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Abstract

By using disqualification people negate their own messages (self-disqualification) or each other's messages (transactional disqualification). This study was concerned with self-disqualification, those variations in speech whereby people implicitly deny their message, or deny that they are the source of the message, or that the message was intended for the receiver or for the context in which it was sent. One aim of the study was to determine whether situations which encourage denial of personal responsibility for behavior would differentially influence how much disqualification an S used in justifying his behavior in the situation after it occurred. Another aim was to determine whether the proportion of responsibility placed on the S would also make a difference. Proportion of responsibility was varied by changing the locus of responsibility in hypothetical situations presented to the Ss: half of the Ss were told they were alone in what they had done or failed to do (sole locus of responsibility); half were told they shared responsibility for what happened with a few other people (diffuse locus of responsibility).

Forty male and 40 female college undergraduates were volunteer Ss. Each S was given a printed booklet containing one of eight hypothetical situations. The Ss were instructed to write a direct response to a hypothetical addressee after imagining themselves in the situation. The eight situations included descriptions of two separate events (A variable), with each event described so that it either encouraged acceptance or denial of responsibility by the S for his behavior (B variable).
Finally, within each of the events and responsibility conditions just mentioned, the situations were worded so that the S was either solely or jointly responsible with other people for what happened (C variable). It was hoped that data obtained with this written format would provide information about the feasibility of developing a paper-and-pencil instrument for measuring disqualification in various other groups.

It was hypothesized that situations which encouraged denial of responsibility (responsibility-reducing situations) elicit more disqualification than situations which encouraged acceptance of responsibility (responsibility-inducing situations). The responsibility-reducing situations in the study described the S as failing to do something that was expected of him because of his role or because of social norms. Responsibility-inducing situations described the S as complying with social or role expectations. The hypothesis was only partly supported by the results. A significant responsibility reducing-inducing difference occurred only for one of the hypothetical events and only for female Ss.

It was further predicted that the sole locus of responsibility condition elicits more disqualification than the diffuse locus of responsibility condition, especially in responsibility-reducing situations. The locus of responsibility variable did not, however, affect the Ss' responses.

Finally, no sex differences in disqualification were expected. Although no overall sex effect was found, females used significantly more disqualification than males in responding to responsibility-reducing situations. Females also tended to use more disqualification in
responding to one of the events.

The paper-and-pencil task was, therefore, sensitive to differences in disqualification. Furthermore, it was found that disqualification was not merely an artifact of how much the S wrote or how involved he rated himself in the task.

The results were discussed in terms of personality traits, sex-role expectations, and various situational variables which might influence disqualification. Future research was suggested to investigate these variables.
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INTRODUCTION

Human beings are unique in their ability to communicate with each other in a variety of ways and through a multitude of "channels." Recent research on human communication has focused on different "channels" of communication, including nonverbal channels, like vocal/facial expressions and body postures (Mehrabian, 1972), as well as implicit verbal channels or subtle variations in speaking style, like verbal nonimmediacy, for example (Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968). The latter variations in speaking style are distinct from the explicit content of speech. It is believed that these implicit verbal channels imply a speaker's attitude or feeling about the topic he is discussing or about the person he is addressing which he cannot express directly. Verbal nonimmediacy, for example, implies negative feelings and includes subtle variations in speech which distance the speaker from what he is saying or from the person he is addressing. The speaker might use certain qualifiers, certain changes in verb tense, or certain nonspecific referents for his statements in order to accomplish this end. For example, instead of saying, "I find X irritating," Y might say, "Somehow X's behavior is irritating to people."

The present study was designed to investigate another implicit verbal channel which is in some ways similar to nonimmediacy, but which also differs from it. This implicit verbal channel is called disqualification and it includes variations in speech which function to negate what a person has said rather than to distance him from it. In nonimmediate communications, a person makes a statement with uncertainty and qualification. In disqualification, on the other hand, the person says something
and then actually disqualifies it, conveys a conflicting message, or essentially tells the addressee to disregard what he has said. With disqualification, therefore, it would seem even less clear what the speaker intended to convey.

The general rubric of disqualification includes two separate, but interrelated, kinds of processes: self-disqualification (Haley, 1959 a, 1959 b, 1960, 1969) and transactional disqualification (Sluzki, Beavin, Tarnopolsky, & Veron, 1967). Self-disqualification includes variations in speaking style by which individual speakers negate their own messages. Transactional disqualification, on the other hand, includes variations in speech by which individuals negate messages sent by another person. The present study is concerned only with self-disqualification.

Haley (1959 a, 1959 b, 1969) has presented the most detailed conceptual framework for understanding self-disqualification. On the most general level, Haley views disqualification as an incongruence in a person's communications. This incongruence can exist between the content of the person's communication and the nonverbal behaviors which accompany the communication, or the incongruence can exist within the verbal statement itself. When an incongruence exists between the content and nonverbal behaviors, the speaker's tone of voice, his facial expression, or his body movements give a different "message" than the content of what he says. For example, a man can make the same statement, "I won't stand for your behavior anymore," in either a loud, strong tone of voice, or in a soft, weak one. When the speaker relates this communication in a loud voice, his tone of voice is congruent with the content. He asserts himself both verbally and vocally and it is obvious that he means what he has said.
On the other hand, when the same statement is made in a weak tone of voice, the speaker is essentially conveying the message that his statement should not be taken seriously. The speaker is left with two options if his statement should be challenged by the person he is addressing: firstly, he can deny responsibility for the content of what he said by focusing on how he said it, responding to his addressee's challenge by saying, "Did I sound like I meant it?" Or, secondly, he can assert that he did mean what he said by focusing just on the content, stating, "I said it, didn't I?"

The present study is concerned specifically with the incongruences which can exist within a verbal statement itself and which also leave the speaker the option to deny his true opinion or feelings. In Haley's framework, this latter kind of incongruence can occur when any one or more of four basic parts of a statement are negated. Haley defines the four parts of a statement in the following way: I (the source of the statement) am saying something (the message) to you (the receiver) in this time and place (the context). In self-disqualification, the speaker negates one or more of these four elements.

For example, a speaker might deny that he is the source of his message by indicating that he is only an instrument transmitting the message. When a student addresses his teacher he might say, "I was told by the other students to tell you that your grading system is unfair." In this example, the student who makes the statement leaves his own personal opinion unclear. If the teacher to whom he addressed the statement should question him (the speaker) about what he sees as unfair, the student can deny that he personally was being critical of the teacher. The student
is therefore able to criticize the teacher, but at the same time can avoid committing himself to justifying the criticism or can avoid taking personal responsibility for making such a remark.

An individual can deny his message by following it (or preceding it) with another phrase or statement which negates or contradicts it. For example, when asked to give feedback on another student's paper, a student replies, "Well, I really don't know much about this topic or about grammar, but I think that maybe you should change it around a little, but I really don't know." In one breath, the student giving the feedback indicates that the paper needs some changes, therefore implying that it is not very good. In the next breath, he takes back his implied criticism by saying that he really doesn't know anything about these matters. If the person receiving the message should respond to the implied criticism, the speaker can deny that he was criticizing by focusing instead on his statement that he does not know anything about the area. In this way, the speaker gets himself off the hook and avoids having to justify his criticism by specifying what he did not like about the other person's paper.

When a speaker wants to deny that his statement was intended for the receiver, he can direct his comments to the person's role or status rather than to the person directly. For example, if a student feels that a certain teacher gave him an unfair failing grade, the student might say, in

1 This example was taken from a response given by a student in an actual pilot project done by the author.
the teacher's presence, something like, "Some teachers are really unfair hard markers." If the teacher in question should pick up on the student's comment and ask if the student felt that his (the teacher's) grading was unfair, the student has the option to deny that he was referring to this teacher. This makes it difficult for the teacher to pursue the issue or to pin the student's personal feelings down.

As a final illustration of self-disqualification, an individual speaker might deny that his message was intended for the context in which he says it. Instead of saying to an addressee that his present performance is not adequate, a speaker might say, "In the past, you have done very poorly on these kinds of things." The receiver is left in the dark about how the speaker sees his present performance on the specific task he is engaged in doing. If the receiver should question how the speaker feels right now about the job he is actually doing, the speaker can deny that he thinks the receiver is doing badly. He can say something like, "Well, I was talking about what you did the last time or about a task a little different from this one."

Watzlawick (1964) summarized disqualification by saying that it is "a technique which enables one to say something without really saying it, to deny without really saying 'no,' and to disagree without really disagreeing---, and what is meant by 'really' is to take a stand for which one is prepared to accept responsibility." (p. 18) The above examples illustrate some of the ways in which self-disqualifying statements prevent an individual from being held responsible for what he has said, from committing himself to justifying his remarks, or from being subsequently disagreed with or challenged.
It is believed that the ultimate function of disqualification is to prevent people from establishing certain roles or power relationships with each other (Haley, 1959 a, 1959 b, 1960, 1969). Two major axioms of communication theory (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967) help to explain how disqualification ultimately functions this way. The first axiom states that people cannot NOT communicate. As long as people have any contact whatsoever, all of their behavioral responses, verbal or nonverbal, and even their apparent "non-responses," such as silence, contain communications to each other. If, for example, Person X completely ignores Person Y and is totally silent in Y's presence, X nevertheless communicates to Y that he (X) does not want to speak to anybody or have anybody speak to him. When Person Y interprets this message, it is very likely that Y will stop trying to talk to X. In this way, X's silent communication has not only conveyed the message that he does not want to speak to anybody, but it also affects how Y subsequently acts and, thus, influences the kind of relationship X and Y have at the time the message is sent.

The second axiom of communication theory makes more explicit the dual purpose of any communication implied in the example just given. Every communication has two functions: it not only conveys specific information, but to a large extent, it also determines how the receiver of the communication is expected to relate to the speaker. Ruesch & Bateson (1951) labelled these two functions of communications report and command functions; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson (1967) labelled the same two functions information and relationship functions. In also summing up the notion that communications have two purposes, Satir (1967) stated that
"Whenever a person communicates, he is not only making a statement, he is also asking something of the receiver and trying to influence the receiver to give him what he wants." (p. 78) It follows logically from the two axioms of communication theory that people who negate their own or each other's communications also negate the relationship aspect of the communications, thereby avoiding the establishment of certain roles or power relationships with each other.

Many of the assumptions that have been made about the functions of disqualification have come from clinical observations of schizophrenics and their families (Haley, 1959a, 1959b, 1960, 1969). Haley sees the confused language of the schizophrenic primarily as an exaggerated form of disqualification. The schizophrenic who wants to avoid relating to other people says something so absurd or something that makes so little sense that it negates itself. Aside from Haley's clinical observations, there has been very little empirical investigation of disqualification except for a few studies (Mishler & Waxler, 1968; Sojit, 1969, 1971). In these studies, however, disqualification was not the major focus. Mishler and Waxler, for instance, included disqualification along with 19 other communication measures in studying the interactions of normal and schizophrenic families while the family members were attempting to reach some agreement on how to solve certain problem situations. Prior to these interactions, the family members had independently endorsed discrepant solutions to problems posed to them in a questionnaire (Revealed Difference Technique, Strodtbeck, 1951). Because disqualification was clustered with so many other measures in the study, however, it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions about disqualification from the findings.
that Mishler and Waxler reported.

Likewise, both of Sojit's studies were designed to investigate the role of other factors in family interactions (in this case, double-bind communications, a la Bateson, Jackson, Haley, & Weakland, 1956) rather than disqualifications per se. As one part of this investigation, Sojit measured disqualification in the interactions of parents of physically ill children and parents of children with psychological problems. In his 1969 study, he compared the communications of parents of delinquent children, parents of children with ulcerative colitis, parents of children with cystic fibrosis, and parents of normal controls while they were trying to reach some agreement about the "correct" meaning of a proverb so that they could teach this meaning to their children. Sojit found that parents of delinquent children disqualified their own and each other's messages significantly more often than parents in any of the other three groups. He concluded that the parents of the delinquent children were trying to criticize or disagree with each other, but not overtly.

In a follow-up to his 1969 study, Sojit (1971) compared the interactions of parents of schizophrenic children with the interactions of the four groups of parents in the earlier study. He used the same interactional procedure, i.e., a discussion between the parents as they tried to reach some agreement about the meaning of a proverb. He found that parents of schizophrenics disqualified their own and each other's messages about as often as parents of delinquent children, but more often than parents of normal children or parents of children with ulcerative colitis or cystic fibrosis. Sojit felt that his findings were consistent with Haley's (1960) earlier clinical observations that the schizophrenic, his siblings, and his
parents contradict their own and each other’s messages in an attempt to undermine family relationships or to maintain a family structure in which relationships remain undefined. The apparent reasoning behind this is that if relationships are undermined or remain undefined, then there is less potential for any one family member to have enough power to hurt, reject, or frustrate other family members.

Purposes and Specific Hypotheses of the Present Study

While much of the theory and rationale for disqualification and its functions was developed from observations of normal and abnormal families, the present study was designed to investigate the use of disqualification by "normal" individuals who were presumably not involved in pathological family relationships.

A major purpose of the study was to empirically test the assumption that the primary function of disqualification is to help most people avoid taking personal responsibility for what they say or do, and ultimately to avoid establishing certain power relationships with each other. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the study was that situations which normally encourage people to deny personal responsibility for what they have done would elicit significantly more disqualification than situations which encourage acceptance of personal responsibility for behavior.

For convenience, the situations which encourage denial of personal responsibility were labelled responsibility-reducing situations in the present study. Broadly speaking, these are situations which are expected to reduce the probability that the person involved would want to acknowledge how he had behaved in the situation. The individual has either committed an undesirable behavior or has omitted a behavior that is expected of him
because of his role or because of social norms. In the present study there were two specific situations which were believed to fit the responsibility-reducing criteria: in one of them, the person involved was described as a student who had failed to complete a class assignment because of his own procrastination. In the second responsibility-reducing situation, the person involved had failed to stop a fight in which a young boy was obviously being beaten by another boy.

Those situations which encourage acceptance of personal responsibility were labelled responsibility-inducing situations. In these situations, the person presumably would want his particular involvement to be known and his responsibility in the matter to be clarified. In the study, there were two responsibility-inducing situations: one in which the person involved had done a good job in writing a paper but was accused unjustly of plagiarism, and another in which the person involved had generously helped to stop a fight between two young children. In general, then, responsibility-inducing situations are those in which an individual has done something positive or has acted according to his role or according to social expectations.

A second aim of the study was to determine if varying the proportion of responsibility that individual Ss felt they personally had within each of the responsibility-reducing or responsibility-inducing situations would further affect how much disqualification they used when they talked about their particular role in the situation. In order to vary the relative amount of responsibility, a "locus of responsibility" variable was introduced into the responsibility-reducing and responsibility-inducing situations presented to the Ss. The variable had two levels: 1) in the sole locus of responsibility condition, the Ss were told that they were alone
in the situation in question and, therefore, the total burden of responsibility for what happened was on them; 2) in the diffuse locus of responsibility condition, the Ss were told that they were sharing responsibility for the situation with a few other people.²

It was hypothesized that more disqualification would be used by those Ss who were solely responsible for what happened and that less disqualification would be used by those Ss who were sharing responsibility with other people. Of course, this difference might occur more often within responsibility-reducing conditions than within responsibility-inducing conditions.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that Ss who are left with all the responsibility and who want to deny it might have few other options than to disqualify what had happened. On the other hand, if the Ss were sharing responsibility with other people, they might use this fact as a primary excuse for their behavior (i.e., other people were doing it, or were not doing it), and they might not need to use as much disqualification to justify what they had or had not done. In other words, since it is presumably easier to accept some of the responsibility for a bad situation than it is to accept all of it, those Ss who were only "partly" responsible would not have as much need to use disqualification as would those Ss who were "Fully" responsible.

Finally, the study was also designed to investigate whether male and female Ss would use disqualification to the same extent. It was hypothesized

²The "locus of responsibility" variable has its basis in research on helping behavior (Darley & Latane, 1968; Macauley & Berkowitz, 1970). Specifically, "diffusion of responsibility" has been a prime factor in explaining bystander behavior in emergencies.
that male and female Ss would not differ significantly in their use of disqualification in the study. In other words, no overall sex effect was expected. Both male and female responders were expected to use more disqualification when responding to responsibility-reducing situations and less disqualification when responding to responsibility-inducing situations.

This prediction was based on a review of the communication literature dealing with nonimmediacy and disqualification. Wiener & Mehrabian (1968) did not find consistent sex differences in their investigations of nonimmediacy, which as mentioned earlier is a communication style similar to disqualification. In one instance, for example, Wiener & Mehrabian reported no difference between male and female Ss in their use of nonimmediacy when they were instructed to write statements about people they liked or people they disliked. The instructions left the Ss with the option to express their positive or negative feelings or opinions either overtly in the verbal content of what they wrote, or in the implicit nonimmediacy channels.

In another study reported by Wiener & Mehrabian (1968), the verbal content of the Ss' written responses was restricted by the instructions which were given to them. They were told to disguise their true attitudes about another person whom they liked, neither liked nor disliked, or whom they disliked by writing something which would give the impression that they had neutral feelings toward the person. Under these conditions, it was found that nonimmediacy did not discriminate among female Ss' responses about liked, disliked, or neither liked nor disliked others; but nonimmediacy did discriminate among the three attitudes for male Ss. The significance
level for this difference, however, was only at $p < .10$. Unfortunately, in many of the other studies Wiener & Mehrabian (1968) summarized, either the analyses of the data did not include sex of the Ss as a variable, or else male and female samples were tested separately and not directly compared with each other for their use of nonimmediacy.

Lastly, the prediction of no sex differences in the present study was also based on Watzlawick, Beavin & Jackson's (1967) assertion that all kinds of people regardless of their psychological adjustment (and perhaps even of their sex) use disqualification when they want to deny personal responsibility for their behavior.

In summary, three predictions were made in the study: 1) there would be significantly more disqualification in responsibility-reducing situations than in responsibility-inducing situations; 2) more disqualification would occur in the sole locus of responsibility conditions than in the diffuse locus of responsibility conditions; and 3) the two sexes would not differ in their use of disqualification.
METHOD

A role-taking technique was used in lieu of a pure deception paradigm, a complex laboratory manipulation, or naturalistic observation. That is, the Ss were asked to indicate in writing how they imagined they would respond to certain hypothetical situations. The most important reason for choosing a written communication medium in the study was to assess whether a written format would be sensitive to disqualification. It was hoped that the results of the study might have some implications for the possibility of a future "objective," paper-and-pencil instrument for measuring the occurrence of disqualification in various groups. In addition, there were three other reasons for selecting a written, role-taking approach: 1) it provided for a more systematic control of the variables of interest than a naturalistic study would allow; 2) it enabled the experimenter to present two different realistic events for the Ss to respond to which would not have been feasible or practical using a laboratory-deception method; 3) this approach also provided Ss anonymity in responding. Pretesting indicated that Ss were able to get involved in such a role-taking task, that disqualification did occur using this format, and that it would be possible to find experimental differences with such a method.

A pilot project was conducted by the author in which 49 Ss responded in writing to a series of hypothetical situations. The Ss' identities remained unknown to the E and author. Although it is only a subjective observation, the Ss appeared to be quite open and honest in this context. There were no empirical data about how Ss would have responded in a face-to-face setting, but it is conjectured that Ss might be less varied and open in their responses and might limit their responses to more socially acceptable modes if their identities were known to the E.
Subjects

Forty male and 40 female undergraduate students from Introductory Psychology classes at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, volunteered to serve as Ss in the experiment. The participants received credit points toward their final course grades for being in the study.

Procedure

All 80 Ss were tested in small groups which averaged six Ss each. In the group sessions, each S was handed a booklet containing specific instructions for the experiment, a description of a hypothetical situation, a demographic data sheet, a page of questions about his involvement in the task, and a blank sheet of paper for writing his response to the hypothetical situation (see Appendix I). In the instructions, the Ss were told to imagine themselves in the hypothetical situation described in the booklet. They were told to respond spontaneously to the hypothetical addressee in the situation, just as if they were actually talking directly to him. The Ss were also instructed to write their responses on the separate blank page in the booklet so that there was some control over the amount of writing space available to all Ss. In order to encourage the Ss to respond as fully as possible, and in detail, they were given a maximum of 20 minutes to write their responses after they read the hypothetical situation.

Hypothetical Situations

Although each individual booklet contained the description of only one hypothetical situation, there were eight hypothetical situations in all in the study (Appendix I). These eight situations were randomly assigned across all Ss with the one stipulation that an equal number of male and
female responders be represented in each of the eight situations depicted. As a result, each one of the hypothetical situations was given to five male and five female Ss.

The eight different situations were designed so that there would be two levels for each of the three variables of interest (a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ between-subjects design). First of all, there were two entirely different interpersonal events which were described (A variable). Each S therefore received either a description of an event in which he had been assigned a paper to write for a particular class or an event in which he happened upon the scene when two young children were having a fight. Within each of these two events, the situation also varied along the responsibility-reducing-inducing dimension described earlier (B variable). Therefore, in the case of the paper event, one hypothetical situation described the S as procrastinating in writing the paper and failing the course as a result (responsibility-reducing) and another hypothetical event described the S as writing a good paper, but being accused unjustly of plagiarism and failing the course as a result (responsibility-inducing). Likewise, for the fight event, there were two responsibility conditions: in one of the hypothetical fight situations, the S was described as not helping to stop the fight between the two children (responsibility-reducing), while in another fight situation, the S was described as generously helping to stop the fight (responsibility-inducing).

Finally, within each of the above two conditions, a third variable was introduced which also had two levels, i.e., the locus of responsibility variable (C variable). Within both the responsibility-reducing and
the responsibility-inducing paper situations, the S was additionally
told either that he was alone when he worked on the assigned paper (sole
locus of responsibility), or that he worked with other people on it (dif-
fuse locus of responsibility). In a similar manner, within both the res-
ponsibility-reducing and the responsibility-inducing fight situations, the
S was told either that he was alone when he saw the fight or that other
people were around who also witnessed the children fighting.

Although Ss were not debriefed individually by the E because of the
extended period of time over which data were collected, a written explana-
tion of the purposes of the experiment was handed out to the Ss in their
classes after the data collection was completed (see Appendix II). Those
Ss who chose to speak individually to the E were obviously unaware of the
specific purposes of the experiment during their participation in it.

Scoring

Prior to scoring the 80 protocols, two judges (the author and another
judge who had some familiarity with disqualification) discussed the scor-
ing categories presented in Appendix III and then independently scored
12 practice protocols which were not included in the sample of 80. The
two judges then scored the 80 protocols using the same scoring criteria.
Although they scored the protocols independently, the two judges compared
their scores at regular intervals throughout the scoring process in order
to determine if there were any significant discrepancies in their judg-
ments. If there were discrepancies, these were discussed at length and
either some agreement was reached or else a compromise was made in which
statements or phrases which either judge still had doubts about were not
included in the final disqualification score assigned to the S. The final score assigned to any one S always represented, therefore, only those disqualifications which both judges could jointly agree upon.
RESULTS

Interscorer Agreement

In order to estimate how reliable the two judges were in their scoring, that is, how much they independently agreed with each other, a mean percent agreement was computed between the scores they assigned to the 80 protocols. For each individual S, the percent agreement between the two judges was calculated in the following way: the number of those particular statements or phrases which both judges had independently scored in common was divided by the number which both had scored plus any other disqualifications which were scored by one judge but not the other. Averaging over these percentages for the 80 individual Ss, it was found that the overall mean percent agreement between the two judges was 85.4%. The judges therefore were in substantial agreement with each other.

Comparisons were made between the paper and fight events, the responsibility-reducing and-inducing conditions, the sole and diffuse locus of responsibility conditions, and male and female Ss using the mean

---

4 The judges disagreed on an average of .43 disqualifications per protocol and their numerical scores, ignoring which specific statements or phrases these scores included, were highly correlated (r = .95, p < .001, two-tailed). They disagreed considerably more often in scoring responsibility-reducing protocols than in scoring responsibility-inducing protocols (t = 3.03, df = 39,39, p < .05, two-tailed, heterogeneous variances). Since the final score assigned to any one S included only those specific statements or phrases which both judges could ultimately agree upon, however, these findings about how much they disagreed or about how much their numerical scores correlated were not considered to be as important to the actual results of the study.
percent agreement measure. The purpose of these comparisons was to check if interscorer agreement differed substantially from one level of an independent variable to another. As shown in Table 1, none of the comparisons were significant. The judges characteristically scored different levels of the four independent variables (Event x Responsibility x Locus of Responsibility x Sex) in a comparable manner.

The Length of an S's Response and Disqualification

The question might be raised whether any significant differences in disqualification found in this study could be merely an artifact of differences in the length of Ss' responses to the different experimental conditions. To test this possibility before analyzing the data for significant variable effects, correlations between the Ss' disqualification scores and the length of their responses were calculated.

The average response length for an S was 126.85 words (sd = 57.51), although individual responses ranged from 30 to 308 words. The average disqualification score assigned to an S was 1.36 (sd = 1.82), with individual scores ranging from zero to eight. The correlations between these two measures (see Table 2) ranged from -.16 to .07 for various conditions, and none were significant. These two measures seem to be unrelated (see Figure 1), and apparently the amount of disqualification an S used in the study was not an artifact of the length of his response to a hypothetical situation.

Ss' Involvement in the Task and Disqualification

It was also suspected that how the S responded to the paper-and-pencil task, that is how involved he felt in the hypothetical situation,
could also have influenced the amount of disqualification he used. The Ss rated their involvement in the task on a 5-point scale at the time of the experiment. The mean rating of involvement for all 80 Ss was 3.74 (sd = 1.10). It might be that these self-ratings were not the best measure of how the Ss really felt about the task or the hypothetical situation, because their scores tended to fall at the upper end of the rating scale (see Figure 2). It is suspected that this was a biased estimate of the Ss' involvement and that it probably reflected a tendency on the part of some of the Ss to raise their ratings in order to conform to the demand characteristics of the study. They were explicitly told in the instructions accompanying the experimental task that the E wanted to see how well they could put themselves in a situation. Despite the apparent bias of these self-ratings, this measure nevertheless seemed to be a valid indicator at least of the physical effort the Ss maintained in writing their responses; that is, the self-ratings were found to be significantly positively correlated with the number of words the Ss wrote (r = .39, p < .001, two-tailed). It seems reasonable to assume that the more involved a person felt in the task, the more he might write.

Correlation coefficients were computed between the Ss' own ratings of involvement and their disqualification scores to determine if any relationship existed between these two dependent measures. These correlations, presented in Table 3, ranged from -.26 to .19 and none were significant. A scatterplot of the individual pairs of scores (Figure 3) does not indicate any systematic relationship between how much an
S disqualified and how involved he saw himself in the task.

**Disqualification Analysis of Variance**

To test the hypotheses of the study, the Ss' disqualification scores were analyzed in a four-factor between-subjects analysis of variance design (Event x Responsibility x Locus of Responsibility x Sex of Subject). The means for the 16 cells in the analysis and the overall means for each level of the four independent variables are presented in Appendix IV.

The results of the analysis of variance, shown in Table 4, indicate that there were two significant main effects and three significant interactions.

**Disqualification: main effects.** The Responsibility (B) and Event (A) effects were the only significant main effects. The Responsibility effect was consistent with the first hypothesis of the study: Ss who responded to the responsibility-reducing situations (B₁) used significantly more disqualification (p < .001) than Ss who responded to the responsibility-inducing situations (B₂). While no differences had been predicted between the two events, Ss who responded to the fight event (A₂) used significantly more disqualification (p < .005) than Ss who responded to the paper event (A₁).

There was no significant Locus of Responsibility (C) effect, contrary to the second hypothesis. Neither the sole nor diffuse locus of responsibility conditions produced significantly more disqualification.

Finally, there was some support for the third hypothesis of the study: no significant overall sex effect (D) was found.
Disqualification: interaction effects. The Event x Responsibility (A x B), Event x Sex (A x D), and Responsibility x Sex (B x D) interactions were significant. The cell means for these three interactions are presented in Appendix V. All three interactions were further analyzed using the Scheffé test for multiple comparisons (Edwards, 1972).

For the Event x Responsibility effect, the results of the Scheffé tests (Table 5) indicate that the difference between responsibility-reducing situations and responsibility-inducing situations was significant only for Ss who responded to the fight event and not for Ss who responded to the paper event. Significantly more disqualification was used in the responsibility-reducing fight event than in the responsibility-inducing fight event (p < .05), but both the responsibility-reducing and responsibility-inducing paper events produced similar amounts of disqualification. The Responsibility main effect predicted by the first hypothesis could, therefore, be attributed primarily to those Ss who wrote responses to the fight event.

The Scheffé comparisons for the Event x Sex interaction are shown in Table 6. According to the table, male and female Ss did not show any significant difference in their use of disqualification when they responded to the paper event. They tended, however, to respond differently to the fight event. Females tended to use more disqualification than males in their responses to the latter event. The comparisons for the Event x Sex interaction also showed that females who responded to the fight event used significantly more disqualification (p < .05) than females who responded to the paper event. Males, on the other hand,
used comparable amounts of disqualification for both events. In other words, the significant Event effect was restricted to female Ss.

Finally, the results of the Scheffé comparisons for the Responsibility x Sex effect further modified the support found for the first hypothesis. The significant Responsibility effect was restricted to female responders. The difference between responsibility-reducing and responsibility-inducing situations was significant for female Ss (p < .05), but not for male Ss (see Table 7). If the interaction is viewed in a different direction, it indicates that females used significantly more disqualification (p < .01) than males in responding to responsibility-reducing situations. The two sexes did not differ significantly, however, in responding to responsibility-inducing situations. In other words, although no overall sex effect occurred, there was a sex effect for responsibility-reducing situations, but not for responsibility-inducing situations.

**Heterogeneity of Variance**

Tests of heterogeneity of variance using Cochran's formula (Myers, 1966) indicated that the intersubject variability was not homogeneous across all experimental conditions. As can be seen in Table 8 and in Appendix IV, the greatest variability among Ss occurred within the responsibility-reducing fight event cell for both male and female Ss, but especially for the females. The presence of such high intersubject variability within the responsibility-reducing fight cell suggests that this particular experimental manipulation discriminated best between high and low disqualifiers and was therefore the most sensitive of all
the manipulations to individual differences in disqualification.

The presence of significant heterogeneity of variance also suggests that there were probably other variables not accounted for by the analysis of variance which nevertheless influenced how much disqualification individual Ss used in the study. Perhaps, for example, there are certain personality differences between Ss, certain differences in interaction style, or even individual differences in role-taking ability which could also have affected how much the Ss disqualified.

In any case, because the F test is robust and the error introduced by heterogeneity of variance does not significantly affect it (McNemar, 1969), the presence of heterogeneous variances does not negate the statistical results which were found in the study.

Summary

Two independent judges who scored the 80 protocols for disqualification were in agreement 85.4% of the time. The average disqualification score the judges finally assigned to any one S was 1.36, with individual scores ranging from zero to eight. The amount of disqualification the Ss used did not appear to be an artifact of either how long their responses were or how involved they saw themselves in the paper-and-pencil task.

Individual scores were analyzed in a four-factor analysis of variance design and two main effects and three interaction effects were found. Consistent with the first hypothesis of the study, Ss who responded to responsibility-reducing situations used significantly more disqualification than Ss who responded to responsibility-inducing
situations (significant Responsibility effect). While no predictions had been made about differences between the two hypothetical events, Ss who responded to the fight event used significantly more disqualification than Ss who responded to the paper event (significant Event effect). Further analysis of the three significant interactions showed that both the Event and Responsibility effects were significant only for female Ss, and that a significant responsibility-reducing-inducing difference occurred only for the fight event. While no overall sex effect was found, as the third hypothesis had predicted, female Ss tended to use more disqualification in responding to the fight event and they used significantly more disqualification than male Ss in responding to the responsibility-reducing situations.

Tests of heterogeneity of variance showed that the paper-and-pencil task used in the study was sensitive to differences among individual Ss within experimental conditions. The responsibility-reducing fight condition was the most sensitive to individual differences in disqualification and discriminated best between high and low disqualifiers.
DISCUSSION

It is the primary goal of this discussion to emphasize several important points: 1) that disqualification apparently functions to help people deny responsibility for an event, and ultimately, perhaps, to undermine existing overt power relationships; 2) that disqualification is used by certain kinds of people more often than by others; 3) that disqualification occurs more frequently in certain situations than in others; and 4) that it is possible to obtain such differences in disqualification even with a simple paper-and-pencil measure.

Disqualification and Denial of Responsibility

The first hypothesis of the study was directed at the assumption that disqualification functions to help people deny personal responsibility for their behavior. The results of the study provided some support for this hypothesis. The Ss responding to hypothetical situations which were designed to encourage denial of personal responsibility used significantly more disqualification than Ss responding to situations designed to encourage acceptance of responsibility.

Contrary to the expectations of the second hypothesis, the proportion of responsibility placed on the individual S did not significantly affect how much the S disqualified. There are two possible post hoc explanations why the locus of responsibility manipulation did not significantly affect the Ss' responses. First of all, while such a variable has been empirically shown to influence how a person acts in a given situation (Darley & Latané, 1968), the same variable might not affect the style of language the person uses to verbally defend his actions.
once the situation is over. Secondly, it is entirely possible that the locus of responsibility manipulation was simply unsuccessful. In effect, with the role-taking method used, all of the Ss actually responded alone when they wrote their own personal responses, regardless of which locus of responsibility condition they had been originally assigned to. Each S might have been more concerned about what he, as an individual participant in the study, should write, and less concerned about whether or not other people were supposed to be with him in an imaginary situation.

Event Differences

The fight event elicited significantly more disqualification than the paper event. Furthermore, support for the first hypothesis was found only in the responses to the fight event: the difference between responsibility-reducing and responsibility-inducing conditions was significant for the fight event, but not for the paper event.

Paper event. There are at least two possibilities why the paper manipulation did not work. First, there was a different relationship between the S and his addressee in the two events. In the paper event, the addressee's role vis-à-vis the S was well-established (i.e., the advisor-addressee had a clearly defined authority relationship with the S). There was, therefore, no need to negotiate power relationships in the paper situation. In the fight event, however, the addressee was a stranger who had no prescribed relationship with the S. According to Haley (1959 b), disqualification is most likely to occur where there are no clearly defined power relationships. In fact, disqualification apparently helps to maintain such an ambiguous state of affairs. It
does this because it negates the **relationship** aspect of communications, including the power relationship aspect. Such a maneuver does not allow any relationship to be defined, and, therefore, no one is able to gain the upper hand in a situation. By angrily accusing the S of being negligent in the responsibility-reducing fight event, the addressee had in effect taken the upper hand in the situation. The S could either simply accept the addressee's definition of the situation and assume a defensive, one-down position, and/or he could try to subvert the addressee's power either by openly or covertly challenging him. One way to covertly undermine the addressee's power is to challenge that power and at the same time **disqualify** the challenge.

Less disqualification might have occurred in the paper event because roles were already well-defined and there was little need for power relationships to be negotiated, covertly or otherwise.

Secondly, in the fight event, the S was instructed to respond to his "prime accuser," the person who had just directly witnessed his behavior. In the paper event, however, the S had to respond to a "third party" who was not a direct witness to the original behavior in question. The real facts were more obvious to the "prime accuser" in the fight event because she had witnessed the S's behavior first-hand. The S, therefore, did not have as much opportunity to distort the facts or to directly deny what he had actually done. Perhaps the Ss in the fight event disqualified more than the Ss in the paper event because it was the only option left which allowed them to deny responsibility for their behavior. This suggests that disqualification is a tactic of
last resort, to be used only when other tactics, such as distortion of
the facts or outright denial, are not possible.

Either or both of these two factors could have played a role in
making the paper manipulation less effective than the fight manipulation
in eliciting disqualification. The two interpretations are not mutually
exclusive.

**Fight event and sex differences.** While the fight event elicited
significantly more disqualification than the paper event, this Event
effect occurred only for females. Also, while the responsibility-reduc-
ing manipulation elicited more disqualification than the responsibility-
inducing manipulation, this effect was also restricted to the females in
the sample. Thus the two conditions which elicited differential amounts
of disqualification did so only for female Ss and not for male Ss.

There are three possible interpretations of these results. First, it is possible that the real issue is not why females showed such a high
amount of disqualification, but why males did not. One speculation is
that the sex of the accuser in the fight event was somehow responsible
for the paucity of disqualification shown by males. Perhaps males did
not feel it was important for them to justify their behavior to a woman.
Being accused or reprimanded by a woman might not have been a threat to
their male image or their sense of responsibility. Many male Ss might
have felt that they were in a dominant position in relation to their
female accuser because of their past experience in a culture which pre-
scribes the male role as dominant. Perhaps, from this position of con-
trol, male Ss felt freer to simply apologize or else directly chastize
the woman for making such accusations. Maybe male Ss would have disqualified more if their accuser had been a man, where power relationships would have been more of an issue.

A second interpretation of the results hinges on the fact that the fight situation involved physical aggression. In this culture, males are more used to dealing with aggression than are females. Because of this, many females may be more likely than males to find aggressive behavior aversive or unpleasant. If this is the case, then a failure to intervene in a fight and stop aggressive behavior would be much more disturbing to some females than it is for males. As a result these females would be more highly motivated to disqualify their lack of action, rather than to simply accept responsibility or deny it.

A final, but not mutually exclusive, possibility is that there are certain differences between males and females in the way they interact with other people, and it is these differences in interaction style which determine the extent of disqualification a person uses.

Research on sex differences (Bardwick, 1971; Maccoby, 1966) has shown, for instance, that females characteristically behave more passively than males and that they seem more dependent on other people for social approval than males do. It seems to be a logical extension of this that someone who is highly dependent on others for social approval would also be more apprehensive of being censured by them for committing undesirable behaviors. If the person had already committed the undesirable behavior (as in responsibility-reducing conditions), he might try to avoid social disapproval or censure by decreasing his personal
responsibility via disqualification.

Mehrabian (1972) presented some indirect evidence that people who want to gain or maintain social approval use the least obvious, indirect channels to communicate with other people. He and Zaidel (1969) found that people with a lower need for approval, as measured by the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (1960), expressed negative feelings in the more obvious communication channels, i.e., vocal and facial expressions. On that basis, Mehrabian and Zaidel speculated that high approval seekers would use less salient channels to communicate, like nonimmediacy and perhaps disqualification.

Moreover, it appears consistent with the notion of passivity that the passive person under attack for his behavior would more likely take a conciliatory-defensive position toward his attacker rather than a dominant-offensive one. The data for Ss in the responsibility-reducing fight condition, where sex differences were the greatest, were examined post hoc, albeit in a very cursory fashion, to determine whether there might be any validity to the notion that disqualification is related to conciliatory-defensive personality styles.

Each S's general approach to the addressee in these situations was judged to be either predominantly dominant-offensive or predominantly conciliatory-defensive. These judgments were made on the basis of certain statements or phrases the Ss made to the addressee other than those considered to be disqualifications. The dominant-offensive category generally included responses in which the S took a one-upmanship role toward the addressee, directly attacked, blamed, or judged the addressee or any-
one else present, and moralized or lectured about the situation (see Appendix VI for examples). The conciliatory-defensive category, on the other hand, generally included apologies by the communicator, attempts to make restitution, and pleas of ignorance about the situation or inability to respond to it (see Appendix VI).

Five out of 10 male Ss gave clearly dominant-offensive responses to the responsibility-reducing fight situation, and five gave clearly conciliatory-defensive responses. For the 10 female responders, three were clearly dominant-offensive, two gave mixed responses, and five gave clearly conciliatory-defensive responses. A Fisher Exact Probability test (Siegel, 1956) showed that the two sexes were not significantly different in how frequently they took a dominant-offensive stand with their addressee (p = 0.32, one-tailed test). But, when the data for male and female Ss who took a conciliatory-defensive position were pooled and compared with males and females who took a dominant-offensive position, it was found that the conciliatory-defensive group used significantly more disqualification (t = 1.94, df = 16, p < .05, one-tailed). These results imply that perhaps there is some relationship between a passive-conciliatory personality style and disqualification. The results do not, however, account for the sex differences found in the study since males and females did not differ in the frequency with which they adopted either the conciliatory-defensive or the dominant-offensive interaction style.

Speculating even further, and using Haley's hypothesis that disquali-

---

5Dominant-offensive group: n = 8, mean disqualification = 2.13, sd = 1.88; conciliatory-defensive group, n = 10, mean disqualification = 3.80, sd = 1.75.
fication ultimately helps people to covertly undermine power relationships, it is possible that the passive-conciliatory individual, who is typically in a one-down position, might have to rely on covert means, like negating his own or other people's messages, to gain control in interpersonal situations. The dominant-offensive person might take control more directly.

**Individual Differences in Disqualification**

In addition to the significant main and interaction effects found in this study, the analyses also showed that there was heterogeneity of variance in the data. Specifically, the responsibility-reducing fight cells for both males and females showed the greatest of all cell variances. These cells also showed the highest mean amounts of disqualification. This would indicate that when overall disqualification increases, the differences in disqualification between individual Ss becomes more pronounced. Thus it is those situations which "pull" for disqualification that also show the highest amount of intersubject variability in the use of disqualification. These situations therefore enable one to detect high and low disqualifiers, providing a sensitive medium for investigating personality correlates of disqualification. They also afford a model for developing other paper-and-pencil situations which might also elicit disqualification.

**Summary and Suggestions for Future Research**

Disqualification is clearly a complex phenomenon. The study suggests that disqualification does function to help people avoid taking responsibility for undesirable behavior, and it might ultimately play
a role in undermining unacceptable power relationships between people.

On the basis of the results of this study, future research might be directed toward answering the following questions regarding disqualification: 1) Is disqualification more likely to be used in an undefined power relationship than it is in a well-defined one? 2) Is the amount of disqualification used in a situation inversely related to how much opportunity the S has to simply deny or distort the facts? 3) In order for disqualification to occur, does the S have to feel at least some need for the addressee's approval? If so, how much? 4) How important must the behavior in question be to the S in order to motivate him to disqualify his communications when he has failed to behave appropriately? 5) What are the personality traits which are most highly correlated with disqualification?

The study has shown that a paper-and-pencil measure of disqualification is sensitive to differences in disqualification. If the development of an optimal measure of disqualification is the major interest, then situational determinants of disqualification need to be the focus of study and a more controlled, piecemeal approach to devising paper-and-pencil situations is necessary. Outside of the responsibility-reducing manipulation, perhaps the most potent situation effect might be the "prime accuser" versus the "third party" manipulation. This may be the place to start in further defining situational determinants of disqualification.

If, on the other hand, greater interest lies in determining personality differences associated with disqualification, it is suggested
that such research identify and utilize situations (paper-and-pencil or real-life) which seem to "pull" for high disqualification and high inter-subject variability. Possibilities suggested by this study are situations in which the S has performed poorly in a task which is important to him and he is faced by a "prime accuser" who is a relative stranger (controlled for sex).

The first research strategy would concentrate on developing and refining the paper-and-pencil measure itself, before actually correlating it with some external measure of behavior. The second strategy, on the other hand, would immediately attempt to establish whether there is any relationship between a relatively unrefined paper-and-pencil measure of disqualification and overt behavior, before proceeding to refine the paper-and-pencil measure any further.
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Table 1. Mean percent agreement for the overall data and for each level of the four independent variables, and t-test comparisons between the levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean % agreement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ (paper)</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>78^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$ (fight)</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$ (reducing)</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$ (inducing)</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>39.39^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$ (sole)</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$ (diffuse)</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$ (males)</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$ (females)</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a range = 0 to 100%

^1 two-tailed t-test for two means with homogeneous variances

^2 two-tailed t-test for two means with heterogeneous variances
Table 2. Pearson product moment correlations between disqualification scores and response length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ (paper)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$ (fight)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility (B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$ (reducing)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_2$ (inducing)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Responsibility (C)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$ (sole)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$ (diffuse)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$ (males)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$ (females)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Pearson product moment correlations between self-ratings of involvement and disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ (paper)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ (fight)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁ (reducing)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂ (inducing)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Responsibility (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁ (sole)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂ (diffuse)</td>
<td>-.26⁻¹</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ (males)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂ (females)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ not significant, two-tailed (no predictions made)
Table 4. Analysis of variance: disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>10.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility: Reducing, Inducing (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>15.67****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Responsibility (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>18.22****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>5.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>7.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C x D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/ABCD</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .001  
*** p < .005  
** p < .01  
* p < .05
Table 5. Event x Responsibility (A x B) effect: Sheffe' comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>MS_{D_i}</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A_1 B_1 vs A_1 B_2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_2 B_1 vs A_2 B_2</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>33.84^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_1 B_1 vs A_2 B_1</td>
<td>57.60</td>
<td>27.76^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_1 B_2 vs A_2 B_2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^* p < .05

Note: A_1 = paper    A_2 = fight
      B_1 = reducing   B_2 = inducing
Table 6. Event x Sex (A x D) effect: Scheffé comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>$\text{MS}_{\text{Di}}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1 D_1$ vs $A_1 D_2$</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2 D_1$ vs $A_2 D_2$</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>6.37$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1 D_2$ vs $A_2 D_2$</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>14.76$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1 D_1$ vs $A_2 D_1$</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ approaches significance at $p < .10$

$^*$ $p \leq .05$

note: $A_1 =$ paper  
$A_2 =$ fight  
$D_1 =$ males  
$D_2 =$ females
Table 7. Responsibility x Sex (B x D) effect: Scheffe comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>MS&lt;sub&gt;Di&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁ D₁ vs B₂ D₁</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁ D₂ vs B₂ D₂</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>22.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁ D₁ vs B₁ D₂</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>8.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂ D₁ vs B₂ D₂</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .05
* p < .10

note: B₁ = reducing B₂ = inducing
D₁ = males D₂ = females
Table 8. Heterogeneity of variances: disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>largest variance sum of variances</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event (A)</td>
<td>4.57/6.19</td>
<td>2,39</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (B)</td>
<td>4.72/5.90</td>
<td>2,39</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Responsibility (C)</td>
<td>3.95/6.69</td>
<td>2,39</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (D)</td>
<td>4.51/6.65</td>
<td>2,39</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4.91/9.01</td>
<td>4,19</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x D</td>
<td>6.16/11.97</td>
<td>4,19</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x D</td>
<td>5.92/11.11</td>
<td>4,19</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
*p < .05
Figure 1

Correlations Between Disqualification and Length of Response
Figure 2

Distribution of Self-ratings of Involvement
Figure 3
Correlations Between Disqualification Score and Self-rating of Involvement
APPENDIX I

General comments made to all Ss and booklet presented to them in the study

First, I want to thank all of you for coming and for volunteering to be Ss in this experiment. The experiment has two parts which will take about 30 minutes to complete. Be sure to answer all questions in both parts. I'm going to hand out some booklets now. Please keep your booklet closed with the instructions facing you until I tell you to begin.

(Hand out booklets)

Let's go over the instructions together first before you start, so I can answer any questions if you have them. (Read instructions to Ss). I want to stress two points in the instructions: First, be sure you respond to the situation in the booklet in the present, as if you are talking directly to the other person described in the situation. Secondly, you will notice that the instructions say that you have 20 minutes to complete the first part of the experiment. Any one of you may or may not need the entire 20 minutes. You do not have to use the full time if you don't need to. Just be sure to respond in as full detail as you can. Please hand in your booklets to me as soon as you are finished. Remember to answer all questions. Do you have any questions? (Answer questions, if any.) Okay, begin.
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We are interested in seeing how well you can put yourself into a situation and respond spontaneously to it.

On the next page is a description of the situation. Read it carefully and imagine yourself in the situation as vividly as possible. Let yourself feel that you are actually there. It is important that you respond as spontaneously and naturally as possible. Therefore, as soon as you feel involved, do not mull over your answer, but respond with the first thing that comes to your mind. Write it down just the way you think it.

Remember, respond in the present, as though you are in the situation and it is happening to you. Put yourself in the position described, facing the other person, and respond directly to him.

Do not, for example, phrase your answer in the form "I would tell the person how happy I was about his good luck (or whatever)." Instead, say, "I was really happy to hear about your good luck."

You will have 20 minutes to respond to the situation. Therefore, we expect that you will respond in some detail.
APPENDIX I (continued)

Paper event, responsibility-reducing, sole locus of responsibility

\( A_1 \ B_1 \ C_1 \)

You were getting a B in a course earlier in the semester on the basis of your first test. In addition, the instructor assigned a paper at the beginning of the semester which was supposed to be handed in by midterm. The instructor warned the class when the paper was assigned that anyone whose paper wasn't in on time would automatically flunk the course at midterm. You waited until the last minute to start the paper and didn't get it in. The instructor gave you an F for a midterm grade and told you that this would definitely affect your final grade in the course. In the meantime, you have to see your academic advisor about pre-registering for next semester. You are in your advisor's office. Picking up your pink slip with your midterm grades on it, your advisor says, "Hey, what's this? You really shouldn't be doing this kind of work. I know you can do better than this. You better get serious about your work or else I won't recommend you for a job or for grad school when you finish here. What did you do to get this F?" What do you say now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Paper event, responsibility-reducing, diffuse locus of responsibility
$(A_1 B_1 C_2)$

You were getting a $B$ in a course earlier in the semester on the basis of your first test. In addition, the instructor gave you and three other people a group assignment to prepare a paper which was supposed to be handed in by midterm. The paper was assigned at the beginning of the semester and the instructor warned the class that anyone whose paper wasn't in on time would automatically flunk the course at midterm. No one in your group said anything about the paper or about making arrangements to get it in. So when midterm rolled around, it wasn't done. The instructor gave everyone in your group Fs and told each of you that this would definitely affect your final grades in the course. In the meantime, you have to see your academic advisor about preregistering for next semester. You are in your advisor's office. Picking up your pink slip with your midterm grades on it, your advisor says, "Hey, what's this? You really shouldn't be doing this kind of work. I know you can do better than this. You better get serious about your work or else I won't recommend you for a job or for grad school when you finish here. What did you do to get this F?" What do you say now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Paper event, responsibility-inducing, sole locus of responsibility
\((A_1 B_2 C_1)\)

You were getting a \(B\) in a course earlier in the semester on the basis of your first test. In addition, the instructor assigned a paper at the beginning of the semester which was supposed to be handed in by midterm. The instructor warned the class when the paper was assigned that anyone whose paper wasn't in on time would automatically flunk the course at midterm. You wanted to at least keep your \(B\) in the course or try for an \(A\), so you worked really hard on the paper and spent a lot of time reading the literature on your topic and organizing and writing the paper. You were really proud of the outcome and thought it was one of the best papers you had ever written. Because the paper was so good, the instructor doubted that it was your own work and questioned you about the sources you used. He asked to see the notes you took while you were writing the paper. Unfortunately, as is your usual habit, you threw all your notes away when you finished the paper. You told the instructor that it was your own work, but he was still unconvinced and he gave you an \(F\) for a midterm grade. He also told you that "this plagiarism" would definitely affect your final grade in the course. In the meantime, you have to see your academic advisor about pre-registering for next semester. You are in your advisor's office. Picking up your pink slip with your midterm grades on it, your advisor says, "Hey, what's this? You really shouldn't be doing this kind of work. I know you can do better than this. You better
APPENDIX I (continued)

A_1 B_2 C_1 (continued)

get serious about your work or else I won't recommend you for a job
or for grad school when you finish here. What did you do to get this
F?" What do you say now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Paper event, responsibility-inducing, diffuse locus of responsibility
\((A_1 B_2 C_2)\)

You were getting a B in a course earlier in the semester on the basis of your first test. In addition, the instructor gave you and three other people a group assignment to prepare a paper which was supposed to be handed in by midterm. The paper was assigned at the beginning of the semester and the class was warned that anybody who did not get his paper in on time would automatically flunk the course at midterm. The group got together and really worked hard on the paper. You all spent a lot of time reading the literature on the topic and organizing and writing the paper. Each of you wrote different portions of the paper and helped edit what the others had written. You were all proud of the final result and the group expected to get a good grade for its efforts. Because the paper was so good and because the different portions differed in style a bit, the instructor doubted that it was the group's own work. He questioned the group's sources and asked to see the notes the group had gathered when writing the paper. Unfortunately, when the group was finished writing, you all got together for a party to celebrate a job well done and you burned all the notes. You each told the instructor that the paper was the group's own work, but he was still unconvinced and gave everyone an F for a midterm grade. He also told each of you that "this plagiarism" would definitely affect your final grades in the course. In the meantime, you have to see your academic advisor about pre-registering for next
APPENDIX I (continued)

A_1 B_2 C_2 (continued)

semester. You are in your advisor's office. Picking up your pink slip with your midterm grades on it, your advisor says, "Hey, what's this? You really shouldn't be doing this kind of work. I know you can do better than this. You better get serious about your work or else I won't recommend you for a job or for grad school when you finish here. What did you do to get this F?" What do you say now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Fight event, responsibility-reducing, sole locus of responsibility
\((A_2 B_1 C_1)\)

You are walking alone across campus coming back from studying at the library. It's Sunday afternoon and there doesn't seem to be anybody else around, except for two kids walking diagonally in front of you about fifty yards and to your left. They look about ten or eleven years old. They're yelling loudly at each other, but you don't pay much attention to what they're yelling about. Just as you pass by, heading in the direction opposite from where they were walking, one of the kids starts to really rough up the other one, shoving him around, punching him, and finally knocking him flat on the ground. The boy on the ground is crying and yelling for help, although he doesn't see you because the other boy is on top of him. You walk a short distance and then stop to turn around and watch what is happening. In the meantime, a woman appears on the scene and tries to break up the fight. She finally manages to pull the boys apart and is walking toward you with one of the boys. She is trying to wipe his bloody nose. She crosses your path and when she sees you she stops and says angrily, "I saw you standing here. You must have seen my son getting beaten up over there. You must have heard him call for help. Why didn't you do something?" What do you say now?

( Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Fight event, responsibility-reducing, diffuse locus of responsibility

\((A^2 \ B_1 \ C_2)\)

You are walking alone across campus coming back from studying at the library. It's Sunday afternoon and there are a number of people around. As you're walking along you notice two kids walking diagonally in front of you about fifty yards and to your left. They look about ten or eleven years old. They're yelling loudly at each other, but you don't pay much attention to what they're yelling about. Just as you and a few other people pass by, heading in the direction opposite from where the kids were walking, one of the kids starts to really rough up the other one, shoving him, punching him, and finally knocking him flat on the ground. The boy on the ground is crying and yelling for help, although he obviously doesn't see you or the other people around because the other boy is on top of him. You walk a short distance and then stop near a small group of people who have gathered to watch what is happening. Nobody seems to be doing anything to stop the fight. In the meantime, a woman suddenly appears on the scene and tries to break up the fight. She finally manages to pull the boys apart and is walking in the direction where the group had been standing. The other people have wandered off, but you are still standing there. She has one of the boys with her and is trying to wipe his bloody nose. She crosses your path and when she sees you she stops and says angrily, "I saw you standing here. You must have seen my son getting beaten up over there. You must have heard him call for help. Why didn't you do
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A_2 B_1 C_2 (continued)

something?" What do you say now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Fight event, responsibility-inducing, sole locus of responsibility
($(A_2 \ B_2 \ C_1)$)

You are walking alone across campus coming back from studying at
the library. It's Sunday afternoon and there doesn't seem to be any-
body else around, except for two kids walking diagonally in front of
you about fifty yards and to your left. They look about ten or eleven
years old. They're yelling loudly at each other, but you don't pay too
much attention to what they're yelling about. Just as you pass by,
heading in the direction opposite from where they were walking, one of
the kids starts to really rough up the other one, shoving him around,
punching him and finally knocking him flat on the ground. The boy on
the ground is crying and yelling for help, although he doesn't see you
because the other boy is on top of him. You turn around and run over
to see what's happening. Just as you are trying to stop the fight, a
woman appears on the scene. You both manage to pull the boys apart.
She starts to wipe one boy's bloody nose. Then she turns to you and
says, "This is my son who was getting beaten up. Not everybody would
have stopped to help break up a fight. Why did you?" What do you say
now?

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

Fight event, responsibility-inducing, diffuse locus of responsibility \((A_2B_2C_2)\)

You are walking alone across campus coming back from studying at the library. It's Sunday afternoon and there are a number of people around. As you're walking along you notice two kids walking diagonally in front of you about fifty yards and to your left. They look about ten or eleven years old. They're yelling loudly at each other, but you don't pay much attention to what they're yelling about. Just as you and a few other people pass by, heading in the direction opposite from where the kids were walking, one of the kids starts to rough up the other one, shoving him around, punching him, and finally knocking him flat on the ground. The boy on the ground is crying and yelling for help, although he obviously doesn't see you or the other people around because the other boy is on top of him. You and two other people turn around and run over to see what's happening. The three of you try to stop the fight and finally manage to pull the boys apart. The other two people have just walked away, but you are still standing there trying to keep the kids from resuming their battle and attempting to comfort the boy who was beaten. Just then a woman appears on the scene. She goes over to the boy who was beaten and tries to wipe his bloody nose. Then she turns to you and says, "This is my son who was beaten up. Not everyone would have stopped to help break up a fight. Why did you? What do you say now?"

(Please write your response on the next page)
APPENDIX I (continued)

PART II

Please answer all of the following questions:

How old are you? ____________________________

Sex: Male Female (Circle one)

Class: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Grad (Circle one)

How many brothers and/or sisters do you have? ____________________________

Are you the: only, first-born, middle, or youngest child in the family? (Circle one)

How involved were you in the situation described to you?

1 not at all involved  2 only slightly involved  3 somewhat involved

4 fairly involved  5 very much involved (Circle one)

Have you ever experienced a situation similar to this one?

Yes No (Circle one)

How similar was the situation described to one you have experienced?

1 not at all similar  2 only slightly similar  3 somewhat similar

4 fairly similar  5 very similar (Circle one)
APPENDIX II

Debriefing to Ss

Experiment

Several weeks ago you participated as a subject in an experiment. In the experiment, you were given a booklet containing a description of a situation. You were told that the experiment was designed to see how well you could put yourself in the situation and respond spontaneously and naturally to it.

The situation you received was in fact only one of a total of 8 situations that were handed out randomly to all subjects in the experiment. First, there were 2 basic events described in the booklets: one was a fight scene, the other was a class assignment. For each of these 2 events, there were 4 slight variations: the event was described so that 1) you, as a subject, were alone when the event occurred, or 2) that you were with some other people; and the outcome was described so that you either 3) did the assignment well and on time or you helped break up a fight you witnessed, or 4) you procrastinated and did not do the assignment on time or you did not stop to break up a fight you saw. In all of the situations concerning the class assignment, you were then asked to explain the failing grade you got for the assignment to your academic advisor. In the fight situation, you were asked to explain why you did or did not stop the fight to the mother of the 11-year old boy who was getting hurt in the fight.

Purpose

Although I am in fact interested in how well you were able to relate to the situation described in your booklet, there is another purpose for the experiment which I didn’t tell you about. The experiment really was designed to see what you said in your response to the hypothetical listener and how you said it.

Specifically, I will be looking for a communication pattern called disqualification. Disqualification is a technique (accomplished in several different ways) whereby a person says or does something and then denies or avoids taking responsibility for what he has said or done. A person does this by "hedging" on what really happened. For example, he can deny that he was at all to blame for what happened by saying or implying that what occurred was totally determined by some external circumstance. He is therefore essentially giving the message that he had no other choice and that anybody would have behaved the same way under the same conditions. In another case, the person can directly contradict himself so that what his real position is remains open to question. Or, he can distort or omit information about the situation so that the situation is perceived differently by his listener and perhaps the speaker’s own "faulty" behavior is minimized as a result. Disqualification, according to the hypothesis I am testing, is expected to occur more often in situations in which the speaker
APPENDIX II (continued)

feels more uncomfortable about his behavior and feels "put on the spot" when he is asked to explain it. In the study itself, I am assuming that most of those subjects who were put in the situations where they did not complete a class assignment on time or where they did not help break up a fight would feel more uncomfortable when asked to explain their behavior to their academic advisor or the mother of the child being beaten up in the fight. Therefore, they might use more examples of disqualification in their explanation than would those people in those conditions where they did the assignment or broke up the fight. The former might be more reluctant to acknowledge their behavior than the latter.

Part II of the experiment was included so that I could see if, for example, there is a difference between men and women in how much they use disqualification; or if how involved you felt in the situation affected the amount of disqualification.

Results

Unfortunately all of the booklets have not been scored for disqualification at this time, so no results are available yet. If you are interested in knowing the final results, please put your name, address, and telephone number on a slip of paper and put it in Dr. Zanor's mailbox in the Psychology Office. Note also on the paper that you want results of Ms. Zanor's experiment. That way I can arrange to convey information to you about the results when the information is available later on.

Final Word

The comments made above about disqualification are not meant to imply that this communication pattern is somehow bad. Most communications theorists would agree that many people use disqualification when they are put on the spot or are put in an awkward situation where they would rather not accept responsibility for something they've said or done.

Thanks again for being a subject and helping me in my doctoral dissertation work.

Gene B. Zanor
Examples of Dominant-offensive Responses:

"Well first off the bat I'm not his mother, you are and you should have taken care of your own son...now if you don't mind get out of my face before I show you what a real fight is."

"Lady it was none of my business...Your kid probably asked for it and wasn't tough enough to take it. If he knew he'd get his head kicked in he should have stopped yelling and talked sensibly."

"The way I figure it lady your kid didn't really need the help. How the hell do you expect the kid to learn how to fend for himself if you, or anyone else for that matter, always does everything for him?...besides how do you know he didn't deserve to get kicked around?"

"I think a boy should learn to be a fighter and be able to do things on his own. All young boys have disputes and when a fight erupts it's the best thing for them...I think you should not worry about it and quit being such an overbearing mother."

Examples of Conciliatory-defensive Responses:

"I am sorry but I really had very little time to do anything."

"I didn't know what was going on, I'm sorry."

"I'm very sorry ma'am...when I finally felt I better stop it you had already come. Again I say I'm sorry and if there's anything you would like me to do I'll be happy to do it."

"I'm sorry lady...if there is anything I can do to help you finding (sic) the boy's parents or tracking him down I would surely help."
APPENDIX III

Guidelines and rules for scoring disqualification

I. General rule

If a statement or phrase can stand alone as a disqualification, then count it as a disqualification. When you have two or more separate statements or phrases which repeat themselves or else say essentially the same thing, but each one would count as a disqualification even if the other statements were not present, then you still count each one of them as a separate disqualification.

For example, an S might give a series of similar excuses for his behavior, but he makes each excuse sound like it is sufficient to determine his behavior or to determine what he says. Each excuse is counted separately as a disqualification.

II. Scoring categories

A. Denial of the source of the behavior or the source of the message

1. The S clearly implies or states that his or her behavior was totally determined (not merely influenced) by some external circumstance or some involuntary internal state (e.g., "instinct," fatigue, illness, etc.), when it is clear that in fact he did play a role or make a decision which influenced what happened in a situation. What the S says essentially gives the message that he himself had nothing to do with what happened; that he had no control in the matter; or that anyone else would have behaved exactly the same way he did under the same circumstances.

Examples:

"Because stopping little boys fighting comes as an automatic response to me...I'm usually not aware of what I'm doing."

"It is my nature to prevent violence."

1 These categories were based on Haley (1959 a, 1959 b) and were refined for the purposes of the study on the basis of a pilot project conducted by the author and on the basis of practice scoring sessions by the author and another judge.
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"I was too shocked or amazed to run out and stop it (the fight)." (This is a denial of the source of the behavior because the situation was not considered serious enough to warrant shock or amazement which would interfere with behavior).

2. The S attributes what he says or does to a generalized other without verbally including himself, or else he attributes what happened to someone else rather than to himself.

Examples:

"Most people would think that this was just a little childhood misunderstanding that they didn't have to interfere with." (The S in fact does not know what other people's opinions would be of the "misunderstanding" because he was the only one there to witness it. Therefore he is probably relating his own feelings indirectly.)

"Somebody might think your kid deserved to get beat up." (It is unclear if S himself feels that way)

"Can't a person ask if the kid is okay?" (Which person wants to ask? the S?)

B. Denial of the message

1. The S says one thing to explain his behavior and then directly contradicts it by making a statement which states or implies the opposite of what he just said. Each time he changes his position, a disqualification is scored. For example, if the S makes statement A, and then contradicts it with statement B, score one disqualification. If he then makes statement A again, thus contradicting statement B, score an additional disqualification.

Examples:

"I am a victim of my own circumstances...I feel that by being placed in a group instead of working with other people I'm already familiar with seriously jeopardized my chance of retaining a better grade." (The S first acknowledges his own fault in the situation, but then goes on to blame someone else for assigning him to a group to work.)

"It was none of my business to break the fight up...I was
APPENDIX III (cont.)

going to break it up pretty soon if someone else didn't." (S says it's none of his business to stop a fight and then says it is his business because he intended to stop it)

"I didn't really know what was going on ... They were yelling -- your son as loud as the other boy -- and then they just started fighting." (S says he does not know what was going on, but then describes what was happening)

2. The $S$ gives an explanation for his behavior or makes some statement and then follows it (or precedes it) with a phrase or word which by itself states a definite position and which negates the statement it precedes or follows. The definite phrases include things like "I don't know," "I have nothing to say," "I don't mean that," or "I am not sure." Note: this category does not include qualifiers which express indefinite positions in and of themselves (e.g., "maybe, probably, possibly," etc.).

Examples:

"I really don't know what to say for myself..." followed by an explanation, excuses, etc.

"Maybe the teacher has something against me, I don't know."

"I know he was yelling for help -- but I don't know, I just didn't think I could help him."

C. Denial of the receiver of the message

1. The statement is directed to a generalized other or else it is not clear whether the remarks are intended for the addressee who is present. The remarks must be such, however, that they could apply to the addressee.

Examples:

"Some people just don't think enough of you to realize that you are capable of good work." (S says this about his own work to his academic advisor who has just asked him why he got an F in a course)

"They set up an image of you and your capabilities in their mind and if you deviate from their character sketch you get punished for it." (Same context as the previous example. It is unclear who they includes and whether it includes the addressee)
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D. Denial of the context of the behavior or of the message

1. $S$ addresses himself to a past, future, or a hypothetical situation as a way of somehow explaining his behavior in the present context without addressing himself to the present situation.

Examples:

"I think lady that if your son was on the top then you would not have broken it (the fight) up either."

"Everyone else just walked off --- just like you would have done." ($S$ seems to explain his own failure by saying what other people did before and what his addressee might have hypothetically done)

2. The $S$ talks about the present situation in obviously distorted ways; that is, he contradicts the information he was given about the situation, or he adds or omits information. Such distortions, additions, or omissions make it appear that something else happened in the situation, that what happened was not serious, or that the $S$'s personal role was different from what it actually was.

Examples:

"Your kid didn't really need any help." ($S$ says this in the context of addressing a mother whose child has just been yelling for help while being beaten by another child)

"It wasn't until you went to them that I saw they were really fighting." (The situation was described so that the $S$ was watching the two children fight before the mother came on the scene.)

"I don't think they were really hurting each other." ($S$ says this after the child has received a bloody nose)

"I am tired of people not getting involved in incidents of this sort. So I decided that this time it was going to be different ... I hope that you will appreciate what I did for your boy ..." (This is a distortion because the $S$ was only one of three people who stopped a fight, but he never mentions the other people and gives the impression that he was the only one to step in.)
Appendix IV. Cell means for four-factor analysis of variance design: disqualification Event (A) x Responsibility (B) x Locus of Responsibility (C) x Sex (D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A₁ (paper)</th>
<th>A₂ (fight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₁ (reducing)</td>
<td>B₂ (inducing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>C₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| D₁ | Mean | 0  | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
|    | (sd) | (0) | (1.7) | (1.8) | (0.8) | (2.4) | (1.1) | (0.9) | (0.9) |

| D₂ | Mean | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
|    | (sd) | (1.7) | (1.3) | (1.3) | (0) | (2.1) | (2.3) | (1.3) | (0.5) |

n = 5 note: all variables in the analysis are between-subjects variables, but are presented in the above format for clarity

C₁ = sole C₂ = diffuse D₁ = males D₂ = females
Appendix IV. Cell means for the two levels of each of the four independent variables in the analysis of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event (A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ (paper)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ (fight)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility (B)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁ (reducing)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂ (inducing)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of responsibility (C)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁ (sole)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂ (diffuse)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₁ (males)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂ (females)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V  Cell means for the AB cells: disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A₁</th>
<th>A₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sd = 1.32)</td>
<td>(sd = 2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sd = 1.25)</td>
<td>(sd = 0.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 20

note: A₁ = paper       A₂ = fight
      B₁ = reducing     B₂ = inducing
Appendix V  Cell means for the AD cells: disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$A_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$</td>
<td>1.00 (sd 1.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30 (sd 1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$</td>
<td>0.70 (sd 1.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.45 (sd 2.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 20$

Note: $A_1 =$ paper  $A_2 =$ fight  
$D_1 =$ males  $D_2 =$ females
Appendix V  Cell means for the BD cells: disqualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B_1$</th>
<th>$B_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_1$</td>
<td>1.35 (sd = 1.69)</td>
<td>0.95 (sd = 1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$</td>
<td>2.65 (sd = 2.43)</td>
<td>0.50 (sd = 0.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 20$

note: $B_1$ = reducing  $B_2$ = inducing
      $D_1$ = males  $D_2$ = females.