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The effects of taking a third person role on self disclosure, self sympatheticness and several nonverbal parameters of task involvement were examined in a psychotherapy analogue study. Subjects were classified as high or low in ego strength using previously established norms for college students. In the third person role subjects were instructed to describe themselves from the perspective of an "intimate and sympathetic best friend." An encouragement to talk format was used to facilitate self description from the first person. Support was not found for the hypotheses that altering the perspective used in self description would increase self disclosure and that high ego strength subjects would be better able to use a perspective taking intervention. Theoretical and methodological issues are discussed. Recommendations for future research are made.
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PERSPECTIVE TAKING AND SELF DISCLOSURE

Introduction

Self Disclosure and Psychotherapy

Within most of the widely used models of psychotherapy, self disclosure on the part of the client is seen as making an important contribution to therapeutic progress (Doster & Nesbitt, 1979; Strassberg, Roback, D'Antonio, & Gabel, 1979). In their review of the literature, Doster and Nesbitt (1979) found that studies which focused on the content of self disclosure and studies which focused on the depth of self disclosure have generally demonstrated a positive relationship between self disclosure and various psychotherapy outcome measures. Yet they acknowledged that not all studies have confirmed these relationships.

Therapeutic Interventions to Facilitate Self Disclosure

Much of the research on self disclosure has focused on role induction techniques which attempt to prepare the client for the role of self exploration in therapy. Generally, observational modeling of self disclosure by someone other than the therapist or interviewer has been found to be more effective than instructions describing self disclosure (Doster & McAllister, 1973; Green & Marlatt, 1972; Spiritas & Holmes, 1971). Yet Whalen (1969) found a
combination of instruction and modeling to increase level of self disclosure more than either instructions or modeling alone. The research in facilitation of self disclosure does not address the individual's capacity to construe his or her experience from different perspectives rather than merely having one perspective available from which to self disclose.

**Taking Perspective on the Self**

In discussing personality theory, Rychlak (1981) defines perspective as "the stance a theorist takes in capturing that which he or she intends to explain" (p. 9). He delineates two basic stances, the introspective and the extraspective. In the introspective stance, the emerging theory is elaborated from the perspective of the item under observation, or the first person. The extraspective stance is conceptualized from the viewpoint of an outside observer, rather than the viewpoint of the item under observation. Thus, it may be thought of as a "third person" perspective. The unique aim of this study is to have the subject shift from his typical introspective stance or role to an extraspective stance of an outside observer. The purpose of having the subject take this "third person" perspective is ultimately to enrich his or her self experiencing by describing this experience from an alternative viewpoint.

Many different theories deal with the capacity of the individual to step outside the flow of moment-to-moment
experiencing in order to evaluate, understand, or change behavior. Victor Frankl, a leading Existential theorist, speaks of "self-detachment" as a man's capacity to joke about himself, laugh at himself, and ridicule his own fears. This capacity is what is called upon in Frankl's use of paradoxical intention (willful intention of what one fears) to break the cycle of phobic avoidance (Frankl, 1978).

In his emphasis on the importance of self-detachment, Frankl resembles many personal construct theorists, who view "reflexivity" as a salient defining characteristic of self. According to Bannister (1977) it is the quality of reflexivity—or the ability to reflect upon—that is the most important factor in self definition. Bannister points out that, according to personal construct theory, one's construal of oneself is an intrinsically interpersonal process. We elaborate who we are through our perceptions of others' perceptions of us and through the choices others' lives represent and make clear to us. Thus, we develop many different ways of looking at our experience.

Piaget also shares with personal construct theorists a strong emphasis on the importance of the individual's ability to take various perspectives. He argued that a major portion of the developmental energies of the individual is invested in the process of overcoming his or her egocentric reference system (Piaget, 1962). Piaget's
concepts in this area have stemmed from his investigations of children's cognitive structuring of the physical world (Feffer, 1959). Many cognitive developmental theorists have used Piaget's concepts in their investigations of the development of ability to appreciate and use others' unique viewpoints in order to evaluate and modify one's own thinking and behavior.

According to Piaget, egocentrism always involves some failure of subject-object differentiation (Ford, 1979; Piaget, 1926). In the beginning of life this failure is complete; the infant is entirely unable to distinguish itself as a knower from the environment that is known. This distinction is gradually made through repeated sensorimotor interactions with the environment. However, the child remains completely unaware that he or she has a point of view which is different from other individuals rather than an instantaneous, exhaustive, and infallible grasp of reality.

It is through a process which Piaget termed "decentering" that the child eventually overcomes this lack of awareness of others' points of view. Intrinsic to this construal is the concept of "centration," which refers to the child's tendency to center his or her attention on one perceptually predominant aspect of an object or event. Thus, "decentering" is the ability to shift one's attention from one aspect of an event or situation to another.
Decentering is concomitant with the development of internalized cognitive structures which free the child from immediate sensory data in understanding the external world, and allow refocusing attention on multiple aspects of an event in a flexible, balanced manner. A classic example of decentering in relation to the impersonal world is the child's progression in the understanding of the conservation of quantity. Rather than making a judgment of quantity of a substance based solely upon the sensory perception of height or width of a container, the child becomes able to consider both height and width in making judgments about quantity.

The ability to decenter in interpersonal interactions has been termed "role taking" or "perspective taking" by cognitive developmental theorists. Shantz (1975) has divided the concept of perspective taking according to its referents into the following three spheres: (1) Visual-Spatial--what the other person sees; (2) Social-Cognitive--what the other person is thinking; and (3) Affective--what the other person is feeling. Thus, role taking is viewed as a gradually developing, multifaceted ability which is necessary for successful social interaction.

Research findings have supported the importance of role-taking in psychosocial adjustment. Neale (1974) found that children institutionalized for emotional disturbances showed significantly more Visual-Spatial egocentrism than
did normal children. Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1974) found emotionally disturbed children to be deficient in Social-Cognitive role-taking skills compared to normal children. Further, they found that remediation of these deficits resulted in improved psychosocial adjustment. In a similar study, Chandler (1973) found male juvenile delinquents to be significantly inferior to normal peers in Social-Cognitive role taking skills. Again, remedial training in role-taking skills was found to improve these abilities. The improvements in role-taking skills were associated with significant reductions in delinquent behaviors at an 18-month follow-up.

The fixed role therapy technique of George Kelly (1955) utilizes the clients' abilities to shift perspectives in construing themselves. In the fixed role technique, the client experiments with new social roles which are optimally different from current roles. Before implementing these fixed roles, Kelly attempts to reach a clinical understanding of the client and to identify dimensions to target for change by asking the client to write a "Self Characterization Sketch." The instructions are as follows:

I want you to write a character sketch of (Harry) (Brown) just as if he were the principle character in a play. Write it as it might be written by a friend who knew him very intimately and very sympathetically.
perhaps better than anyone could ever really know him. Be sure to write it in the third person.

Kelly believed that this technique would provide a richer, more useful understanding of clients via a change in role from which the clients construed themselves. He identified the friend role and the "sympathetic" nature of this characterization as particularly important shifts from the clients' typical stance toward themselves.

Prediction of Success in Perspective Taking and Self Disclosure

In their review of the psychotherapy literature on self disclosure, Doster and Nesbitt (1979) reported a number of studies which relate individual differences to the failure of individuals to successfully modulate their communicative behaviors. The present study will also attempt to account for the differing abilities of subjects to modulate or shift perspectives in self experiencing and in interpersonal communication. An important dimension in this regard is ego strength which has been broadly defined as "those personality assets and resources which enable the individual to adapt to life's stresses and to profit from support and psychological insight" (Dahlstrom, Welsh & Dahlstrom, 1975, p. 31). A widely used measure of ego strength, the Barron Ego Strength Scale (BESS), was developed by Barron (1953) to predict the response of
neurotic patients to psychotherapy. In his initial validation studies, Barron (1953) found this scale (BESS) to be predictive of success in relatively short term insight oriented psychotherapy. Yet, as Graham (1977) pointed out in his review of the scale, subsequent attempts by others to validate the BESS as a predictor of response to various forms of treatment have yielded mixed findings. He concluded that further research is needed to clarify the parameters of this scale's predictive accuracy in relation to success in therapy. Dahlstrom, Welsh and Dahlstrom (1975) state that a high BESS score may be predictive of therapeutic success for clients who are willing to acknowledge personal distress but may lack predictive validity for clients who are experiencing personal difficulties but are unwilling to acknowledge them.

The BESS has a high degree of validational support as a measure of personal resourcefulness and adaptability. In her review, Harmon (1980) stated that the BESS successfully differentiates those who display psychopathological symptoms from those who do not. Additionally, the BESS scale has been found to positively correlate with internal locus of control (Artwhol, 1979) and to negatively correlate with over-conformity (Martin, Blair & Bottoms, 1979). In his review of the literature, Graham (1977) includes stability,
persistency, social effectiveness and resourcefulness as correlates of a high BESS score.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was twofold. The primary purpose of the study was to examine the hypothesis that altering the perspective from which one describes one's experiences will facilitate self experiencing. Specifically, it was predicted that asking subjects to describe personal experiences from the third person perspective of "an intimate and sympathetic best friend" will increase self experiencing relative to an encouragement to talk interview format as measured by the Self Disclosure Rating Scale (Doster, 1971) response time, silence quotient, total talk time, and speech duration measures, used by Doster (1972), Wixson (1985) and Peterson (1986).

The secondary purpose of this study was to investigate the hypothesis that subjects who possess greater ego strength as measured by the Barron Ego Strength Scale will be more successful in using the third person role to enhance self experiencing compared to subjects with lower ego strength scores.

Method

Subjects

Sixty female undergraduates volunteered to participate in this study in exchange for extra credit points in their
psychology classes. The subjects' ages ranged from 18 to 34 years with a mean age of 20.12, a modal age of 19 and a median age of 19. The mean educational level of the subjects was 13.8 years with a range from 13 to 16 years.

Materials

**Demographic data questionnaire.** This questionnaire is designed to gather demographic data including age, educational level, and parental educational levels (see Appendix A).

**Barron Ego Strength Scale.** This scale consists of 68 true-false items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory selected on the basis of their significant correlation with rated improvement in three samples of patients seen in insight oriented psychotherapy (see Appendix B). Barron's initial study of the reliability of the scale, administered in the context of a complete MMPI, yielded a split-half reliability coefficient of .76 and a test-retest reliability coefficient after three months, of .72 (Barron, 1953). Gaines and Fretz (1969) administered the scale to two samples of college students out of the context of the MMPI and found a test-retest reliability coefficient of .75 and .81 over a two month interval. Silverman (1963) found Pearson product moment correlations of .91 and .85 between the scale in the context of the MMPI and administered by itself a week later in samples of normals and schizophrenics, respectively.
Disclosure Rating Scale. This measure designed by Doster (1971) is a seven point descriptively anchored scale on which trained raters measure the subject's level of self disclosure from audio tapes or written transcripts (see Appendix I). The reliability estimates range from .98, \( p < .01 \) using Ebel's \( r \) (Doster, 1972) to .75, \( p < .01 \), Ebel's \( r \) (McAllister, 1973).

The measures on this scale by one rater were chosen for use in this study. This individual's ratings reached an interrater reliability coefficient of .72 using Ebel's intra-class correlation method with another independent rater. On a random sample from the interview topics an interrater reliability coefficient of .82 was reached with the experimenter who trained the raters in the use of the Disclosure Rating Scale.

Sympatheticness toward Self Rating Scale. This scale is designed to assess the degree of experiencing caring or affection versus displeasure or lack of acceptance in relation to the aspect of self brought to experience. The rating is made on a five point Likert scale (see Appendix J).

Measures of Nonverbal Behavior

Several nonverbal measures used by Doster (1972), Wixson (1985), and Peterson (1986), which were based on similar nonverbal measures described by other authors (Goldman-Eisler, 1961; Matarazzo, Weins, & Gaslow, 1965;
Pope & Seigman, 1965; Seigman & Pope, 1968) were used. These measures are described below.

Response time. This is defined as the amount of time between the interviewer's last sentence and the junction of the subject's first noun and verb combination. As an indication of the amount of time spent thinking before beginning to speak, response time is typically regarded as a measure of guardedness and self-monitoring.

Total talk time. This is the length of time spent talking beginning with the first noun and verb combination and ending when the subject indicates finishing. This measure is thought to represent the degree of task involvement on the subject's part.

Silent quotient. This measure is a ratio of the summation of all silent pauses over two seconds in duration divided by the total talk time. The silent quotient has been found to have a negative correlation with verbal self disclosure measures (Doster, 1972). Thus, it is regarded as a measure of self-monitoring and guardedness.

Speech duration. This measure is the sum of all silences two seconds in duration or larger subtracted from the total talk time. Speech duration is a measure of verbal productivity. It has been found to have correlations from .35, $p < .01$ (McAllister & Kiesler, 1972) to .55, $p < .01$ (Doster & Brooks, 1974) with verbal measures of self disclosures.
Number of Interviewer Encouragements

The interviewers were instructed to offer further encouragement after a pause in speech of 15 seconds with a limit of twice per topic (see Appendices E and G). Thus, this score can range from 0 to 12. It provides an index of the subject's ability to persist in staying on task.

Measure of Role Enactment

Number of role inappropriate pronouns. This score is the number of times subjects in the third person role used a pronoun other than "her" or "she." It is a measure of the subjects' ability to stay in a detached role.

Measure of Interview Credibility

Treatment Credibility questionnaire. This questionnaire, devised by Young (1982) consists of four Likert scaled questions addressing the subjects' evaluation of the interview experience (see Appendix H).

Procedure

The subjects were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses and screened in groups on the Barron Ego Strength Scale. Subjects who scored 45 or greater were included in the high ego strength group while those who scored 39 or lower were included in the low ego strength group. These criteria were based on a normative sample which most closely resembled subjects used in this study (Martin et al., 1978). The criteria represent one standard
error of measurement around the mean. After pre-screening, interviews were then scheduled with eligible subjects. Subjects were instructed to arrive at the NTSU Psychology Clinic waiting room where they would be met by a research assistant. Upon arrival, the subjects were greeted by a research assistant, who introduced the experiment and gave an overview of the procedures of the experiment. This introduction and overview are similar to Peterson’s (1986) and are as follows:

As you know, this is a psychotherapy study and your participation will help us learn more about the ways psychologists can help their clients. We will ask you to give us some background information about yourself and to participate in a private interview with a graduate student in psychology. Your answers to the questionnaire will be identified only by a subject number. Although the interview will be audiotaped, only the interviewer and selected assistants will hear your responses. The tape will be erased immediately after the necessary information is gathered. You are free to withdraw your participation for any reason at any time you wish. Do you have any questions?

The subjects were then asked to sign a statement of informed consent (see Appendix A) which included the above mentioned information. Then, the subjects filled out the
Demographic Data Questionnaire (see Appendix B). The research assistant randomly assigned the subject to one of two interview conditions, the third person role condition or the encouragement to talk condition. The assistant informed the interviewer which interview script to follow and then introduced the subject and the interviewer.

The first interview condition involved a traditional encouragement to talk interview format (see Appendices D and E). The interviewer gave detailed instructions for self disclosure and encouraged the subjects to explore their thoughts and feelings about themselves. The instructions and encouragements in the second interview condition were equivalent to the first condition but this condition also involved asking the subject to take a different perspective on her experiences by assuming the role of an intimate and sympathetic best friend (see Appendices F and G).

The interviewers were the author and two first year, male doctoral students in clinical psychology. The doctoral students were trained together in all aspects of the interview procedures by the author to insure uniform administration across interviewers.

For all interviews two identical chairs were placed approximately three feet apart, facing one another at a slight angle (approximately 30 degrees). The tape recorder and other interview materials were placed on a small table
to the right of the interviewer. The first year doctoral students were given guidelines for their verbal and nonverbal behavior. After being introduced to the subject by the research assistant the interviewers were to greet each subject by saying "hello (subject's name), please have a seat." The interviewers were to make no further verbalization beyond the interview script until after the subject completed the treatment credibility questionnaire. The subjects were given the opportunity to ask questions before the first topic (see Appendix H). Interviewers were to answer these questions by repeating the relevant portion of the role induction script if possible, otherwise to say "just do as you wish." During the subjects' self descriptions, interviewers were to continuously monitor a stop watch. When speaking to the subject they were to maintain facial gaze.

Interview Topics

The interview consisted of seven topics with a maximum discussion time of four minutes each. The topics were empirically derived from Jourard's list of private topics by Doster (1971). One topic was included as a warm-up topic and was not analyzed in the statistical analysis. The following seven topics were used: (a) movies (warm-up topic), (b) fear, (c) guilt and shame, (d) self-esteem, (e) sensitivity, (f) anger, and (g) sexual relations.
Results

A 2 x 2 x 3 Analysis of Variance (ego strength by interview condition by interviewer) was done with the total credibility score as the dependent measure in order to examine the possibility that low or high ego strength subjects found an interviewer, treatment condition or some combination of these relatively more credible. Results of the analysis of variance may be found in Table 1 while means and standard deviations appear in Table 2. No significant differences were found either between interviewers, between treatment conditions or in their interaction with respect to perceived credibility.

Table 1
Analysis of Variance for Total Credibility Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
The initial hypothesis to be investigated was that taking the perspective of an intimate, sympathetic best friend would facilitate the level of self disclosure and the degree of sympatheticness toward self. Bartlett's test of sphericity (Barker & Barker, 1985; Norusis, 1984) was done to verify that the assumptions of Multivariate Analysis of Variance were met for the dependent measures of total self disclosure rating and total self sympatheticness rating. Bartlett's test reached significance \( (F = 4.89, df = 1, p < .05) \). Thus, it is assumed that an identity matrix did not exist and therefore the dependent measures were significantly correlated.

Given that this basic assumption of Multivariate Analysis of Variance was met, a 2 X 2 X 3 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (interview condition by ego strength by interviewer) was done for the total self disclosure rating and the total self sympatheticness rating (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations). The main effect for interview condition was nonsignificant (see Table 4). Thus, the results do not provide support for the hypothesis that speaking from the perspective of an intimate and sympathetic best friend would lead to higher levels of self disclosure and a greater degree of self sympatheticness.

A three-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (interview condition by ego strength by interviewer) was
Table 2
Total Credibility Score Means and Standard Deviations for Interviewer by Interview Condition by Ego Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Interview Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Verbal Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Condition</th>
<th>Total Self Disclosure Rating</th>
<th>Total Self Sympatheticness Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition I</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition II</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Verbal Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DfN</th>
<th>DfE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pillais Trace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Interviewer</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.

done after it was verified that the nonverbal dependent measures (reaction time, total talk time, speech duration, silent quotient and total encouragements) were significantly correlated (Bartlett's test of sphericity, $F = 181.52$, df = 10, $p < .01$). The main effect for interview condition was nonsignificant (means and standard deviations are found in Table 5). Results of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance are found in Table 6. Again, these results fail to provide support for the hypothesis that taking the perspective of an intimate sympathetic best friend alters nonverbal behavior related to task involvement. Thus, in sum, neither the
Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Nonverbal Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Reaction Time</th>
<th>Total Talk Time</th>
<th>Total Speech Duration</th>
<th>Average Silence Quotient</th>
<th>Total Number of Interviewer Encouragements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>818.00</td>
<td>366.66</td>
<td>670.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>853.53</td>
<td>393.06</td>
<td>704.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>822.80</td>
<td>436.51</td>
<td>680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>707.00</td>
<td>381.01</td>
<td>600.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>1030.00</td>
<td>371.12</td>
<td>834.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>53.93</td>
<td>52.18</td>
<td>782.47</td>
<td>348.26</td>
<td>636.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>594.20</td>
<td>363.57</td>
<td>495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>910.20</td>
<td>360.45</td>
<td>768.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition II</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>740.03</td>
<td>388.15</td>
<td>552.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>739.20</td>
<td>328.07</td>
<td>560.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>783.40</td>
<td>352.02</td>
<td>569.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>563.20</td>
<td>133.20</td>
<td>422.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>871.00</td>
<td>414.94</td>
<td>688.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>740.87</td>
<td>445.03</td>
<td>543.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>684.40</td>
<td>464.91</td>
<td>501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>801.60</td>
<td>446.38</td>
<td>550.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>736.60</td>
<td>518.82</td>
<td>579.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
process of verbal self exploration, the self sympatheticness of the self disclosures nor the nonverbal parameters of task involvement were significantly affected by the perspective taking intervention in this psychotherapy analogue situation.

The second hypothesis investigated in the present study was that subjects who scored high on the Barron Ego Strength Scale would be more effective in using the third person role in the process of self exploration compared to subjects who scored low on ego strength in the third person role. The interview condition by ego strength interaction on the Multivariate Analysis of Variance on the dependent measures of total self disclosure rating and total self sympatheticness rating was nonsignificant (see Table 6).

The results of the interview condition by ego strength Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the timed nonverbal measures were also nonsignificant. Thus, the results for these verbal and nonverbal measures do not provide support for the hypothesis that high ego strength subjects would be more able to use a third person perspective in self exploration compared to low ego strength subjects.

As a further check on the hypothesis that high ego strength subjects would be better able to use a third person perspective than low ego strength subjects, the number of role inappropriate pronouns was analyzed in a two-way Analysis of Variance (interviewer by ego strength) for
Table 6

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Nonverbal Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df_N</th>
<th>Df_E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pillais Trace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Interviewer</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition by Ego Strength</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Condition</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects in the third person role. Means and standard deviations are found in Table 7. The results were nonsignificant (see Table 8). Low and high ego strength subjects did not use a significantly different number of role inappropriate pronouns.

**Additional Findings**

Two nonverbal measures reached significance in Univariate Analysis of Variance. These findings are considered tentative and do not change the conclusions.
Table 7

**Means and Standard Deviations for Total Number of Role Inappropriate Pronouns for Subjects in the Third Person Role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Ego Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ego Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

**Analysis of Variance for Number of Role Inappropriate Pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength by Interviewer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.23</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05. **p < .01.*
reached in the present study yet they may provide useful information for future researchers. A main effect was found for ego strength on the total number of interviewer encouragements. High ego strength subjects needed more interviewer encouragements ($F = 6.49$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). A main effect was also found for interview condition on average silence quotient ($F = 4.38$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Subjects in the third person role had a greater percentage of silence than subjects in the encouragement to talk condition.

Discussion

The present study investigated the effects of a perspective taking intervention on several verbal and nonverbal parameters of the self exploration process in a psychotherapy analogue study. The results generally did not provide support for the hypothesis that taking an alternate perspective on one’s experience would lead to increased task involvement and higher levels of self disclosure. These findings call for a closer look at the issues of measurement and methodology as well as the hypotheses and the theory underlying them.

While the dependent measures used in this study were designed to measure nonverbal correlates of task involvement and depth of self disclosure, other dimensions of clinical importance may be more closely linked with perspective taking. Kelly (1955) used the self characterization sketch upon which the third person interview script for the present
study was based, to elicit constructs which represented the most important dimensions of the clients' self construal. It is possible that perspective taking such as "best friend" role used in this study may affect the nature of the constructs used in understanding the self, rather than the depth of self disclosure. Two important aspects of self description relevant to personal construct theory which seem worthy of investigation are the relative number of superordinate versus subordinate constructs used and the number of functionally independent constructs used. Changes in the nature of the constructs used in self description may have an important impact on the process of therapy and seem to be fruitful areas for future investigation.

The issue of defining and measuring individual differences which predict ability to use a shift in perspective to increase self experiencing also remains open for future research. In the present study, Barron's Ego Strength Scale was not successful in predicting the ability to use perspective taking to enrich the process of self exploration. Yet, it may be predictive of this ability under certain conditions. Dahlstrom, Welsh and Dahlstrom (1975) note that a high score on this scale may be predictive of therapeutic success only for clients who are willing to self disclose about personal difficulties. Thus, measurement of willingness to acknowledge difficulties in combination with measurement of ego strength may result in
greater predictive success of verbal behavior in psychotherapy.

Although the Barron Ego Strength Scale did not predict changes in verbal behavior, it did yield one unexpected but potentially useful finding. Subjects in the high ego strength groups required more interviewer encouragements (had more pauses in speech of fifteen seconds or greater). Two possible interpretations of this finding are that the ego strength scale is measuring an increased guardedness or that it is measuring an increased deliberativeness. Future research on this scale should address these issues.

Yet on this scale's positive relationship with numerous aspects of healthy adjustment and resourcefulness (Harmon, 1980), the finding that high ego strength subjects had more pauses of 15 seconds duration may call into question the traditional hypothesis that increased silence represents resistance to self exploration (the high ego strength subjects did not show less task involvement on other nonverbal measures or less self disclosure relative to low ego strength subjects in this study).

Another unexpected finding also calls for questioning the notion that silences represent resistances. Subjects in the third person role had greater average silence quotients than subjects in the first person role (there were no other significant differences between the two groups). A likely hypothesis (that needs further substantiation in future
research) is that subjects in the third person role needed more time for cognitive processing given the more complex nature of the task. These findings must be interpreted cautiously due to increased risk of type I error arising from multiple univariate analyses. Yet, they at least call for further research into the relationships between pauses in speech and other aspects of therapy process.

In light of the lack of significant differences in verbal and nonverbal behavior between the interview conditions it is necessary to consider the potency of the experimental manipulations. Frequently, subjects in both conditions commented during the debriefing after the interview that they felt at a loss over what to talk about. This ambiguity may be responsible for the relatively low ceiling on self disclosure across all conditions. A more detailed role induction or inclusion of self disclosure modeling prior to self description may have assisted subjects in going further into the self exploration process which would have led to both higher levels of self disclosure in general and increased variability in self disclosure among subjects. It may be that the effects of perspective taking on factors other than self disclosure are more pronounced at higher levels of self disclosure. Perhaps perspective taking as a class of interventions is most helpful to the client after a certain level of competence in self exploration has been achieved rather than
being useful in increasing self experiencing across all levels of understanding or abilities in self exploration.

A repeated measures design may overcome many of the difficulties discussed thus far. Having each subject serve as her own control may be superior to relying on randomization of unspecified individual difference variables which influence the self exploration processes. Yet, more importantly the experiencing of alternating perspectives may provide a rich source of material for the client in regard to choices in evaluating one’s experience.

In sum, the results of this study did not provide support for the hypothesis that taking an alternate perspective on one’s experience would lead to increased task involvement and higher levels of self disclosure. Yet, different choices in methodology for further examination of this hypothesis exist. Further, investigation of the effects of perspective taking may profit from inclusion of other dimensions of interviewee behavior in addition to depth of self disclosure.
APPENDIX A

Consent Form
Consent Form

Participant’s Name: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

1. I hereby authorize Bruce Allen of North Texas State University and any research assistants designated by him to gather information from me on the topic of interviewing styles. I have freely and voluntarily consented to participate in this study with no coercion, psychological or otherwise. I understand that my participation will involve a brief audiotaped interview which may or may not include answering three questionnaires and giving background information through various processes of self-exploration.

2. I understand that there is no physical and minimal psychological risk involved in any of this work.
   A. I am aware that some people may become offended by some of the questionnaires used in this study. I am aware that I may choose not to answer any questions I find embarrassing or offensive.
   B. I understand that I may terminate my participation in this study at any time.

3. All information in this study is completely confidential. Only Bruce Allen will be able to identify my individual responses during the study, using a code list of names and matched numbers. When the research is finished, only the numbers will be retained to identify individual responses. The interview tape will not identify you by your full name and will be heard only by Bruce Allen and three other research assistants. The tape will be erased immediately after rating the responses.

4. I also understand that if, after my participation, I experience any anxiety or stress that may be connected to the experience, Bruce Allen will be available for debriefing and referral (if appropriate).

5. I am aware that a written summary of the findings is available when this project is completed. I understand that this will be sent to me at my request, provided I supply a long term address below.
6. The procedures and investigation have been explained to me.

Participant's Signature__________________________________________

Date____________________

____________________________________________________
Address (optional if wish to receive summary)
APPENDIX B

Demographic Data
Demographic Data

Social Security Number: ________________  Age: ______

Sex: ______  Date of Birth: ______________________

Classification: ________________________________

Father's Educational Level (# of years in school): ______

Mother's Educational Level (# of years in school): ______
APPENDIX C

Barron Ego Strength Scale (BESS)
Instructions

Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you. If a statement is true or mostly true as applied to you, write a T beside the statement. If a statement is false or not usually true write an F beside the statement. If a statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you don't know about, make no mark beside the question. But, try to give a response to every statement. Remember to give your own opinion of yourself.

___ 1. I have a good appetite.
___ 2. I have diarrhea once a month or more.
___ 3. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
___ 4. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
___ 5. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
___ 6. I have a cough most of the time.
___ 7. I seldom worry about my health.
___ 8. My sleep is fitfull and disturbed.
___ 9. When I am with people I am bothered by hearing very queer things.
___10. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.
11. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.

12. Parts of my body often have feelings like burning, tingling, crawling, or like "going to sleep."

13. I am easily downed in an argument.

14. I do many things which I regret afterwards (I regret things more or more often than others seem to).

15. I go to church almost every week.

16. I have met problems so full of possibilities that I have been unable to make up my mind about them.

17. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.

18. I like collecting flowers or growing house plants.

19. I like to cook.

20. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.

21. I have never had a fainting spell.

22. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.

23. My hands have not become clumsy or awkward.

24. I feel weak all over much of the time.

25. I have had no difficulty in keeping my balance in walking.

26. I like to flirt.

27. I believe my sins are unpardonable.
28. I frequently find myself worrying about something.
29. I like science.
30. I like to talk about sex.
31. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.
32. I brood a great deal.
33. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
34. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.
35. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.
36. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
37. If I were an artist I would like to draw flowers.
38. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.
39. At times I hear so well it bothers me.
40. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see.
41. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
42. Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love.
43. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.
44. I am not unusually self-conscious.
45. I am embarrassed by dirty stories.
46. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people.
47. My worries seem to disappear when I get into a crowd of lively friends.
48. Whenever possible I avoid being in a crowd.
49. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game.
50. I have had some very unusual religious experiences.
51. One or more members of my family is very nervous.
52. I am attracted by members of the opposite sex.
53. The man who had most to do with me when I was a child (such as my father, stepfather, etc.) was very strict with me.
54. Christ performed miracles such as changing water into wine.
55. I pray several times every week.
56. I feel sympathetic towards people who tend to hang on to their griefs and troubles.
57. I am afraid of finding myself in a closet or small closed place.
58. Dirt frightens or disgusts me.
59. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington.
60. In my home we have always had the ordinary necessities (such as enough food, clothing, etc.).
61. I am made nervous by certain animals.
62. My skin seems to be unusually sensitive to touch.
63. I feel tired a good deal of the time.
64. I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.
65. If I were an artist I would like to draw children.
66. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.
67. I have often been frightened in the middle of the night.
68. I very much like horseback riding.
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Interviewer Instructions for Encouragement to Talk Condition
Interviewer Instructions for Encouragement to Talk Consition

Initial Encouragement

One way that a psychotherapist is helpful is by assisting others in more deeply understanding themselves. Today, I will ask you to think about and share with me your personal thoughts and feelings about yourself. Concentrate entirely on yourself, your emotions, the way you believe and how your thoughts and feelings influence the actions you take or do not take.

I will be asking you to talk about several topics for four minutes each. When you have 15 seconds left, I will signal to you by raising my hand. The interview will be audiotaped but only I and selected assistants will have access to the tape. At no time will the tape be made public. After the data is analyzed the tape will be erased. After you begin I will not be able to answer any questions. Do you have any questions before we start? (Answer questions that can be answered by reviewing the instructions or stating "Do as you wish." Answer other questions by stating, "I will be able to answer that after the interview.")

Instructions for Individual Topics

Topics 1-3

Please tell me all you wish that will help me understand you on this topic (interviewer hands card with topic on it to the subject). Tell me about your experiences
with/of (Topic). I want to know as much about you as you want me to know. Tell me when you are finished.

Topics 4-7

Tell me about your experiences with (Topics).
APPENDIX E

Guidelines for Interviewer Interventions

in the Encouragement to Talk Condition
Guidelines for Interviewer Interventions in the Encouragement to Talk Condition

1. After a pause in speech of at least 15 seconds and prior to 30 seconds before the time limit the interviewer may make one of the following interventions. These interventions should be made no more than twice per topic.

2. Permissible Interventions
   A. Try to tell me more about yourself in this area of your life.
   B. See if you can continue exploring this topic further.
   C. Try and help me to further understand you on this topic.
APPENDIX F

Interviewer Instructions for Third Person

Role Initial Encouragement
Interviewer Instructions for Third Person Role Initial

Encouragement

One way that a psychotherapist is helpful is by assisting others in more deeply understanding themselves. Today I want you to be (subject's name)'s friend. A friend who knows (subject's name) very intimately, perhaps better than anyone really could know (subject's name). As her friend, you are sympathetic towards (subject's name). To help you do this, I will put (subject's name) in this chair over here (interviewer points to empty chair). As her friend, you will be sitting here with me (interviewer points to subject's chair). Concentrate entirely on (subject's name), her emotions, the way (subject's name) believes and how her thoughts/feelings influence the actions (subject's name) takes or does not take. I want to know as much about (subject's name) as you want me to know about her. Be sure to talk about (subject's name) as her friend.

I will be asking you to talk about several topics for four minutes each. When you have 15 seconds left, I will signal to you by raising my hand. The interview will be audiotaped but only I and selected assistants will have access to the tape. At no time will the tape be made public. After the data is analyzed, the tape will be erased. After you begin, I will not be able to answer any questions. Do you have any questions before we start?
(Answer questions that can be answered by reviewing the instructions or stating, "Do as you wish." Answer other questions by stating, "I will be able to answer that after the interview.").

If the subject does have questions, repeat the following reminder: Be sure to talk about (subject's name) as her friend.

Instructions for Individual Topics

Topics 1-3

As a friend who knows (subject's name) intimately and sympathetically, please tell me all you wish that will help me understand (subject's name) on this topic.

(Interviewer hands card with topic on it to the subject.)

Tell me (subject's name)'s experiences with/of (topic). I want to know as much about (subject's name) as you want me to know. Tell me when you are finished.

Topics 4-7

As (subject's name)'s friend, tell me about (subject's name)'s experiences with (topic).
APPENDIX G
Guidelines for Interviewer Interventions
in Third Person Role Condition
Guidelines for Interviewer Interventions in Third Person Role Condition

1. After a pause in speech of at least 15 seconds and prior to 30 seconds before the time limit, the interviewer may make one of the following interventions. These interventions should be made no more than twice per topic.

2. Permissible interventions

A. As (subject's name)'s friend, try to tell me more about (subject's name) in this area of her life.

B. As (subject's name)'s friend, see if you can continue exploring this topic further.

C. Try and help me to further understand (subject's name) on this topic.
APPENDIX H

Treatment Credibility Questionnaire
Treatment Credibility Questionnaire

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The interview procedure made sense to me.
   1   2   3   4   5

2. The interview procedure helped me to talk more easily about myself than I normally would.
   1   2   3   4   5

3. I felt comfortable with the interviewer.
   1   2   3   4   5

4. I learned something about myself during the interview.
   1   2   3   4   5
APPENDIX I

Self-Disclosure Rating Scale
Self-Disclosure Rating Scale

0. Absence of personal involvement. The topic has been explored in an entirely impersonal or superficial manner. Focus is wholly on people, objects, and events (or experiences) not including this person. Self-references are notably lacking or few in number. Information may be an attempt to define, clarify, or discuss the topic without reference to self. His response may represent an inability or refusal to deal with the topic in terms of his personal frame of reference.

1. This person has dealt with the topic almost entirely on a nonpersonal or superficial level. An attempt has been made to bring oneself into the picture, but this is mostly incidental to the content presented. Identification of self usually serves to acknowledge where the thoughts originate (e.g., "It seems to me . . ." "I believe that . . .") but the central focus is on people, objects, and events surrounding the person. Inclusion of self can also be implied through membership in a larger group (e.g., "Everyone is . . .," "Our fraternity sent . . .," "People in the South are . . ."), but inclusion or standing in the group requires interpretation. The information does allow for an understanding about what he thinks or how he sees events external to himself in terms of attitudes, opinions, or beliefs about them. However, his interaction with the events or their impact on him are clearly unexplored.
2. There is noticeably more material involving aspects of the speaker but the tendency to deal with the topic on a superficial level clearly predominates. Involvement of self is not incidental and requires no interpretation, but reflects an attempt to reveal information about self. The person has placed himself within the context of his experiences as opposed to an observer of experiences. This person is primarily at a cognitive level, clearly owning his attitudes, opinions and beliefs. However, his elaboration of an experience is shallow or not profound in content. Reference can be made to emotions or behaviors, but their generality, scope, or breadth is such as to not allow for discrimination among his experiences or to distinguish them from other people.

3. Equal attention is given to both superficial and personal aspects regarding this topic. The person clearly places himself within the context of his experiences, but information about self is oriented more to event description or clarification rather than exploration of self. The content of his descriptions clearly place events as aspects of his personal experience. Aspects of the event are described, feelings labeled or behavior indicated. But his orientation is one of having you understand various aspects of the event rather than exploration and understanding of himself in this event. Labeling of feelings or behavioral description enhances a picture of the event but provides
mostly a general overview of him and not an appreciation of integral relationships. Evaluations of self (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.

4. This person has dealt with this topic mostly on a personal level. He clearly places himself within the context of his experience and the information provided allows for a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. Cognitions and emotions are well explored at a specific situational level and tied into aspects of these events. Elaboration of cognitions and emotions go beyond simply labeling, and are explored in terms of an integrated internal experience of himself. However, the impact of his cognitions and emotions on his responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external remains vague and unclear. Aspects of self including behaviors and evaluations (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.

5. This person has dealt with this topic almost entirely on a personal level. Cognitions and emotions are well explored within the context of his experiences and the information provided allows for a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. Exploration in terms of his internal experience of himself is more fully understood through his efforts to integrate these aspects with his
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responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external. Evaluations (comparisons, impressions, judgments) are either absent from topical treatment or explored at a general and/or impersonal level.

6. This person has focused entirely on himself, providing an intimate picture of various aspects of himself as they relate to the topics. Cognitions and emotions are well explored within the context of his experience and the information provides a good understanding of his personal frame of reference. His internal experience of himself is more fully understood through his efforts to integrate these aspects with his responses to (operations on or interactions with) the external. He reflects on himself in an evaluative manner, offering comparisons of self with others, impressions of self and others, and judgments about self and others. At this level he places his understanding of self in perspective with where we wants to be (or doesn’t want to be) and where others are.
APPENDIX J

Self Sympatheticness Rating Scale
Self Sympatheticness Rating Scale

This scale is designed to assess the degree of sympathy the subject maintains toward herself as she discusses each topic. You are to assign a rating from 0 to 4 based on the degree that the subject expresses caring or affection versus displeasure of rejection of the aspect(s) of self brought to experience (e.g., "the self" or part of the person who experiences sensitivity in various context and deals with it in various ways such as hiding it or blowing up or discussing it with other).

Rating Scale

0 - The subject's description indicates complete rejection of, lack of acceptance of, or displeasure with the aspect of self involved in the experience(s).

1 - The subject's description indicates that they are largely displeased or unsatisfied with but not completely rejecting of the aspect(s) of self involved in the experience(s).

2 - The subject's description expresses neither displeasure nor affection in regards to the aspect(s) of self involved in the experience(s).

3 - The subject's description indicates a sense of affection or caring for the aspect(s) of self involved in the experience(s).
4 - The subject's description indicates a strong sense of pleasure, affection and caring in relation to the aspect(s) of self involved in the experience(s).
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