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ABSTRACT

The Shapiro Control Content Analysis Scale (SCCAS) is a content analysis rating scale based, methodologically, on the pioneering work of Gottschalk and Glessner. This manual consists of four sections. Section One provides background, rationale, and relevance of efforts to develop control and self-control scales. Section Two provides a theoretical background about different control-related constructs, and how the five categories of control in the SCCAS were arrived at. Section Three provides overview guidelines and rules for scoring in the SCCAS; and Section Four provides specific guidelines, examples, and tables for coding each of the 3 categories. These categories include 1) species of control (ranging from having control to lack of control); 2) mode of control (assertive or yielding); 3) dimensions of control (and self-control): (awareness, responsibility, skill, effort, choice, goal); 4) agent of control; and 5) object of control.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of control, self-control, and self-control strategies.

Control is increasingly recognized as an important variable in psychological and physical wellbeing (Rodin, 1986). This is true across a wide spectrum of clinical disorders, ranging from the eating disorders to stress management. (Shapiro, Evans, and Shapiro, Note 1). Unfortunately, control has many different meanings and valences depending upon the theoretical orientation of the practitioner, and the clinical problem. These range from too high efforts at control, lack of control, loss of control, need for control, self-efficacy, self-determination, competence, self-control, releasing and letting go of control, among others.

Previous efforts have involved attempts to analyze the components of different self-control strategies, and to compare these strategies with each other for anxiety and stress related concerns (Sources). More recent efforts attempted to analyze the dimensions involved in the construct of self-control (Shapiro, 1983) and to see if, using the methodology of content analysis developed by Gottschalk and Glesser (1969) a manual could be developed for self-control (Shapiro, Greensang, Carrere, Note 2, 1982). The current revision of the manual involves extending this earlier work to encompass several categories of the construct of control, including the category "self-control."

1.2 Rationale for Control Content Analysis Scales

The significance of control and self-control have been detailed elsewhere (Rodin, 1986; Shapiro, Evans, and Shapiro,
Note 2); Shapiro, 1983b; Shapiro, Note 3) describing the importance, background, and rationale of control and self-control. This manual, representing microscopic linguistic analysis is an effort to refine both theory building and clinical efforts with respect to control. The scales themselves were based on the clinical and research literature from experimental, clinical, and social psychology on control and self-control strategies, and methodologically were developed based on the pioneering work of Gottschalk and Gleser content analysis scales.

1.3 Benefits, Relevance, and Significance of the Control Scales

There are several potential benefits to the development of these scales: 1) to more accurately assess components of self-control which are relevant to patient concerns as well as in which domains the control problems occur; 2) to obtain specific pre-post assessment measurements of therapeutic change related to control. 3) Through the construction of normative scales for different clinical populations, the instrument could eventually serve as a method for predictive validity of therapy outcome. Finally, by using the instrument as an assessment device, clinicians could develop greater sensitivity and understanding of the patient’s clinical concerns in terms of human control. This precise assessment, in turn, could help bring more specificity in developing, refining, and tailoring actual cognitive behavioral self-control interventions to address patient problems.

Thus, the scales could have value on multiple levels: 1) heuristic—in terms of theory development and refinement of key
words, concepts, and constructs, a linguistic analysis; 2) research development as noted above; and 3) practical clinical applications in teaching and training students and professionals how to listen more carefully to aspects of control in therapeutic and health related encounters.
11. THEORETICAL OVERVIEW, BACKGROUND, AND EXPLANATION OF HOW THE FIVE CATEGORIES OF THE SCCAS WERE ARRIVED AT

2.1 INTRODUCTION AND FIGURE ONE; LIST OF CONTROL RELATED TERMS

The following pages provide some detailed comparisons of the different terms used in the five categories selected for the SCCAS. For those wishing to go straight to the coding Guidelines, they should skip directly to Section Three.

Based on a literature review of the psychological and health-related literature on control, it became apparent that there were multiple terms being used to differentiate various aspects of the construct of control, as can be seen from Figure One. However, often these terms, used by different investigators, had overlapping, and sometimes conflicting meanings. It was clear that some sort of linguistic refinement was necessary which could, on the one hand, capture the subtley and complexity of the construct of control, and, at the same time, simplify extraneous differences.

-----------------------------------
INSERT FIGURE ONE ABOUT HERE
-----------------------------------
FIGURE ONE: LIST OF CONTROL RELATED TERMS

1. ACTUAL CONTROL (personal control)

2. SENSE OF CONTROL (perceived control)
   2.1 from self
   2.2 from benevolent other

3. SELF-EFFICACY: belief one can accomplish or obtain control
   
   NOTES ON RELATIONSHIP OF 1-2-3 ABOVE:
   --When S.C > A.C. = Denial, Defensiveness, Illusion of control
   where S.C is sense of control and A.C is actual control
   
   --When A.C. > S.C. = learned helplessness, low sense of self-efficacy.

4. EFFORTS TO GAIN CONTROL

5. PREFERRED AMOUNTS OF CONTROL
   5.1 need for control
       --over self
       --over others/environment
   5.2 not wanting (more) control (desire to lose control)

6. FEAR OF LOSS OF CONTROL

7. LOSS OF CONTROL
   --power
   --coping abilities

8. LACK OF CONTROL

9. SELF-CONTROL (self-management, self-determination)
   9.1. too little control (learned helplessness; lack of impulse control)

   9.2. too much control (overcontrol)

10. SELF-CONTROL STRATEGIES
    10.1 active, altering

    10.2 yielding, accepting

11. CONTROL ENHANCING INTERVENTIONS
    (offered by and from the environment)

12. Domains of control

13. Agents of control (issues of causality)

14. Object of control
The following material discusses the relationship of the above categories and suggests why certain decisions were made to collapse certain categories.

\[
(A < C) \quad (S < C)
\]

2.2 RELATIONSHIP OF ACTUAL CONTROL, SENSE OF CONTROL, SELF-EFFICACY: With additional comments on efforts, desire, and beliefs regarding control.

It has been noted elsewhere (Shapiro, Evans, Shapiro, Note 1) the critical distinction that needs to be made between actual control and sense of control. Further, the consequences between the disparity has been formulated as follows:

1) when \(AC > SC\), a person does not acknowledge his/her own resources accurately. Therefore there may be learned helplessness and a low sense of self-efficacy.

2) when \(SC > AC\), the positive benefit is healthy denial (Lazarus, 1983, the negative is defensiveness and inaccurate appraisal (e.g., I am not an alcoholic because I can control my drinking, and only have four shots before lunch). As Freud noted, an (illusory) sense of control about one’s ability is denial and defensive.

Self-efficacy is the belief that one can accomplish a task to effect change)---see A. Bandura, Social Foundations of Thought and Action (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NY, 1985); A. Bandura, Psychol. Rev. 84,2 (1977).

Although these are all different meanings, and have spawned independent lines of research, for the purpose of a content analysis of patient’s speech, they are deemed collapsable into one subcategory: HAVING/GAINING CONTROL. This is because there is, in fact, no way to determine, from a verbal sample, whether a person actually has control (from verbal behavior), and therefore a sense of control is functionally the same as actual control. Further, we have made the rule that a positive belief that one
can gain control (self-efficacy) is to be similarly coded, because that belief gives one a sense of control.

We have, however, distinguished having, or gaining control, from EFFORTS FOR CONTROL. A person may say they are struggling to gain control, but may not feel they are gaining any control. Further, BELIEFS ABOUT CONTROL are coded only when there is uncertainty expressed about one's ability. For example, I believe I can gain control, or I believe I am losing control are coded as gaining control, or losing control, respectively. However, "I am not sure but I think there is a possibility I have the ability to gain control, would be coded as BELIEF. This category, Belief, is seen to be stronger than desire: I'd like to get control, but not as strong as making actual efforts, or believing you actually can (or already have) control.

2.3 LACK OF CONTROL, LOSS OF CONTROL

The distinction needs to be made between lack of control (which is not having control) and loss of control — in which a person once had control in an area, and then lost it. See J. Brehm A Theory of Psychological Reactance (Academic Press, New York, 1966). When considering the construct "lack of control," the following needs to be addressed 1) is the area where there is "lack of control" salient to the individual? 2) what is the process by which an individual defines a particular domain or event as salient; 3) What strategies do individuals use to cope with salient uncontrollable events?

2.4 SELF-CONTROL, PERSONAL CONTROL, SELF-CONTROL STRATEGY AND CONTROL-ENHANCING INTERVENTIONS

CONTROL ENHACING INTERVENTIONS, according to Judith Rodin (1986) come from the environment, and are "offered" to the individual. Subsequent research needs to determine 1) what are the empirical outcome differences which occur between control-enhancing interventions offered by the environment, and self-control strategies generated by the organism (see #13); 2) the actual, non-semantic differences which exist between those two control related constructs (e.g., role of conscious choice, effort); 3) Ways in which social, cultural, and/or religious values and institutions influence a person's sense of control, actual control, and/or self-control through environmental planning, options, affordances (either unidimensionally or reciprocally (see also issues of causality--free will and determinism--in 2.6 Domains, Agents of control).
Taylor's work is instructive here showing that for cancer patients, the use of self-control strategies in areas where they could control (i.e., running, diet, information seeking) was one healthy coping strategy; and another, equally effective, was belief that a "benevolent other" (i.e., in this study, the Doctor) was in control and could handle the situation. It appears that even when we don't personally feel we are responsible for effecting control, if we feel a benevolent other is in control, this may mitigate potential negative effects of lack of control. S. Taylor, Am. Psychol. 38, (1983). See also S. Miller, Behav. Res. Ther. 17 (1979); S. Cohen, G.W. Evans, D. Stokols, D.S. Krantz, Eds., Behavior, Health, and Environmental Stress (Plenum, New York, 1986).


2.5 ACCEPTING YIELDING MODE OF CONTROL VERSUS ACTIVE, ALTERING MODE OF CONTROL

There are two basic modes of coping, and gaining control over a situation. One has been referred to as the mastery model, and one a coping model) (for a discussion of the mastery model,

These two modes have also been framed as primary and secondary types of control, (Weisz, Rothbaum, et al, 1984) instrumental and palliative coping (Lazarus, 1986), and assertive and yielding types of control (Shapiro, 1978, 1983).

In considering them, Reinhold Niebuhr’s quote is instructive: “God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference.” For an effort to operationalize that, see D.H. Shapiro in R.N. Walsh and D.H. Shapiro, Eds., *Beyond Health and Normality: Explorations of Exceptional Psychological Wellbeing*, (Van Nostrand/Reinhold, New York, 1983); D.H. Shapiro, *Psychologia* 28, 4 (1985).

The category yielding control will be picked up by the mode and valence of yielding/positive. It may occur alone, or with one of several species: not wanting control; lacking control, or desire for control (i.e., I wish I could accept this situation, for I would feel more calm and in control then.)

**THE TWO NEGATIVE QUADRANTS: OVERCONTROL AND TOO LITTLE CONTROL**

The negative aspect of active, assertive efforts to control is overcontrol. This category would be be picked up in
the coding by the mode and valence of: assertive, negative. This may stand alone, or may be combined with a species (i.e., having control, assertive, negative; or desire for control, assertive, negative, etc.)

The negative side of acceptance, is too much passivity and too little control. This will be picked up in the mode and valence of yielding/negative.

2.6 COMMENTS ON DOMAINS AND AGENT OF CONTROL (Issues of Causality)

Because of the many different areas where an individual may have control (or feel controlled), certain "domains of life" were set forth. (Schedule two). This is in an effort to determine what is the object of control (including oneself: i.e., self-control), as well as to help determine what is the agent of control.

In looking at the issue of what the person phenomenologically believes is the agent of control, we should not be construed as making a comment on actual causality.

Although tackling the complex issue of causality is beyond the scope of these comments, to discuss self-control one is forced to presume that some percent of the variance is due to individual choice and free will. For a discussion of causal issues, including Rollo May and the existentialist’s person centered undeterminism, B.F. Skinner and the radical behaviorist’s environmental undeterminism, and A. Bandura’s social learning theorist’s reciprocal determinism, see A. Bandura, *Am. Psychol.* 33 (1978). For a discussion of the paradox.

2.7 ISSUES OF DENIAL AND DEFENSIVENESS

As noted in section 2.2, there may be times when individuals believe they have control, when they in fact don't (e.g., the alcoholic who believes he is control of his drinking). There are two areas where the coding sheet attempts to pick up these issues. The first is in the species section, where there is a category for rater disagreement. This is to be a seldom used category, because it is somewhat hard, based just on a verbal sample, to know what "the truth" is. In the alcoholic example cited above, the rater may not know whether this is or isn't accurate, particularly in the initial interview. Further, in certain therapeutic approaches, the very essence of therapy is removing patient "blinders" to their own habits. For example, in depression, a client might say, I feel like I have no choices. This would be coded as "lack of control." However, almost without exception, a therapist would state that of course there are some options, somewhere, even if it is only how you respond to the situation. Therefore, this is a category to be used cautiously.

The second area where denial/discrepancy might be caught is regarding the valence of the mode. Here there are rater valence, and speaker valence. So, for example, if a person says "I beat my kids daily, and that is how I show them who is boss, and I'm
proud of it." The coding for mode would be assertive; the coding for speaker valence would be positive, and the coding for rater valence would be negative.
3. GUIDELINES FOR SCORING: OVERVIEW SCCAS CODING AND RULES

3.1 RULES FOR PREPARATION OF MATERIAL FOR CODING.

The content analysis method described in this manual relies extensively for its foundation and structure on the ideas and techniques of Gottschalk and Gleser (1969a; Gottschalk, Winget and Gleser, 1969b) developed for affect scales. The same techniques are utilized with the material, including: obtaining the material (via free associations, standardized verbal samples, or in response to projective material); preparing the material (by use of tape recording, transcribing, proof reading, correcting the sample); clauing the material (obtaining word counts and clauing the final sample).

The scored verbal samples are tabulated, weight factors assigned, where appropriate, and a raw score obtained. Lastly, subjects raw scores are multiplied by the correction factor (determined by the number of words spoken (Gottschalk and Gleser, p. 22, 1969). Thus each verbal sample yields a single numerical score per category.

Formulated as rules, the above would read as follows:

1. All verbal material is transcribed and double spaced

2. Verbal samples have a word count, as per the method of Gottschalk, et. al, 1969b

3. The unit of scoring remains the clause, dependent or independent, with each clause potentially obtaining one score.

4. Raw scores obtained by cumulative addition for all minuses and plus scores per verbal sample are multiplied by a correction factor to offset for amount spoken. This ensures that a few scorable phrases for a very small amount is compared equivalently to a few scorable phrases for a large amount spoken.

5. Because these samples involve potential dyadic interaction, statements to the therapist are scored. However therapist's responses are not scored.

3.2 COMPUTER SCORING: THE SCANTRON
The SCCAS (see schedules 1 and 2) has a quite large number of possible permutations, when all subcategories and levels are considered. Without the use of sophisticated data management and microcomputers, this would be quite cumbersome, if not impossible to hand tabulate. By devising a Scantron sheet (schedule 2) for computer entry, easier data retrieval and multiple comparisons are facilitated.

-----------------------------
INSERT SCHEDULES ONE, TWO, THREE ABOUT HERE
-----------------------------
## SCHEDULE ONE

**SAPIRO CONTROL CONTENT ANALYSIS SCALE**

### THE FIVE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Related (1-3)</th>
<th>Agent/Object Related (4-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIES OF CONTROL</td>
<td>AGENT OF CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Disagree</td>
<td>OBJECT OF CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE OF CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKER VALENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Valence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>SELF/PERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>SELF IN RELATIONSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>OTHER/PERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>OTHER IN RELATIONSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categories:

1. **HAVING/GAINING**
   - ACTIVE/ALTERING
   - POSITIVE
   - POSITIVE
   - GOAL
   - SELF/PERSONAL
   - SELF/PERSONAL

2. **EFFORTS**
   - POSITIVE
   - POSITIVE
   - GOAL
   - SELF/PERSONAL
   - SELF IN RELATIONSHIP

3. **BELIEFS**
   - YIELDING/ACCEPTING
   - NEGATIVE
   - NEGATIVE
   - CHOICE
   - OTHER/PERSONAL
   - OTHER IN RELATIONSHIP

4. **DESIRE FOR AMBIVALENCE**
   - NONSPECIFIC
   - NEUTRAL
   - NEUTRAL
   - SKILL
   - EFFORT
   - OTHER IN RELATIONSHIP

5. **NOT WANTING**

6. **LOSS OF**

7. **LACK OF**

---

Scantron Line 3
Scantron Line 4
Scantron Line 5
Scantron Line 6
Scantron Line 7
Scantron Lines 8-13
Scantron Lines 14-17
Scantron Lines 18-21
### Schedule Two:

**Subcategories of Agent of Control and Object of Control**

#### Agent of Control

**(Lines 14-17 on Scantron)**

**Self/Personal (Line 14)**

1. global
2. mind
3. brain
4. cognitions
5. feelings
6. behavior
7. body
8. other
9. two of the above (or more)

**Self in Relationship (Line 15)**

1. interpersonal
2. occupational
3. environmental
4. social/political
5. spiritual
6. nonspecific/diffuse
7. two of the above
8. three or more of the above

**Others/Personal (Line 16)**

1. global
2. mind
3. brain
4. cognitions
5. feelings
6. behavior
7. body
8. other
9. two of the above (or more)

**Others in Relationship (Line 17)**

1. interpersonal
2. occupational
3. environmental
4. social/political
5. spiritual
6. non-specific/diffuse
7. two of the above
8. three or the above (or more)

#### Object of Control

**(Lines 18-21 on Scantron)**

**Self/Personal (Line 18)**

1. global
2. mind
3. brain
4. cognitions
5. feelings
6. behavior
7. body
8. other
9. two of the above (or more)

**Self in Relationship (Line 19)**

1. interpersonal
2. occupational
3. environmental
4. social/political
5. spiritual
6. non-specific/diffuse
7. two of the above
8. three of the above (or more)

**Others/Personal (Line 20)**

1. global
2. mind
3. brain
4. cognitions
5. feelings
6. behavior
7. body
8. other
9. two of the above (or more)

**Others in Relationship (Line 21)**

1. interpersonal
2. occupational
3. environmental
4. social/political
5. spiritual
6. non-specific/diffuse
7. two of the above
8. three of the above (or more)
3.3 SCORING RULES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONTROL CATEGORIES (1-3)

As a general guideline, an effort is made in this coding manual to limit the scope of the coding of control to those clauses where control (or one of the categories) is clearly being referred to. Without an effort to utilize a narrow-based definition of control, there was a danger of “over-inclusiveness” in that everything that is said could potentially, be some indirect connection, be connected to control.

RULE ONE: A clause is coded only when one of the control categories is definitely in evidence.

For example, the statements "I am depressed; I am tense; I am a bulimic; I am an alcoholic" would NOT be coded, because control has not directly been addressed, and coding it would not give us any new information. However, statements such as the following would be coded: I feel I am unable to make anything happen in my life; I feel I can’t handle the pace of events; I desperately want to control my weight; I cannot control my drinking.

RULE TWO: Each scorable clause can obtain a score for all five categories. However, not all categories need to be coded (i.e. there can be species without mode; or mode without species; etc).

RULE THREE: References to self-esteem. These are scored for control whenever mention is made of either
a) control related aspect to self-esteem: e.g., I’m really proud of myself for losing weight; I feel awful because I can’t keep my weight off. Generally these will have some mention of effort, responsibility, choice. When none of these are mentioned, it should not be coded. For example, she is smart is not coded: she works hard to do well in school is coded (efforts for control).

b) active or yielding (mode) references: e.g., I’ve learned to accept my height; etc.

Rule 4:

Questions are not scored if patient makes third party reference about another (e.g. She said to me “can you accept that he won’t change.”

Conditional clauses are scored as follows:
If I would do it, I would feel better.” Coded as (desire for control)
If they try to desert, I should stop them. (not coded).
3.4 RULES FOR CODING THE AGENT AND OBJECT (Categories 4 and 5)

RULE ONE: The main rule for these categories, detailed in their respective section, is that when either agent or object is the "self," then the subcategory used is self/personal or self-in relationship.

RULE TWO: If the self is not mentioned as either agent or object, then the coding for agent and object is other/personal and other in relationship.

RULE THREE: Clauses containing verbs of being: i.e., is, or having—because they have no mention of an agent of control are scored for "Diffuse, or non-specific" as agent of control." For example, I am controlled; I have been controlled.

Rule 4: If the object refers to two items in different categories, code in first category.
Place passive voice into active: I was abused by him is coded as "he abused me."

If a third person says it: e.g. John says I don’t have control; then a) code for low responsibility; (don’t code for species unless speaker says and I agree.)
4. GUIDELINES FOR SCORING: THE FIVE CATEGORIES

The following material provides, examples, guidelines for scoring, and tables for reporting information for each of the different categories of the SCCAS.

4.1 SPECIES OF CONTROL and RATER DISAGREEMENT: CATEGORY ONE

The SPECIES OF CONTROL dimension refers to an interval of control ranging from having control to lack of control. The term species is used because these are a group of related terms within the common grouping of the construct of control. The nine point scale of species is listed below in Figure Two: it represents a vector of control, with the top four representing greater control; 0 (ambivalence) reflecting neutral; and the bottom four representing a vector toward decreasing control.

RATER DISAGREEMENT refers to a narrow band in which the rater feels there is clear and compelling evidence to disagree with the beliefs and/or statements of the speaker/patient.

The subsequent material in this section provides the "size of the net" for each subcategory of species, as well as examples, and questions. Finally, additional refinements are detailed, as well as a table for scoring.
FIGURE TWO: SPECIES OF CONTROL

HAVING OR GAINING CONTROL (+4)

EFFORTS FOR CONTROL (+3)

BELIEF IN ABILITY TO GAIN CONTROL (+2)

NEED OR DESIRE FOR CONTROL (+1)

AMBIGUALITY (0)

NOT WANTING (MORE) CONTROL; DESIRE TO LOSE CONTROL (-1)

FEAR OF LOSS OF CONTROL (-2)

LOSING CONTROL (-3)

LACK OF CONTROL/OUT OF CONTROL (-4)
HAVING OR GAINING CONTROL: being in control, in control, I believe I have control. The state of having, or gaining control, a sense of control; increasing one's control. The continuum ranges from absolute sense of control to the sense that one can have (some) influence on events.

EXAMPLES OF HAVING/GAINING CONTROL:
(I believe) I can do what I want; can effect change.
I have lots of freedom at work.
I make the decisions around my house.
He owns 51% of the company.
The government regulates our lives.
God has a master plan for the Universe.
He thinks he can just walk in here and order everyone around.
We can choose what we dwell on--half empty or half full.
I was able to resist the urge to give in (buy, do act).
Nobody can take this away from me.
I don't have to answer if I don't want to.
I make the rules; run the show.
I can break the law if I want.
It was my plan. I called the shots.
I wasn't surprised by what they did.
It's not really bad what just happened because it gives us time to plan our response.
No one else can make us anxious, the choice is ours.
No one can make us think about anything we don't want to think about.
We're in charge of our own thoughts and attitudes.
There are things I can change if I want to.
Anytime I say I am going to do something, I do it.
I'm sure the Doctor (government, parent, God) will take care of me. (i.e., someone is in control).
I can find people who can help me do it.
He uses people.
I manipulated the situation.
I accept myself as I am (mode would be yielding, positive).
I am responsible.
I feel really competent when I give a talk.

OVERCONTROL (i.e., I am extremely possessive of my children), will be picked up in mode and valence; Examples:
He is a tyrannical dictator;
I am a master puppeteer of people
He is rigid and has too high need for control (or "judy" too much.
She controls people by demanding, yelling, screaming,
My boss likes to see people squirm.
He always tries to get his own way.
UNREALISTIC CONTROL (i.e., I can control everything; I’m not an alcoholic because I don’t drink before 10) will be picked up by rater disagreement (either a check and/or a space) I’m invincible.

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS FOR HAVING/GAINING CONTROL
I have influence, but I don’t have control. (Coded in this subcategory).
I don’t want to/I don’t have to (coded here because person is making the choice). I want to (coded here); I have to (coded in lack of control because others are issuing the order).
Can I, may I, Should I (should be coded as lacking control, or ambivalence, depending upon the context, because the person does not feel they have control, and are asking permission.) Same with: They’re waiting to be directed.
I demanded (directed) her to do it. I told (instructed) her to do it. I asked her to do it. I encouraged her to do it. (These may be coded in this subcategory depending upon the context and the power of the person doing the “asking” as well as the empirical results (i.e., was it done?) The nature of the tone could be refined in the mode dimension.

I said you don’t have to if you don’t want to. (Again, a contextual question. May be coded here, may be “ambivalence). Like “Pruning a tree enriches its growth.” (you are controlling the tree, but for the tree’s benefit). Coded as having control.
I am very possessive (would be coded here because there is having control. May be coded as overcontrol in mode).
The rape (child abuse, etc) was not my fault. (coded here as external person having control; could also be coded as self-lacking control in that section; further coded as “no responsibility” in dimensions section).
People control me (obviously is coded here). People be little me, make me self-conscious, put me down. (As a general rule would be coded here because the people are exerting a strong influence on him).

I like the way I look (this is not coded, unless it is something the person has done i.e., the way I have taken care of my body, dressed, etc. But not if it is I like the color of my eyes.

*notice the difference in tone:
I’m not asking you to do it, I’m telling you.
This is not a demand, but a preference
My suggestion would be...
The Dr. referred me to you.....ordered me to see you
EFFORTS TO GAIN CONTROL: trying to/striving to gain or have influence or control, or gain more. The continuum here is without reference to intensity; coding would occur whether there were the greatest possible efforts, to I'm making some attempt to change. Rater disagreement would comment on the accuracy of the efforts; category on dimensions (effort) would add information about the intensity. I tried to gain control of X by....

EXAMPLES:
I'm trying to get more influence at work.
I'm working hard at school so my life will have more prospects.
I'm trying to.... run every day.
I'm making an effort to overcome.
He is working hard to secure his family's financial future.
I'm a fighter
I push myself very hard
You have to make your own opportunities

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS:
I need to be pushed to reach my limits (this could be coded here; or in lack of control, depending upon the context)
I put pressure on myself to succeed (efforts or desire, depending upon context).
If you say you are going to do it, follow through, or don't say it (efforts, desire, or ambivalence, depending upon context)
I need to trust you. (Could be effort, or lack of control, depending upon context).
I tried to deny it, but I have to accept it. (first clause if effort; second clause is lack of control, yielding mode).
BELIEF IN ABILITY TO GAIN CONTROL. This is a somewhat tricky category, reflecting self-efficacy. On the one hand, I believe I can gain control is potentially synonymous with a sense of control. The understood clause is (If I wanted to, or was willing to make the effort, etc. Belief is placed between desire and effort in the species chart for that reason. The continuum ranges from I am sure I can gain control to I think there's a vague possibility I can gain control.

Note that not all belief statements are coded here. Only those with beliefs about one's ability (self-efficacy) to obtain control. For example, "I believe I have control" would be coded in having control; I believe I don't have control" or I don't believe I can gain control would be coded in lack of control.

EXAMPLES
I believe I could gain control if I really tried.
I know I could lose these pounds if I really wanted.
I think I could probably can control

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS
I'm uncertain whether I can gain control (coded in ambivalence, not here).
I believe the Doctor will take care of me. (Coded in having control).

This category may represent a relatively narrow band.
NEED, OR DESIRE FOR CONTROL. The continuum ranges from I would like, I think it would be nice to have, to I want, I need, I must have, it is imperative that, I wish I could; I want to make all the decisions around here. I want to dominate, control others. Note the continuum from need to control, to desire for choice.

WANTING TO BE PERCEIVED AS BEING IN CONTROL. This category would be included in desire for control: e.g., I want others to see me as being in control (a desire to control other's perceptions).

EXAMPLES:
He is competitive, and tries to win at everything he does.
It is important for me to have an effect.
I wish I could control my temper.
I want to lose this fat.
I'd like to be asked before you do that.
I want to control myself better.
The Government doesn't want to give any appearance they are not in control.
The Board wants control. They aren't interested in issues, just control.
Adolescent rebellion against authority.
I want to control myself/the world/others.
He wants to be the boss; boss us around.
SDI is a high technology pseudo solution to the anxiety and power needs of men—a pathological defense against pain and vulnerability.
I hate disruption to the routine. I like things ordered.
People try to qualify for the largest house possible.
I don't like bosses/don't like to be controlled; don't like authority figures; don't like being told what to do.
Their country has a distrust of authoritarian rulers.
I'd like to be asked before you do it.
I want to lose weight.
I want to be a....superperson, not let anyone down; not show emotions. (refinement in goal category of dimensions, also).
I must run the show.

QUESTIONS; REFINEMENT
Do we need a subcategory differentiating desire/preference for control, from need (which is more of a compulsion)? For now, no. Look at data post-hoc to see if that is needed. Also note that this category may give important information when combined with active negative mode.

I don't want to be controlled by some bureaucrat's hands. I want to arrange my own concert tours (Russian pianist). (Coded here for wanting control, because not an element of fear—i.e., fear of losing control.)

I like having something to take care of (could be desire for control: i.e., order event or environment; cf. Japanese bonsai; or not coded at all; depends on context.)

He will go to any length to achieve his goal. (Either
desire/need for control; efforts for control; or having control, depends on the context).

I don't care whether the answer is yes or no, just tell me and get it over with. (either coded hear as need for control, or in ambivalence, depending upon context)

I must run the show (either here, or in having control--overcontrol, depending upon the context).

Ego questions: e.g., I want to be respected. (could be coded here as desire to influence, or control other's perceptions of oneself). Or not coded at all, depending upon the context.

Note:
*The distinction between not wanting to be controlled (don't tell me what to do) which is "reactive"; and I want be in charge (which is proactive).
*I don't want to be living like I am (e.g., lack of control) (but I don't have the energy or desire to change). The first clause coded as "species" the second as low desire/effort for control
NOT WANTING CONTROL. This is a category in which a person expresses a desire to have less (or at least not to have more) control. e.g., I don’t want any more responsibility. I want some help in making the decisions. (This is a conscious choice, picked up in dimensions). This category could also express a desire to be more accepting, or yielding, a fact which would be picked up by mode and valence. e.g., I wish I could just accept what is happening more, and stop trying to control it. I need to let loose.

EXAMPLES
I need to stop taking on so much responsibility.
I need to let loose of trying to control everything.
I’ve got to let my daughter lead her own life.
I want to take more risks without the certainty of outcome.
I don’t want to be the authority figure.
The burden of being in control.
I wish I had someone to share the responsibility with.
The point of rock and roll is losing control.
Control is not important to me.

FEAR OF LOSS OF CONTROL. I’m afraid that I might lose control. This would be coded for when the event has not yet happened, but there is a fear it might. Examples include fear of being controlled, social fears, fear of risk taking; fear of being trapped; fear of being manipulated; fear of change, newness, unexpected. Fear of losing one’s abilities.

FEAR OF OTHER’S PERCEIVING ONE AS LOSING CONTROL.

EXAMPLES
I fear getting Alzheimer’s.
I fear being enfeebled, and someone having to take care of me.
She is afraid she may decide to stop exercising.
I don’t want others to feel I am losing my abilities.
I hope I don’t make a mistake which gets me kicked out of the training program.
I fear he’ll take the children from me;
I’m jealous (fear of losing control of loved one)
When will I have a chance like this again (fear of losing the moment, or opportunity)
I have a fear of being ineffective (and so I whip myself into a frenzy).
I have a fear of being controlled (so I sometimes overcontrol (The first clause coded here, the second clause in having control).

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS
I have a fear of making a commitment in a relationship (could go in ambivalence, or here (i.e., someone else taking away my freedom).)
I don’t want to lose control; I fear losing control. (The former could be coded in desire for control, because no fear is expressed; the later, expressing worry, concern, would be coded here.)
LOSING CONTROL. Based on Brehm, there is an assumption here that one once had control, and is now losing it. Feeling of losing one's abilities; losing power; losing emotional control; losing control of social/interpersonal events; environmental events. I can no longer do what I once did.

EXAMPLES

- I'm losing my power base at work.
- He is no longer as effective at making things happen.
- I'm losing my ability to get reinforcements (I'm not getting the credit I feel I deserve).
- I'm not as strong or quick as I used to be.
- I don't feel I can direct my future as clearly as I once could.
- I lost control of my emotions and lashed out (first clause coded here; plus mode assertive/negative).
- My daughter doesn't listen to me as much anymore.
- When I try to do two things at once, it seems I do neither well.

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS

- I fear I'm losing control (coded here; vs. I fear I might lose control (coded in fear of losing.).
- I fear vulnerable (coding would depend on the context: fear of losing control, loosing control, or lack of control.)
LACK OF CONTROL. No options; no choice. There is nothing I can do about it. It is beyond control. I have no influence. I am not competent. I am out of control. Things are out of control.

EXAMPLES
I feel dominated, victimized.
He tyrannizes me.
He just can’t control himself around women.
Alcohol makes him crazy.
He has no future
He is totally out of control.
The country is in chaos
Nobody is willing to make a decision, and the monetary system is a shambles.
The universe is disordered.
No one is minding the ship.
Things are not in control; are out of control.
You can’t control the future.
I know I can’t control the future.
I was intimidated/paralyzed.
I couldn’t get the toilet to work. (daily hassle)
I don’t know how to communicate this to him.
The government has no power or ability to deal with the terrorists.
I can’t keep my thoughts under control.
Everything’s falling apart.
It’s impossible to influence anyone else.
My job is too much for me; I can’t handle it.
Life has taking control away from me.
My boss has taken control away from me.
I am self-destructive.
I don’t get credit for my efforts.
I couldn’t let go of it.
My efforts don’t make a difference.
I have to... (i.e., I am being ordered to, it’s not my choice.

RESPONSIBILITY.
I’m not responsible for his behavior.

BELIEF STATEMENTS, LIKE:
I can’t do it.
I don’t know how.
It’s all hopeless.
Nothing helps.
Why try to change, it won’t do any good.
What is the use.

QUESTIONS: /REFINEMENT
Is there a need to distinguish here between non-salient events beyond one’s control, and salient events. No, because, if they bring them up, it is assumed they are salient to the person.
It didn’t matter as long as there was nothing I could do about it (coded as lack of control for species, yielding/positive for mode).
4.2 THE MODE: ASSERTIVE AND YIELDING and SPEAKER/RATER VALENCE
(CATEGORY TWO)

The mode section refines the species of control and states whether it involves an assertive, altering, mode of control, or a yielding, accepting mode of control. For example, if one wants to do exercise and diet, one is using an active, altering mode to control one’s physical appearance. However, if one wants to “accept themselves” as they are, they are using a yielding, accepting mode.

SPEAKER VALENCE

Sometimes the individual may state they are acting assertively, but feel they are trying too much (negative valence); and sometimes they may feel they are accepting a situation that they shouldn’t (Negative valence).

FIGURE TWO, below, is taken from Shapiro, 1982, and provides a coding sheet listing all possibilities for coding the mode.

---

**INSERT FIGURE TWO ABOUT HERE**

Table 1. Coding Sheet—Instructions to Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Active Assertive Positive.</td>
<td>This refers to words which show instrumental activity in a positive way toward the accomplishment of something—goal oriented, self-starter, independent. They involve a concept of doing, of activity, of motion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passive (Yielding) Letting Go Positive.</td>
<td>This refers to the positive aspects of acceptance, yielding, softness, gentleness, nurturing. There is more a sense of stillness here, of quiet, of softness, of being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Active (over assertive) Negative (over active/over control).</td>
<td>This refers to too much activity, too high control, a sense of aggressiveness, a certain ruthlessness, a Machiavellian quality, a high agitation, an insensitivity, a selfishness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Passive (over yielding) Negative (too low self-control).</td>
<td>This refers to too low activity, a mushiness, an over passivity, a diffuseness, undifferentiatedness, helplessness and hopelessness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, please try to fit all the words, phrases, and sentences/questions on the next pages in the above four categories. If they do not fit, please then use the following categories:

5. Active, but uncertain whether it is positive or negative.
6. Passive, yielding word, but uncertain whether it is positive or negative.
7. A positive word, but uncertain whether it is active or passive.
8. A negative word, but uncertain whether it is active or passive.
9. Not sure whether the word is positive or negative, active or passive.
If one takes assertive and yielding, and positive and negative valence, four-quadrants of possibilities are revealed. This material is based on previous work (Shapiro, 1978; 1983c) in which words reflecting a four quadrant model of control were developed, and rater reliability obtained for the discreteness of the four quadrants (Shapiro, 1982a): 1. active control--positive assertiveness; 2. letting go control--positive yielding; 3. overcontrol--negative assertive; and 4. too little control: negative yielding.

Sometimes there will be questions about whether a given situation is assertive/yielding, or both. This is then classified as non-specific/diffuse (examples are given in the next section). Similarly there may be questions about whether is positive or negative (again classified as neutral, non-specific, or diffuse). These 9 possible categories are described in figure two.

RATER VALENCE

Because of issues of patient defensiveness, it was thought important to have the rater determine his view of the valence. For example a person may be maintaining control of others, or a situation by coercion or force, and may feel that is positive, but a rather may disagree and see the valence as negative. Or the person may feel it is positive acceptance not to act when someone is intimidating them, and the rater may again disagree, and see non-acting as negative acceptance.

Other issues of "patient defensiveness" and "illusion of control" will be picked up by rater disagreement with the species.
EXAMPLES

ACTIVE, ALTERING:

I am going to try to change this situation.
I can make anything happen I want to.
I have to be pushed to reach my limit (this is active, because it differs from: I am comfortable with who I am now).

POSITIVE:
He is a strong, active leader
NEGATIVE:
He bosses his wife around too much.

ACCEPTING, YIELDING

I have learned to accept what I can't change.
I accept the situation.
I allowed myself to be arrested.
Things will right themselves
I don't want to interfere.
I'm coming to accept there is nothing I can do.

POSITIVE
I allowed it and felt ok about it
NEGATIVE
I allowed it and felt like an idiot victim
I let everybody boss me around.

NON=SPECIFIC (active/yielding)
life is too complex to regulate.
I have a handle on my free time (This is "having control"
species, but unclear whether it is through active or
accepting that it has occurred.
He is the master of his destiny.
NON=SPECIFIC (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE)
She wears the pants in that family.
He is a disciplinarian

EXAMPLES OF SPEAKER DISAGREEMENT:

I control my kids by tying them up, and feel good about it
(Speaker: Assertive positive; Rater: assertive negative).
4.3 DIMENSIONS OF CONTROL AND SELF-CONTROL: CATEGORY THREE

Based on previous research on self-control (Shapiro, 1983b), six dimensions were concretized and operationalized. These dimensions, as applied to this content analysis, can give further refinement of the species subcategories continuum ranging from having control to lack of control. The six dimensions are as follows:

1) responsibility (Shapiro and Shapiro, 1979) (e.g. It’s his fault we’re in this mess); 2) choice (I’m trapped; I have no alternative); 3) skill (I don’t know how to change; I cannot do it); 4) awareness (I’m not able to concentrate; I don’t know why I act like this); 5) motivation/ discipline (I’m not able to make the effort; it’s too hard); and 6) goal (I don’t know what I really want to do).

These items are described in more detail in FIGURE THREE, including definitions, key words, and examples.

-------------------------------------------
INSERT FIGURE THREE ABOUT HERE
-------------------------------------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key words</th>
<th>Examples of sentences (from study itself)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Choice (Furlong, 1981; Thoreson &amp; Mahoney, 1974; Shapiro, 1983b; Nolan, 1972; Lefcourt, 1973): Choice is the dimension that suggests volitional efforts in which external demands (shoulds, oughts) are minimized. Choice implies alternative degrees of freedom, and the ability to evaluate as well as posit goals.</td>
<td>Ability to choose&lt;br&gt;Volitional&lt;br&gt;Deciding what is in one's best interest&lt;br&gt;Weighing responses&lt;br&gt;Exploring options&lt;br&gt;Action either one way or the other</td>
<td>Choosing to respond in a particular manner;&lt;br&gt;Having the ability to choose your reaction/responses&lt;br&gt;Choice of an attitude&lt;br&gt;Extent to which I am volitional in my behavior&lt;br&gt;The possibility for me to choose my own behavior&lt;br&gt;Ability to determine what my action/reaction will be in any given situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goal (vision): This is what choices are made toward—i.e., self-control for/or what?—accelerative or decelerative self-control (Thoreson &amp; Mahoney, 1974). The goal is defined as the desired objective toward which effort (discipline) is directed.</td>
<td>Process goals&lt;br&gt;What is in my best interest&lt;br&gt;What I want&lt;br&gt;Setting appropriate goals&lt;br&gt;Goals specific in their content&lt;br&gt;Self-acceptance and serenity&lt;br&gt;Balance of emotions and intellect&lt;br&gt;Acting more freely&lt;br&gt;Developing inner peace regardless of circumstances</td>
<td>Doing what a person wants to do&lt;br&gt;Doing what is best for me&lt;br&gt;Dealing with impulses and urges in a manner conducive to self-fulfillment&lt;br&gt;Balancing emotional and intellectual aspects&lt;br&gt;Not doing something you want to do and doing something you don't want to do&lt;br&gt;The ability to accept and adapt to things and people the way they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness: Awareness is the ability to discriminate cues in the internal and external environment and an ability to note how those variables affect oneself. (There are many different types of awareness, methods of focusing, depth of concentration and absorption, all of which in turn affect how one perceives the world) (Shapiro, 1978, 1980). Awareness could be either of a particular cause/effect change, style of perceiving, a recognition of the goal (category 2 above) and/or an awareness of options and choices (category 1 above).</td>
<td>Being in touch with, knowing, realizing how, noticing, awareness, recognizing</td>
<td>Conscious regulation of one's behavior and feelings; being in touch with your body processes, feelings, thoughts; awareness of all processes that are in operation at a given time; ability to realize how and when emotions play a significant role in decision making; recognizing one's resources and limitations; to be aware of habitual ways of thinking, feeling, behaving that influence me; being able to recognize what is best for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discipline: Discipline is utilized here to include effort, delay of gratification, self-sacrifice, determination. Webster's (1981) defines discipline as &quot;training that molds, corrects, or perfects the mental faculties or moral character,&quot; and control gained by enforcing obedience or order (p. 322).</td>
<td>Hold to, restrain, control responses, stay with goal, follow through, put aside immediate pleasure, repression, limit, restriction</td>
<td>Holding to the behavior or attitude one intends in the face of intrusion&lt;br&gt;Not doing something you want to do and doing something you don't want to do&lt;br&gt;Conscious regulation of one's behavior&lt;br&gt;Regulation of responses to stimuli encountered physically and mentally&lt;br&gt;The ability to decide what is right for me at a particular time and follow through with that decision&lt;br&gt;Ability to restrain oneself physically, emotionally to achieve a higher goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skill (Thoreson &amp; Cotes, 1976; Bandura, 1977): Webster's (1981) defines skill as &quot;the ability to use one's knowledge effectively and readily in execution of performance&quot; or &quot;a development of aptitude or ability&quot; (p. 1079). It refers to the abilities to do something, such as in the case of self-control, developing self-discipline, learning how to concentrate, recognizing cues in the environment that will help the person become more aware, etc.</td>
<td>Skill, ability, capability, know-how, learning options (as opposed to innate behaviors)</td>
<td>The ability to see creatively, the ability to balance emotional aspects of ourselves with intellectual aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Responsibility: Responsibility is defined as a cognition in which one assumes a unidirectional, causal attribution about the effect one's own behavior and thoughts have or could have on the environment. Webster's (1981) defines it as a &quot;moral, legal, or mental accountability&quot; (p. 979). (See also Gobus, 1980; Shapiro &amp; Shapiro, 1979; Knowles, 1977.)</td>
<td>Any statement that indicated ownership of behavior or use of a pronoun: my, I, me, myself, self, by the person, you, oneself, ones.</td>
<td>Taking responsibility for self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When these dimensions are present, and the agent and object of control are the "self", we have self-control (ranging from having to desiring). When they involve the self as agent and other as object, they involve other control; Examples include the following:

GOAL

I want to control my temper (self-control)
He wants to pick his own job (other control)

AWARENESS:

I am learning how my thoughts effect my emotions.
He is learning how peer pressure influences him.

RESPONSIBILITY

It's up to me to control my thoughts/behavior.
I am not responsible for what he does.
I need to participate more in the national elections.
I cannot control him.

CHOICE

I am going to choose to lose weight.
The new law gives people no choice.

EFFORT/DISCIPLINE

I am going to try as hard as I can to lose weight.
I must give everything I have to win.
He is putting a lot of pressure on me to change my mind.

SCORING:

Each of the six dimensions are scored on a three point scale. 1 (one) represents having that particular dimension. 3 (three represents not having that dimension); and 2 (two) is somewhere in between.
4.4 AGENT OF CONTROL AND
4.5 OBJECT OF CONTROL

These two categories are discussed together because the subcategories within them are exactly the same. The AGENT of control is that which the person speaking perceives to be causing, exerting an influence on (or should be exerting influence on) or is in charge of on an event, place, or person. The OBJECT of control is that animate and/or inanimate person/place or event acted upon.

For example, in the sentence: "I control John" the object is John and the Agent of control is "I." If the sentence were "John controls me" then John is the agent and "me" is the object. If the sentence is "I am controlled by John" the agent is still John, and the object is "I."

FOUR SUBCATEGORIES. There are four subcategories for agent and object: 1) self-personal; 2) self-in-relationship; 3) other-personal; and 4) other in relationship. The following rule applies to coding these subcategories:

DIFFERENTIATING "SELF" SUBCATEGORIES (1,2) FROM "OTHER" SUBCATEGORIES (3,4)

If "THE SELF" (or some part of the self) is EITHER an agent OR object of control, the coding for agent AND object is placed in either self-personal or self-in-relationship. (1,2)

If the SELF is NEITHER an agent NOR an object of control, the coding for agent and object is placed in the other-personal or other in relationship. (3,4)

For example, "I control John" the AGENT is coded as Self/personal--"I"--(1); and the object is coded as SELF IN RELATIONSHIP (2). If the sentence were "She controls John" then the agent could be coded as Other/personal (3), and the object,
John, would now be coded as Other in Relationship (4).

This scheme is being used so that there can be a subsequent comparison of clauses involving the self as either agent or object, with those involving the self as neither agent nor object.

LEVELS WITHIN THE "SELF-PERSONAL" AND "OTHER-PERSONAL" SUBCATEGORIES.

As can be seen from Figure 4, there are several levels within the "Self-personal" and "other-personal" subcategories

----------------------------------------

INSERT FIGURE FOUR ABOUT HERE:

LEVELS OF SELF/PERSONAL AND OTHER/PERSONAL.

The following levels are differentiations of the above subcategories. Depending upon the clause, they may also be coded as either agent or object.

GLOBAL
MIND
BRAIN
COGNITIONS
FEELINGS
BEHAVIOR
BODY
OTHER
TWO OR MORE OF THE ABOVE

----------------------------------------
GLOBAL: This refers to the entire "self." Code words include "I"; me, my entire being, when referring to the self; and she, he, etc, when referring to "other." The person in their totality. EXAMPLES: I control him; she ordered me to stop.

MIND: My mind, his mind, God's mind. EXAMPLES: "My mind controls my body" (Mind as agent). "Voices control my mind." (mind as object).

BRAIN: This would be either when the word "brain" is used by the person, or when reference to a certain part of the brain: e.g., My brain controls my body; his brain is out of control; the occipital lobe controls eyesight.

COGNITIONS: Thoughts, statements, beliefs. Examples: Meditation has helped me slow down my thoughts. (cognitions as object); Thinking helps me gain a better perspective; my thoughts control my feelings. Other's thoughts control me (cognitions as agent). She knows how to block out her negative thoughts; (thoughts as object in subcategory other/personal).

FEELINGS: emotions, mood states. EXAMPLES: I feel I can control my sadness (emotion as object); my temper runs away with me; he makes me angry (emotions as agent). Her impulsive feelings make her get out of control (emotions as agent, subcategory other/personal).

BEHAVIOR: actions, bodily movements, deeds. EXAMPLES: My behavior affects others (behavior as agent); He controls my behavior; the law makes him control his actions (behavior as object).

BODY: weight, illness, body parts (e.g., eyes, etc). Also to be included here are statements about "genes"; "heredity", etc. EXAMPLES: I am having trouble controlling my weight (body as object). When my body is in good shape, my mind feels good, too. This physical illness is destroying my will to live; my body craves chocolate. (body as agent).
LEVELS WITHIN THE "SELF-IN-RELATIONSHIP" AND OTHER IN RELATIONSHIP SUBCATEGORIES.

These categories involve people, events, objects at least one step removed from the "self" or the "other." These levels are listed in Figure Five.

INSERT FIGURE FIVE ABOUT HERE: LEVELS OF SELF-IN-RELATIONSHIP; OR OTHER IN RELATIONSHIP

These different levels may also be coded as agent or object, depending upon the context of the clause.

INTERPERSONAL

OCCUPATIONAL/FINANCIAL

ENVIRONMENTAL/ANIMATE (NON-HUMAN) AND INANIMATE OBJECTS

SOCIAL/POLITICAL/ECONOMIC

SPIRITUAL

NON-SPECIFIC/DIFFUSE

TWO OF THE ABOVE

THREE OR MORE OF THE ABOVE

INTERPERSONAL: This includes all personal relationships, from those that are quite close (spouse, parents, children, relatives) to those less close, but with whom one has contact (excluding professional relationships). EXAMPLES. I make the decisions in my marriage; I overcontrol our daughter (interpersonal as object); My spouse controls me; my overbearing mother caused my problems (interpersonal as agent). The phrase a wife should submit to her husband would be coded as interpersonal as agent and object.

OCCUPATIONAL/FINANCIAL. This includes the job, profession, relationships there (i.e., boss, colleagues, etc), and money and financial issues. EXAMPLES: I can handle my job well (occupation as object); my boss is driving me crazy; I am a slave to my job; my job requires me to move a lot; jobs demean men; because I was poor I decided to work really hard to escape it (occupation as agent). People's jobs are being effected by the out of control inflation; Bill has alot of clout in his job; I control where I spend my money. (occupation as object; self as neither object nor agent).
ENVIRONMENTAL/BOTH ANIMATE (NON-HUMAN) AND INANIMATE OBJECTS: This includes the entire physical environment, from one's yard and neighborhood, to other planets, and the weather. It also includes inanimate objects such as "guns", and we are also including here "chemicals" such as alcohol and both prescription and non-prescription drugs. EXAMPLES (where the self is either object of agent): Smog makes my eyes water; The empty room allowed my thoughts to relax; the drug calmed my nerves; alcohol makes him go crazy; I like making my garden look neat and orderly. When the gun was pointed at me I did what I was told. Examples when the self is neither object or agent: The big developers are destroying Yosemite (environment as object). Depletion of the ozone layer may destroy all human life (environment as agent).

SOCIAL/POLITICAL/ECONOMIC. This refers to "MACRO" level issues not covered in interpersonal and occupational/financial. The community, the city, the state, the government, big business, the economy, inflation, the stock market, etc. EXAMPLES: I feel I can make changes in world events. The economy is destroying me. I am going to make an effort to have world peace. I don't feel it does any good for me to vote in an election. The radical left wants to destory society. The Senate tries to control the house. The law tells you what you cannot do. Republicans believe in lack of centralized control Democrats believe the individual cannot do everything for themselves. He is a knee-jerk anti-communist.

SPIRITUAL: This includes that which is part of the person's religion, including God, beings not part of the corporeal world, etc. EXAMPLES: Jesus rules my life. Without God, there is no morality; Hinduism gives people a fatalistic outlook. Karma determines what will happen to me.

NON-SPECIFIC/DIFFUSE This is for when something can't be coded in the above categories. EXAMPLE. I feel I drive people away from me (this might be interpersonal, or social/political, or here, depending upon the context.

TWO OF THE ABOVE: EXAMPLE: I feel I have a handle on my family and my job. Kung Fu gives you control of your mind and your body.

QUESTIONS/REFINEMENTS
ADDITIONAL REFINEMENTS:

RATER DISAGREEMENT. This would only be used sparingly, when it is extremely clear that the person is deceiving him or herself.

MODE: This is discussed in a separate section. However, it is noted here because it can help us determine reactions to certain species events: e.g., how does the person react to loss of control (argue, give in, accept, anger, etc.). These would probably be coded as a subsequent clause. In addition, the valence of a person's efforts (positive or negative—bribery, coercion, manipulation,) as well as the valence of the person's "having control" would be refined by the mode/valence categories.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE CATEGORIES TO EACH OTHER. Can we determine a relationship of the categories to each other: i.e., fear of losing control is correlated with strong efforts to gain it;

DIMENSIONS. This category is also discussed elsewhere, but is mentioned here because it can refine the species: i.e., stating which aspects of control are being utilized (choice, responsibility, etc.), level of intensity of effort, etc.

WEIGHTING
Assumption of the weighting is that there is discreetness and an interval between the different species. This is an empirical question which needs to be looked at and refined throughout this research effort. Do the need to be weightings within a subcategory of species: i.e., level of effort, degree of need for control (I wish versus I must); how to deal with ambivalence (a number between desire and not wanting?

Could a standardized test presented to the individual where they had to select (Wish versus must) pick that up better? Ask the person, then correlate with their verbal samples in future research).
AMBIVALENCE (O)

This is a category related to uncertainty, either about whether one has desire for control; whether the efforts are worth it; or whether one in fact has, or lacks control.

EXAMPLES:
I'm not sure where to put my attention.
I'm not sure what to do.
I don't know if it is worth the effort
I can't decide whether to try or not.
I don't want to choose.
RELATED TO BELIEFS:
I'm not sure if I can
I may not be able to do it.
Data (frequency counts) were gathered for the following questions:

1) WHEN THE SELF IS THE AGENT OF CONTROL (category 3, line 4)
   1.1 and self is object of control (i.e., self-control): category 4, line 8
   1.2. and others or inanimate is object of control (i.e., sense of control, perceived control (category 4, line 9)

   Additional frequency counts can be obtained for the above by determining what species (category one, line three) is invoked (e.g., losing self-control, efforts for controlling another, etc); as well as what mode (category 4 and 5) lines 12,13) is invoked (positive assertive, negative assertive, positive yielding, negative yielding).

   1.4 A further refinement of this self as agent category can be obtained by frequency counts on category 7, the dimension data.

   1.5 Denial defensiveness by category 5 and discrepancy.

2) WHEN THE SELF/PERSONAL IS THE OBJECT OF CONTROL (category 3, line 8) AND OTHER PEOPLE, INSTITUTIONS, OR INANIMATE OBJECTS ARE THE AGENT OF CONTROL (category three, line 5).

   2.1-2.2 Further refinement, as cited in 1.3 and 1.4 can be applied here.

3) WHEN REFERENCE TO CONTROLLING "OCCURS" IN THE WORLD (and the self is not invoked either as agent or object) (Agent is category three, lines 6 or 7; and object is category 4, lines 10 or 11.)

   3.1 This is a test of the projective hypothesis and can be compared with one and two for frequency counts.

   3.2-3.3 Further refinement as noted in 1.3 and 1.4 can be applied here.

Thus, after the control data is coded, and rater reliability obtained, the data is run through the computer on the scantron sheets, and reduced first to different frequency counts, as noted above. The above will give frequency count information on the SCCAS, which can be compared within the instrument itself. However, it is not yet clear what are the five scores to be compared with the Gottschalk scales. Therefore the next step is reducing the data to those five scores.

This yields ten scores all together, five from Gottschalk/Glesser, and five from SCCAS. These are reported in Table One.
ENCLOSED IS AN ABBREVIATED SCORING FORM. THIS FORM HAS THE FOLLOWING:

1) SEVEN AGENT AND OBJECT GROUPINGS (see Table 4, Article 1)
   1. S.C. = self-control
   2. S.C. O = self controlling other
   3. S. = self as agent, no object
   4. O.C.S. + = other controlling self positive
   5. O.C.S. - = other controlling self negative
   6. O.C.O = other controlling other
   7. O = other as agent, no object

2) NINE SPECIES CATEGORIES (Table 1, article one)
   1. H.C. = having control
   2. B = belief can gain control
   3. E = efforts for control
   4. D = desire for control
   5. A = ambivalence
   6. N = not wanting control
   7. F = fear of losing control
   8. L = losing control
   9. L = loss or lack of control

3) MODE (see Table five, article one)
   + Assert = positive assertive, quadrant one
   + yield = positive yielding, quadrant two
   - assert = negative assertive, quadrant three
   - yield = negative yielding, quadrant four

NOTE: There is no coding for dimensions, and no coding for subheadings of agent and object (tables 2, 3, 6 in article one).

At the top of each page, the subject's name, the word count (already done) and the number of scorable control-related clauses should be listed.

Each clause should then be coded and placed in the appropriate box: 1) agent/object; 2) species; 3) mode. For example, if clause one is: I fear losing control of my body, would be coded by 1's placed on the next page as shown (under agent/object, species, but nothing in dimension). If clause 2 is "I'm trying to learn to accept my weight" then a 2 would be placed in agent/object, species, and mode, as shown on next page.

As noted in the manual, a clause can have species without mode; and also mode without species (e.g. I use only assertive strategies). There will always be an agent and object; and there will be more species than mode clauses.
SCORING:

AGENT/OBJECT

The total number of agent/object clauses are counted, and a percentage of each of the 7 groupings noted.

OVERALL SPECIES

Overall species is calculated from the self standpoint for agent-object groupings 1-5. This means that any agent/object clause from group five (other controlling self negative) has to be reversed when doing the calculations in species as follows: having (1) becomes loss (9); and belief (2) becomes losing (8). (For example he controls me would be coded as agent/object group five and species group 1 on the previous page. However, to calculate an overall species score from the "self's" standpoint, he controls me is the equivalent of I lack control.)

Nine different scores are thus obtained, one for each species category.

To calculate an overall species score, the following is done: the number of having and and belief clauses are added, and that number is multiplied by 1; the number of not wanting control clauses are subtracted from the number of effort plus desire clauses, and that number is multiplied by 2; and the number of fear, loss, and lack clauses are added and that number is multiplied by 3. Those three numbers are then added and divided by the number of clauses of species to get an overall score.

OVERALL MODE

Overall Mode is calculated only from the self's standpoint and using only agent/object groupings 1-2-3.

A percentage score of each is then calculated based on the overall number of mode clauses.

SPECIES REFINEMENTS

Using the same procedures as described above, it is then possible to go back and determine species by specific agent/object groupings. The four most important are: group 1: self-control; group 2: self-controlling other; group 3: other controlling self negative; and group 6: other controlling other.

MODE REFINEMENTS

Using the same procedures for mode as described above, it is then possible to go back and determine mode by specific agent/object groupings. The two most important are: group 1: self-control; group 2: self-controlling other.
TABLE THREE: RATERS DISAGREEMENT FOR SPECIES:
CATEGORY ONE

HAVE/EFFORTS/BELIEF/DESIRE/AMBIV/NOT WANT/ FEAR/ LOSS/ LACK/ T

1
2
3
4
5
6

SCORING:
Obtain a frequency count of rater disagreement for each of the subcategories of species. (line 4 in scantron).
Then find an overall frequency. (Total=T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABLE THREE: DENIAL (DEFENSIVENESS/DISCREPANCY) LEVEL OF SCCAS I FOR MODE/VALENCE (CATEGORY 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S= SPEAKER (line 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R= RATER; (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1/Q3; Q2/Q4 ARE QUADRANTS (category 2, line 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ1 vs RQ3; SQ2 vs. RQ4; SQ4 vs RQ2; SQ3 vs RQ1 Tdis/Tagr/ %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1
| 2
| 3
| 4
| 5
| 6

SCORING OF TABLE THREE:
1. Determine the discrepancy between scorables (1, 2, and 3) of Scantron lines 6, 7.
2. Get a Total disagree score; get a total agree score; determine the % of disagree to total (agree + disagree).
3. Pick a criteria cut off: e.g., less than 5% discrepancies, is ok; 5 to 25% raises concern; over 25% major concern.
TABLE FOUR: SPECIES OF CONTROL (CATEGORY ONE OF SCCAS)
(Scantron Line

HAVE/EFFORTS/BELIEF/DESIRE/AMBIV/NOT WANT/ FEAR/ LOSS/ LACK/

1
2
3
4

SCORING TABLE 4:
1. Determine frequency counts for each of the subcategories.
2. Note percentage relative to the whole, and ratios relative to each other (e.g., does need for correlate with having, or fear of losing, etc.)
3. Determine a mean \(X\) score by using the weights \(+4\) to \(-4\) as indicated above.
4. Note that overcontrol, and letting go of control would be captured only by using this category combined with category 2.

TABLE FIVE: MODE (CATEGORY 2)
(Scantron lines 5 and 6)

NOTE: This category can be used after determining low degree of discrepancy between rater and speaker (Table Three A)

Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 T 5 6 7 8 9 %Q1/ %Q1&Q3/ Q2&Q4/ Q2/
Q1+Q3 Q1--Q4 Q1--Q4 Q2+Q4

1
2
3
4

SCORING:
1. Instructions for the first nine categories above come from Shapiro, 1982. Coding Sheet: Instructions to Experts. Based on the scantron sheet, the values are as follows:
\[
Q1=6.1/7.1, \quad Q2=6.2/7.1, \quad Q3=6.1/7.2, \quad Q4=6.2/7.2,
\]
\[
5=6.1/7.3, \quad 6=6.2/7.3, \quad 7=6.3/7.1, \quad 8=6.3/7.2.
\]
\[
T=\text{TOTAL of Q1--Q4}
\]
2. The remaining scores, after obtaining the above frequencies, are ratios of positive assertive (q1) to all assertive (q1+q3); positive yielding (q2) to all yielding (q2+q4); and percentage of assertive behavior (q1+q3) and yielding behavior (q2=q4) to all assertive and yielding behavior (q1+q2+q3+q4); and % of each Q to Total of Qs.

TABLE FIVE (A): COMBINING SPECIES AND MODE After obtaining the above information from tables Four and Five, look at refinements of species by quadrant: i.e., of the "having control" species response, how many were Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, ETC.
TABLE SIX: SIX DIMENSIONS OF CONTROL AND SELF-CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Respon</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>X(Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring:
1. Find frequency of responses for each of the six dimensions; then create a mean score for each dimension (i.e., responsibility quotient; effort quotient, etc). Compare within the six.
2. Get a summed score of all six dimensions, and obtain a frequency providing percentages of responses reflecting self-control, some self-control, and no self-control; then create a summed mean mean (x) self-control score for each person.

TABLE SEVEN: AGENT AND OBJECT OF CONTROL
(CATEGORIES 4 AND 5;)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring:
1. S/S=self as agent/self as object (self-control)
2. S/O= self as agent and relation/other as object of control (other control; perceived control)
3. O/S= other controlling the self
4. O/O=other controlling other.
5. S/=Total Self as agents
6. /S= total selves as object
7. S/+ /S divided by Total (S/+ /S + O/+ O)’s percent of self versus total (i.e. test of projective hypothesis).

TABLE SEVEN A: SUBCATEGORIES OF AGENT AND OBJECT OF CONTROL

Determine frequencies based on sub-categories listed in Schedule Two. Make additional refinements as necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Table:</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Q1; %Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (S.C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/S+0; O/S; T%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample (From previous page)
Clauses 1-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NAME</th>
<th>WORD COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CONTROL</th>
<th>SCORABLE CLAUSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT/ OBJECT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. D.C.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. D.C.S.+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. O.C.O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reverse by:
- Group 4 for
- Total by

"numbers"

4( + ) + 2( - - ) + 3( + + + ) =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>Assert</th>
<th>yield</th>
<th>-assert</th>
<th>-yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions.
APPENDIX

Method of Rater Training

The goal of the rater training procedure is to obtain rater agreement (agreement between two raters), rater accuracy (agreement with a previously established criterion protocol), and rater reliability over time. To meet these objectives, the following rater training program has been prepared:

STAGE ONE: Reading and studying of the coding manual (see accompanying sheets).

STAGE TWO: Completion of programmed instruction materials (exercises, videotapes) involving precoded interactions.

STAGE THREE: Achievement of 80% rater reliability. Both agreement between two raters and rater agreement with an established protocol will be calculated. This procedure will (a) eliminate the problem of rater drift (where, over time, rater agreement increases, but rater accuracy decreases) and (b) insure the proper use of the coding instrument. Further, care will be taken not to assume that rater training is complete the first time significant reliability is reached. Such a performance will have to be duplicated in order to insure that the first time was not a lucky accident.
APPENDIX

Appendix is an example from the outpatient research study of coding. It is provided as a model of one way of “coding” the scoring. This sample is a paragraph (including nine scorable clauses) and the 9 scantron sheets where the clauses were scored on the following.

SPECIES OF CONTROL—: including having control, losing control, desire for control, fear of loss of control. (line3, including if rater disagreement with client characterization. (line 4)

MODES OF CONTROL. positive assertive: positive yielding/acceptance; , negative assertive, and negative yielding; (lines 5 and 6, (and if rater disagreement, line 7)

DIMENSIONS OF CONTROL: choice, goal, awareness, effort/discipline. skill and responsibility (lines 8-13

AGENT AND OBJECT OF CONTROL (lines 14-21)
The reason that I'm hear, is that my boyfriend heard about an eating disorder called Bulimia on T.V., and related it to my problem. We think that that's probably what I have. So, we did make a couple calls and I went to a group down in Costa Mesa that someone here had referred me to. I just went a couple times but they seemed to be real impersonal and I think it might help, once I got started individually but they just pretty much talk about the now and they haven't really helped me. Probably because I haven't really participated in it myself.
**Schedule Three:**

Lines for Scantron Use

**Subject ID:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rater ID:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disagreement:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value/Rater:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. In-Between</th>
<th>3. No</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Awareness:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. In-Between</th>
<th>3. No</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choice:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. In-Between</th>
<th>3. No</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effort:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. High</th>
<th>2. In-Between</th>
<th>3. No</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self/Personal:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Self in Relationship:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other/Personal:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Subcategories for Agent and Object of Control (Lines 14-22):**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Are Detailed in Schedule Two:***

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Self in Relationship:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other/Personal:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other in Relationship:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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SCHEDULE THREE:
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SUBJECT ID 1.

SUBJECT ID 2

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3
RATER 4
DISAGREEMENT

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

MODE 5

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

RESPONSIBILITY 10

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal A 14

self in relationship G 15

other/personal E 16

other in relationship N 17

SUBCATEGORIES FOR
AGENT AND OBJECT OF
CONTROL (LINES 14-21)
ARE DETAILED IN
SCHEDULE TWO
CLAUSE #3

SCHEDULE THREE:
LINES FOR SCANTRON USE

SUBJECT ID 1

SUBJECT ID 2

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3
RATER 4

DISAGREEMENT

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

MODE 5

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

RESPONSIBILITY 10

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal

A 14

self in relationship

GEN 15

other/personal

16

SUBCATEGORIES FOR
AGENT AND OBJECT OF
CONTROL (LINES 14-21)

ARE DETAILED IN
SCHEDULE TWO

self/personal

OB 18

self in relationship

JECT 19

other/personal

20

other in relationship

21

22

23

24

25

26

27
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SPECIES 3  RATER 4  DISAGREEMENT 5

1.active 2.yielding 3.diffuse MODE 6

1.positive 2.negative 3.neutral VALUE/SPEAKER 7

1.positive 2.negative 3.neutral VALUE/RATER 8

1.yes 2.in-between 3.no GOAL 9

1.yes 2.in-between 3.no AWARENESS 10

1.yes 2.in-between 3.no RESPONSIBILITY 11

1.yes 2.in-between 3.no CHOICE 12

1.yes 2.in-between 3.no SKILL 13

1.high 2.in-between 3.no EFFORT 14

self/personal GEN

self in relationship GEN

other/personal GEN
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SCHEDULE THREE:
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CLAUSE # 5

SUBJECT ID 1.

SUBJECT ID 2.

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3
RATER 4
DISAGREEMENT

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

MODE 5

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

RESPONSIBILITY 10

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal A 14

self in relationship G 15

other/personal E 16

SUBCATEGORIES FOR
AGENT AND OBJECT OF
CONTROL (LINES 14-21)
ARE DETAILED IN
SCHEDULE TWO

other in relationship N 17

self/personal O 18

self in relationship B 19

other/personal J 20
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SCHEDULE THREE:
LINES FOR SCANTRON USE

SUBJECT ID 1.

SUBJECT ID 2.

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3

RATER 4

DISAGREEMENT

MODE 5

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

RESPONSIBILITY 10

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal

A 14

self in relationship

G 15

other/personal

E 16

SUBCATEGORIES FOR
AGENT AND OBJECT OF
CONTROL (LINES 14-22)

ARE DETAILED IN
SCHEDULE TWO

self/personal

18

self in relationship

O 19

other/personal

B 20

other in relationship

C 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

FORM NO. 2744-UCI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUSE #</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT ID</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT ID</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIES</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATER</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODE</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALUE/SPEAKER</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALUE/RATER</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARENESS</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHOICE</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKILL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFORT</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBCATEGORIES FOR**

**AGENT AND OBJECT OF CONTROL (LINES 14-21)**

**ARE DETAILED IN SCHEDULE TWO**
SCHEDULE THREE:
LINES FOR SCANTRON USE

CLAUSE # 8

SUBJECT ID 1.

SUBJECT_ID 2

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3

RATER 4

DISAGREEMENT

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

MODE 5

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

RESPONSIBILITY 10

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal A 14

self in relationship G 15

other/personal N 16

other in relationship T 17

AGENT AND OBJECT OF other in relationship 18

CONTROL (LINES 14-21) self/personal

ARE DETAILED IN self in relationship 19

SCHEDULE TWO other/personal 20

other in relationship 21

22

23

24

25

26

27
SCHEDULE THREE:
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SUBJECT ID 1.

SUBJECT ID 2.

1. having 2. efforts 3. beliefs 4. desire
5. ambivalence 6. not wanting 7. fear of losing
8. loss of 9. lack of

SPECIES 3
RATER 4
DISAGREEMENT

1. active 2. yielding 3. diffuse

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/SPEAKER 6

1. positive 2. negative 3. neutral

VALUE/RATER 7

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

GOAL 8

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

AWARENESS 9

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

RESPONSIBILITY 10

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

CHOICE 11

1. yes 2. in-between 3. no

SKILL 12

1. high 2. in-between 3. no

EFFORT 13

self/personal

A 14

self in relationship

GEN 15

other/personal

16

SUBCATEGORIES FOR
AGENT AND OBJECT OF
CONTROL (LINES 14-22)
ARE DETAILED IN
SCHEDULE TWO

self/personal

18

other in relationship

GEN 17

self in relationship

19

OBJECT

other/personal

20

other in relationship

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

FORM NO. 2744-UCI
Appendix Three

CODING FOR SENSE OF CONTROL: SUBSCALES

A) SECURITY, COMFORT. (Things are in control, under control)
   6 very (content, safe, secure).
   5 somewhat
   4 slightly
   3 slightly
   2 somewhat
   1 very vulnerable, unsafe, insecure; things are out of
   control.

B) ORIENTATION
   B1 Spatial unmarked
      6 familiar: surroundings and people (content, safe, secure).
      5 somewhat
      4 slightly
      3 slightly unfamiliar
      2 somewhat unfamiliar
      1 very unfamiliar. I don't know where I am. How I got
      here.

   B2 Temporal
      6 Know the time
      5 somewhat aware of time
      4 slightly familiar
      3 slightly unfamiliar
      2 somewhat unfamiliar
      1 don't know time or date or year.

C) PURPOSE, MEANING (order, coherence (cf. a?)
   6 VERY CLEAR where I am going, what I am doing, my purpose
   5 somewhat
   4 slightly
   3 slightly unclear
   2 somewhat unclear
   1 very unclear.

D) AGENT OBJECT:
   D1 SELF as agent with self: self-CONTROL
      6 very in control of my thoughts, feelings, body, beha-
      vior.
      5 somewhat in control
      4 slightly in control
      3 slightly out of control
      2 somewhat out of control
      1 very out of control

   D2 SELF AS AGENT, OTHER AS OBJECT (other and destiny same or
   is destiny this plus one above and one below (a summation)
      6 I am very much in control of the situation: environment,
      place, people,
      5. I am somewhat
      4. I am slightly
      3. I am slightly out of control of
      2. I am somewhat out of control of
      1. I am very out of control of.
D3 OTHER AS AGENT, SELF AS OBJECT+
   6 others are very much determining my destiny, fate.+
   5. others are somewhat +
   4 others are slightly +
   3. others are not at all +

D4 OTHER AS AGENT, SELF AS OBJECT-
   1 others are very much determining my destiny, fate.-
   2. others are somewhat -
   3 others are slightly -
   4. others are not at all -

D5 SELF-DETERMINATION (GENERAL)
   6 I am very much determining my own destiny, fate.
   5 somewhat
   4. slightly
   3 my efforts are slightly unhelpful in
   2. my efforts are not having much impact on
   1 I am not at all determining my own destiny, fate

E) MODE

E1 ASSERTIVE
   6. I am acting very assertively to address
   the situation
   5. Somewhat assertively
   4. slightly assertively
   3 not at all assertively

E2 Aggressively
   1. I am being very overly aggressive and controlling
   2. I am being somewhat too aggressive
   3. I am being slightly too aggressive
   4. I am not at all

E3 Yielding+
   6. I am very accepting of the situation as it is with
   equanimity.
   5 somewhat accepting
   4. slightly accepting
   3. not at all accepting.

E4 yielding-
   1. feeling very passive and helpless.
   2. somewhat passive and helpless about situation.
   3. slightly passive and helpless
   4. not at all passive and helpless.

I) IDENTITY
   6. I know very clearly who I am
   5. I know somewhat clearly
   4. It is slightly clear
   3. slightly unclear
   2. somewhat unclear
   1. very unclear who I am
PREDICTABILITY
6. Events are unfolding in a very predictable and orderly fashion.
5. somewhat predictable
4. slightly
3. slightly unpredictable
2. somewhat unpredictable
1. very unpredictable

COMPETENCE
6. I am very competent to accomplish what I want.
5. somewhat
4. slightly
3. slightly incompetence
2. somewhat incompetence
1. I am very incompetent to accomplish what I want

BELONGING
6 I very much fit, belong, am accepted in this situation
5. somewhat
4. slightly
3. slightly dont belong
2. somewhat dont belong
1 I very much dont belong, outsider, dont fit.
Scale rating self-control statements. Scale runs for \(-2 \rightarrow +2\)

-2 = strongly out of control

-1 = moderately out of control

+1 = moderately in control

+2 = strongly in control

A. RESPONSIBILITY

-2 responsibility statements - complete lack of responsibility, passive voice - these statements imply things are done to the individual with client as object, client taking no responsibility for self

Gene conditioning

religion

ethnicity

sex

he

she

it

they

voices

parent

etc.

makes me

disowning statements

if that is what you want to call it.

-1 responsibility statements - attributing responsibility to others, but referring to self as subject. I am this way because-

I do

act

feel

am behave

because of

him

her

Statements with self as subject, but responsibility attributed to others.

I depend upon him

I need him, her
+1 responsibility statements - statements reflecting moderate degree of responsibility.

I feel pain
I am hurt
I said to him
I told him
I spoke to him
I think I feel
I'm making progress, I'm starting to change

+2 - Strong statements of personal responsibility, differentiated from +1 statements by degree of responsibility, strength of statement

Having

- It's up to me
- I'm the only one
- It's my responsibility
- I do what I want

Being

- I am not responsible for what he does (+2 yielding responsibility)
- I cannot control him/them.
BELIEF STATEMENTS - strongly negative belief statements of hopelessness, must be in relation to self, inability to control others

-2 Belief Statements

I can't do it
I couldn't do it
I don't know how
It's all hopeless
It doesn't help me
Why try to change
What good is it
What is the use.

-1 Belief statements - moderately negative beliefs - expressing uncertainty about abilities, skills, etc.

I'm not sure if I can
I don't know if I can
I may not be able to do it
+1 belief statement - moderately positive beliefs.

I think I can
I might be able to do it
I hope I can do it

+2 strongly positive beliefs - expressing confidence, conviction in skills
abilities, ability to do.

I can do it
I am able to do it
I know I can change
I am aware

I cannot control him - acceptance of what one cannot control -
acceptance of limitations - high score for +
yielding
MOTIVATION STATEMENTS

-2 Motivation statements -- strongly negativistic statements, unwilling to change. Rated as negative 2 motivation when in conflict with stated goals, therapeutic goals i.e. I want to lose weight, I'm not motivated for weight control program - it appears consistent with stated goals, becomes a responsibility statement, or positive motivational yielding statement. (I know I don't want to do it)

I don't want to do it
What good is that
It does me no good.

-1 motivation statements - statement implying external motivation: should, ought to, to please him, her, them, parents, etc.

I should be able to do that but cannot
I would like to do it to please them
I ought to do this but don't know if I want to
They would like me to do it

+1 Motivation statement - statement indicative of moderate degree of self motivation

I want to do this
I will try to do this
I would like to do it
I should do this for myself
I sought to do this

+2 motivational statements - strongly self motivated statements - statements implying strong intensity of motivation as well as a sense of self motivation

I have to do this for myself
I must do it for myself
I need to do it for myself
I know I do not want to do that
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