, great caution should be used in making any interpretations with children below the age of six years.

**References**


---

**A STUDY OF RORSCHACH FLEXOR AND EXTENSOR HUMAN MOVEMENT RESPONSES**

**EMANUEL F. HAMMER AND IRVING JACKS**
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**Introduction**

Perhaps the most fruitful, as well as deeply tapping, aspect of the Rorschach procedure resides in the human movement responses. This is particularly true if the responses are accompanied by an actual experience of movement expressed in the concept of a displacement of blot area. Piotrowski argues that the feeling that all or some parts of the ink blot are in the process of changing their relative positions is a fundamental requirement for regarding the percept as a true response. When subjects speak of human movement and do not experience this kinesthetic sensation, these responses are not primary human movement phenomena but a secondary, or intellectually inferred, description. Rorschach himself strongly insisted on the

---

1Grateful acknowledgement is made to Drs. Bernard C. Glueck, Jr., and Zygmunt A. Piotrowski or their helpful suggestions and constant encouragement.