

1991

Self-image and Type A behavior pattern

Kavous G. Behzadi
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Behzadi, Kavous G., "Self-image and Type A behavior pattern" (1991). *Master's Theses*. 96.
http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/96

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1344242

Self-image and Type A behavior pattern

Behzadi, Kavous Ghavami, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

SELF-IMAGE AND TYPE A BEHAVIOR PATTERN

**Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
San Jose State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts**

**By
Kavous G. Behzadi
May, 1991**

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Robert A. Hicks

Robert A. Hicks

R. J. Pellegrini

R. J. Pellegrini

John S. Kelly

John S. Kelly

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Serena M. Stanford

ABSTRACT

SELF-IMAGE AND TYPE A BEHAVIOR PATTERN

by Kavous G. Behzadi

While considerable effort has been focused on determining the relative characteristics of Type As and Bs, surprisingly little research has been done regarding the relationship between Type A-B behavior patterns and self-image. As a continuation of the research by Blanco, Guidano, Mahoney and Reda (1986) on self-image, this study was designed both as an attempt to clarify the relationship between Type A-B behavior pattern and self-image and as a test for the new mirror time procedure for measuring self-image. The subjects were 56 female and 40 male college students who were classified as either Type A or Type B on the basis of their responses to the Glass (1977) version of the Jenkins Activity Survey (JAS). Within these Type A and Type B groups, subjects were randomly assigned to either a positive or negative self-focus group. The mirror-time procedure was then used to measure self-image of each individual. Contrary to prediction, a two-way analysis of variance revealed that Type As did not differ significantly from Type Bs in self image. There are at least two possible explanations for this unexpected result: 1) the mirror time procedure may be a poor measure of self-image, and/or 2) the self-image of Type A and Type B subjects was measured using their responses to either positively phrased or negatively phrased questions, and perhaps the focus of these questions distorted the responses of these subjects sufficiently to produce the non-significant results reported here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION

INTRODUCTION..... 1

METHODS..... 5

 Subjects 5

 Variables..... 5

 Procedure..... 7

RESULTS..... 8

DISCUSSION 10

REFERENCES..... 13

APPENDICES

 Appendix A

 Consent Form..... 15

 Appendix B

 The Glass Version of The Jenkins Activity Survey..... 17

 Appendix C

 The Total Self-Image Score for Each Subject in Each Type A-B
 Status/Focus Condition Group 22

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	
Means and Standard Deviations for the Self-Image Scores for the Type As and Type Bs, Negative & Positive Self-Focus Group	8
Table 2	
A Summary of the Two Factor ANOVA Computed to Analyze the Effects of Type A-B Status and Self-Focus Conditions on Self Image.....	9

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern is an "action-emotion complex" (Rosenman, 1974, p. 67) that is associated with enhanced risk of coronary heart disease, independent of other risk factors such as smoking and hypertension. Type A is characterized by a competitive achievement orientation, an exaggerated sense of time urgency, and heightened aggressiveness when frustrated (Carver & Glass, 1978). The Type B pattern is defined by the relative absence of these A type qualities. Some researchers have investigated the A-B differences in cognitive functioning (Matthews & Brunson, 1979) which may underlie differences in behavioral and physiological responses, but little has been done on how Type As and Type Bs view themselves.

One's view of self may have pervasive social and psychological effects, for it is thought that the perception of self impacts on emotional satisfaction, behavioral adaptation, and rational thinking. Hartman and Blankstein (1986), based on a comprehensive review of the self perception literature, suggested that self acceptance has played an important role in almost every major theory of personality. They indicated that most psychotherapists view self perception as a central variable in the development and maintenance of psychological dysfunction and as a mediating mechanism in effecting psychological change. From this perspective, investigation of the self-image of persons who exhibit Type A behavior pattern may have important theoretical and clinical implications. To explain, while considerable effort has been focused on the relative characteristics

of Type A and Type B individuals (e.g., Humphries, Carver & Neumann, 1983; Rhodewalt, 1984; Smith & Brehm, 1981), surprisingly little has been done regarding the relationship between these personality variables and self-image. This gap in our knowledge seems important when one considers that Friedman and Rosenman (1974), among others, have argued that a major characteristic that defines Type A behavior is the relative insecurity of status that these individuals show. In describing the insecurity of status of Type A persons, Friedman and Rosenman stated that the Type A person "somewhere in his developmental process began to measure the value of his total personality or character by the number of his achievements. Moreover, these achievements must invariably be those he believes capture the respect and admiration of his peers and superiors. Second, he believes that the number of his achievements are always being judged by his peers and subordinates..." (p. 75). Recently, Lobel (1988) reported data which partially validate this characterization of Type A personality; i.e., he observed that relative to Type Bs, as a group, Type A persons have lower self-concepts. In explaining his data, Lobel suggested that the higher self-concept of Type Bs was a by-product of their more relaxed, less competitive lifestyle and that the lower self-concept of Type As resulted from their feelings of dissatisfaction with themselves. In developing this research, Lobel noted that the insecurity of status which characterizes Type As could manifest itself in the negative view of the self and specifically in negative self-image. Thus, the purpose of this study is to measure the relationships between Type A-B behavior patterns and self-image. In so doing, this study also was designed to further test the validity of the new mirror time procedure as a measure of self-image.

Specifically, this study was designed to measure the relationships between Activity Survey (Glass, 1977), and self-image measured by the mirror-time

procedure that was developed by Blanco and his colleagues (Blanco, et al., 1986).

The Measurement of Self-Image

The procedure developed by Blanco and his colleagues is grounded in the tradition of previous work on cognition and self-systems (e.g., Bandura, 1986; Duval & Wicklund, 1972; Epstein & Erskine, 1983; Guidano, 1987; Hartman & Blankstein, 1986; Kegan, 1982; Mahoney, 1974, 1977; Markus & Nurius, 1986). This procedure employs an innovative clinical and research technique called mirror time. Previous instruments (e.g. Fitts, 1965) for measuring self-image have been limited to a self-report questionnaire format. While such instruments are a reliable means to measuring how people perceive themselves, recent studies (e.g., Bromberg & Hartman, 1986) have indicated that the level of self-awareness during testing situations may in part be a function of internal and external factors that are attended to during the test period. To insure self-attentiveness, the Blanco et al. (1986) procedure requires that subjects stand in front of a mirror while responding to questions that request self-evaluation on the assumption that this procedure induces a higher level of self-awareness in the subject than could be achieved using a self-report questionnaire given in a more conventional testing environment.

Consistent with this view, Bromberg and Hartman (1986) have suggested that being in front of a television camera or a mirror creates a circumstance in which people are induced to have greater awareness of themselves. Thus, in this study, the mirror time procedure was used to enhance the self-awareness of the Type A and Type B subjects, while the subjects responded to self-focused questions. In that regard, self-image was measured under either of two focused conditions. In one of these conditions, subjects were asked to focus on the positive

characteristics of themselves, while in the other condition, they were asked to focus on negative characteristics of themselves. The focus conditions were introduced into the design of this study as a control on the valence of the self-image questions, and provide a more meaningful database upon which to draw conclusions. Thus, self-image was measured under one of these two conditions (either positive or negative) for each of the Type A and Type B students while they stood in front of a mirror.

The Hypothesis

As was discussed above, Friedman and Rosenman (1974) argued that insecurity of status is an important motivating factor in the behavior pattern of Type A persons. Thus, I predicted that Type A students would have a more pronounced negative self-image than Type B peers.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Subjects

The subjects were 56 female and 40 male students, 48 Type As and 48 Type Bs. These subjects were drawn from a pool of 400 undergraduate college students who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course at San Jose State University. The subjects were randomly assigned to one of the following four groups: 1) Type As who focus on positive aspects of the self; 2) Type As who focus on negative aspects of the self; 3) Type Bs who focus on positive aspects of the self; and 4) Type Bs who focus on negative aspects of the self. Each group consisted of 10 male and 14 female students.

Variables

Type A-B Behavior: Type A-B behavior was measured using the Glass version of the Jenkins Activity Survey (JAS). This 21-item scale has been widely used (Glass, 1977) to identify the Type A and Type B behavior patterns in college students. The items that are included in this scale are listed in Appendix B. Responses to this scale were scored according to Glass' criteria with Type As defined by a JAS scored ≥ 8 and Type Bs by a JAS scored < 8 .

Self-Image: Self-image was measured using mirror-time procedure developed by Blanco et al. (1986). Using this procedure, self-image was measured based on self-rating of subjects, on a seven-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 to 7. The subjects responded to either the four positively phrased questions or the four negatively phrased questions, while standing in front of a mirror and viewing their image.

Positively Focused Questions: Subjects viewed their image in a mirror and were asked to respond to an audiotaped sequence of four questions by marking an answer sheet which provided the following 7-point Likert-type scale, where subjects could express to what degree they liked or disliked themselves:

Like very much	Like	Like Somewhat	Neutral
7	6	5	4
Dislike Somewhat	Dislike	Dislike Very Much	
3	2	1	

The four questions focused on the subjects' perceptions of their positive characteristics, and consisted of the following:

- a. "What do you like about your face?"
- b. "What do you like about your body?"
- c. "What do like about your personality?"
- d. "What do you like about yourself?"

Each question was presented twice. Subjects, while viewing their image on the mirror, had 60 seconds to respond to each question, and a signal tone was sounded 15 seconds prior to me next question.

Negatively Focused Questions: The procedure for the negatively phrased questions were identical to that for the positively phrased questions. The questions focused on the subjects' perceptions of their negative characteristics, and consisted of the following:

- a. "What do you dislike about your face?"
- b. "What do you dislike about your body?"
- c. "What do dislike about your personality?"
- d. "What do you dislike about yourself?"

Procedure

Prior to the experiment, Type A-B status was assessed using the Glass (1977) version of the Jenkins Activity Survey. As has been noted, responses to this scale were scored according to Glass' criteria. From this pool, the 96 students who served as the subjects for this study were selected and then were assigned to one of the four Type A-B X Question Focus groups. When each subject arrived for the individual self-image testing, he/she was informed about the study and asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix A) if they agreed to do so.

The mirror-time self-image testing took place in the laboratory room of the Psychology Department, located on the San Jose State University campus. The laboratory was a 9'x9' room. For this study, a large mirror was placed on one side of the room, and it was positioned so that subjects could view their entire image on the mirror. The mirror was covered when the subject first entered the room. A table was placed in front and to the right side of the mirror. The answer sheet was placed on the table, close to the subjects, so that they could mark the answer sheet while standing in front of the mirror. An audiotape recorder was located behind the mirror.

After explaining the steps involved in the experiment, the curtain was drawn back to reveal the mirror. At this time, the audiotape recorder was turned on and was the method by which the four questions were presented. After turning on the tape recorder, the research assistant left the room so that the subjects were alone while responding to the tape-recorded questions by marking their responses to each question on the appropriate 7-point scale. These responses were summed to yield a single self-image score for each subject. The self-image scores for each subject are listed in Appendix C.

RESULTS

First the means and standard deviations for each Type A-B question focus group were computed and these values are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for the Self-Image Scores for the Type As and Type Bs, Negative and Positive Self-Focus Groups

Self-Focus Condition	Type A		Type B		Total Type A-B	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Negative	14.42	2.98	15.83	3.37	15.13	3.23
Positive	19.17	3.46	19.42	3.44	19.29	3.41
Total	16.79	3.99	17.63	3.82	17.21	3.91

Note: N=24 for each cell; N=96 total

Next, using the data which are summarized in Table 1, a two factor (Type A-B by two (Focus Conditions) analysis of variance with independent groups in both factors was computed. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

A Summary of the Two Factor ANOVA Computed to Analyze the Effects of
Type A-B Status and Self-Focus Conditions on Self-Image

Source	df	ss	MS	F
Type A/B Status	1	16.7	16.7	1.52
Focus Conditions	1	416.7	416.7	37.87*
Interaction	1	8.2	8.2	.74
Within Subjects	92	1012.3	11.0	

*P <.05

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis of this study predicted, and both the clinical descriptions of Type A-B behavior (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974) and previous research (Lobel, 1988) have suggested, that Type A students should have reported lower self-images than Type B students, especially in the negatively focused condition. Contrary to this prediction, as is shown in Table 2, neither the main effect computer for Type A-B status and Type A-B by question focus interaction was significant. Thus, in rejecting the hypotheses of this study, these data suggest either of two possibilities. First, it may be the case that the relationship between Type A-B status and self-image is trivial. If this possibility is true, one must discount the consistent clinical reports which indicate that Type A individuals exhibit lower self-esteem than Type B persons and argue that the data reported recently by Lobel are misleading.

With respect to the latter, it is true that there were design differences between Lobel's study and mine. That is, while he used the Jenkins Activity Survey to identify Type A and Type B individuals, as was done in this study, he used a different scale, The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) to measure self-concept. This multidimensional scale yields scores on five separate subscales, i.e. physical, moral, personal, family and social aspects of self-concept. Lobel reported that relative to Type As, Type Bs scored *higher* overall and higher in self-concept on each of the five subscales. Since these data are consistent with the Type A-B construct and clinical observations, it does not seem prudent to argue that they are an artifact.

A more fruitful way of rationalizing the differences between the outcome of this study and expectancy, can be found by examining the differences between the design of Lobel's study and mine. A purpose of this study was to provide further validation of the Blanco et al. (1986) mirror-time procedure for measuring

self-image. One conclusion that may follow from these data is that the mirror time procedure may not measure self-image well. As has been noted, this procedure is a new scale that was developed to measure self-image. Even though recent students (e.g., Bromberg & Hartman, 1986) indicate that the mirror can be used to increase self-awareness, there is no evidence other than the original study, a presented paper that has not been published, that this mirror time procedure is a valid and reliable measure of self-image. An aim of this study was to determine whether this measure could be used to find results that were consistent with those which had been derived.

An alternative to challenging the validity of the mirror-time procedure is the possibility that self-image, as it is measured by the mirror-time procedure and self-concept, as it is measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, are separate concepts that are differentially related to Type A-B behavior.

In this study, as a control on the possible effects of the phrasing of the self-image questions, both positively phrased and negatively phrased questions were prepared and submitted to separate groups of subjects. As can be seen in Table 2, the focus or valence of these questions had a significant effect on the subjects' ratings of self-image.

Perhaps this inclusion of this dimension in this study distorted the responses of the subjects sufficiently to produce the non-significant effects due to A-B status found here. To explain, in addition to the claim that Type As are characterized by lower self-concept and self-esteem, they are also thought to more likely exhibit conformity and be higher in social desirability than their Type B peers. Possibly, the valence focus of the questions in conjunction with their image in the mirror differentially activated these personality traits in the Type As. If this is true, the

effect on ratings of self-image would be to bias them in a positive direction for the Type As.

Here it should be noted that for both focus or valence conditions, the Type Bs scored higher (i.e., had a more positive self-image) than the Type As. Put differently, the "pattern" of the means that are listed in Table 1 is consistent with expectation. Thus, it may be the case that the procedures used to define self-image in this study activated responses in the Type As that altered utility of the mirror-time method sufficiently to produce no significant differences in self-image between Type As and Bs.

Therefore, before drawing conclusions from these data about the effects of Type A-B status on self-image, future research should: 1) determine whether self-image as it is measured by the mirror-time procedure and self-concept as it is measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale are separate concepts that are differently related to Type A-B behavior; and 2) clarify the relative effects that the focus or valence of self-focused questions, has on altering the way that Type A and Type B subjects rate their own self-image.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Blanco, S., Guidano, V.F., Mahoney, M.J., & Reda, N.A. (1986). The experimental use of mirror time in cognitive psychotherapy. Paper presented at the Italian National Psychology Conference, Milano, Italy.
- Bromberg, D. & Hartman, L.M. (1986). Looking for introspection, self-consciousness, self-awareness and emotionality: Preliminary empirical findings. In Hartman, L.M. & Blankstein, R. (eds.), Perception of self in emotional disorder and psychotherapy (pp. 85-106). New York: Plenum.
- Carver, C.S., & Glass, D.C. (1978). Coronary-prone behavior pattern and interpersonal aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *36*, 361-366.
- Duval, S., & Wicklund, R.A. (1972). A theory of objective self-awareness. New York: Academic Press.
- Epstein, S., & Erskine, N. (1983). The development of personal theories of reality from an interactional perspective. In D. Magnusson & V.L. Allen (eds.), Human development: An interactional perspective (pp. 133-147). New York: Academic Press.
- Fitts, W.H. (1965). Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Manual. Nashville: Counselor Recording and Tests.
- Friedman, M. & Rosenman, R., (1974). Type A & your heart. New York: Knopf.
- Glass, D.C. (1977). Behavior patterns, stress and coronary disease. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guidano, V.F. (1987). Complexity of the self: A developmental approach to psychopathology and therapy. New York: Guilford.

- Hartman, L.M. & Blankstein, K.R. (eds.). (1986). Perception of self in emotional disorder and psychotherapy. New York: Plenum.
- Humphries, C., Carver, S., Neumann, G. (1983). Cognitive characteristics of the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 177-187.
- Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self: Problem and process in human development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lobel, T.E. (1988). Personality correlates of Type A coronary-prone behavior. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52, 3, 434-440.
- Mahoney, M.J. (1974). Cognition and behavior modification. Cambridge, MA: Balinger.
- Mahoney, M.J. (1977). Reflections on the cognitive-learning trend in psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 32, 5-13.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. American Psychologist, 41, 954-969.
- Matthews, K.A., and Brunson, B.I. (1979). Allocation of attention and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 2081-2090.
- Rhodewalt, F. (1984). Self-improvement, self-attribution and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 47 (3), 663-670.
- Rosenman, R.H. (1974). The role of behavior patterns and neurogenic factors in the pathogenesis of coronary heart disease. In R.S. Eliot (ed.) Stress and the Heart (pp. 123-141). Mt. Kisco, NY: Futura.
- Smith, T.W. & Brehm, S.S. (1981). Cognitive correlates of the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. Motivation & Emotion, 5, (3), 215-223.

APPENDIX A
CONSENT FORM

Agreement to Participate in Research
San Jose State University

Responsible Investigator: Kavous G. Behzadi

Title of Protocol: Attitude and Perception

I have been asked to participate in a research study that is investigating the relationship between attitude and self-image. By learning more about this relationship, we hope to contribute to the improvement of preventive medicine programs that involve cognitive behavior modifications.

I understand that I will view my own image in a mirror, and answer several questions about my perceptions. My verbal responses will be audiotaped during this experiment which takes about four minutes. There are no stresses or risks involved in this experiment.

The results from this study may be published, but any information from this study that can be identified with me will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with my permission or as required by law.

Any question about my participation in this study will be answered by Kavous G. Behzadi at (415) 494-2362. Complaints about the procedures may be presented to Robert A. Hicks, Ph.D., Department of Psychology. For questions or complaints about research subjects' rights, or in the event of research-related injury, contact Serena Stanford, Ph.D. (Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies & Research) at 924-2480.

My consent is given voluntarily without being coerced. I may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study, and I may withdraw at any time, without prejudice to my relations with San Jose State University.

I have made a decision whether or not to participate. My signature indicates that I have read the information provided above and that I have decided to participate.

Date

Subject's Signature

Investigator's Signature

APPENDIX B
THE GLASS VERSION OF THE
JENKINS ACTIVITY SURVEY

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

18-21

University Microfilms International

APPENDIX C

The total self-image score for each subject in each Type A-B status/focus condition group

	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Self</u>
1	M	A	POS	17
2	M	A	POS	19
3	F	A	POS	20
4	F	A	POS	16
5	M	A	POS	18
6	F	A	POS	21
7	F	A	POS	17
8	M	A	POS	24
9	F	A	POS	21
10	F	A	POS	25
11	M	A	POS	25
12	M	A	POS	21
13	M	A	POS	13
14	F	A	POS	25
15	F	A	POS	18
16	F	A	POS	15
17	M	A	POS	21
18	M	A	POS	17
19	F	A	POS	19
20	F	A	POS	23
21	F	A	POS	16
22	F	A	POS	16
23	M	A	POS	15
24	F	A	POS	18
25	F	B	POS	25
26	M	B	POS	21
27	F	B	POS	14
28	F	B	POS	25
29	M	B	POS	18

RAW SCORES

	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Self</u>
30	F	B	POS	15
31	F	B	POS	21
32	M	B	POS	17
33	F	B	POS	19
34	M	B	POS	23
35	M	B	POS	16
36	F	B	POS	16
37	F	B	POS	15
38	M	B	POS	18
39	F	B	POS	22
40	M	B	POS	18
41	F	B	POS	23
42	F	B	POS	24
43	M	B	POS	18
44	M	B	POS	24
45	F	B	POS	16
46	F	B	POS	19
47	F	B	POS	22
48	M	B	POS	17
49	M	A	NEG	17
50	F	A	NEG	11
51	M	A	NEG	15
52	F	A	NEG	12
53	F	A	NEG	13
54	M	A	NEG	10
55	F	A	NEG	14
56	F	A	NEG	10
57	M	A	NEG	14
58	F	A	NEG	12
59	F	A	NEG	18

RAW SCORES

	Gender	Type	Focus	Self
60	M	A	NEG	13
61	F	A	NEG	14
62	F	A	NEG	20
63	M	A	NEG	15
64	F	A	NEG	14
65	F	A	NEG	15
66	F	A	NEG	11
67	F	A	NEG	14
68	M	A	NEG	16
69	F	A	NEG	12
70	M	A	NEG	20
71	M	A	NEG	16
72	M	A	NEG	20
73	F	B	NEG	14
74	F	B	NEG	16
75	F	B	NEG	12
76	M	B	NEG	14
77	M	B	NEG	16
78	F	B	NEG	15
79	F	B	NEG	10
80	F	B	NEG	10
81	F	B	NEG	19
82	M	B	NEG	15
83	M	B	NEG	20
84	M	B	NEG	13
85	F	B	NEG	17
86	F	B	NEG	19
87	F	B	NEG	15
88	M	B	NEG	15
89	F	B	NEG	19

RAW SCORES

	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Focus</u>	<u>Self</u>
90	M	B	NEG	11
91	F	B	NEG	19
92	M	B	NEG	12
93	M	B	NEG	20
94	F	B	NEG	19
95	M	B	NEG	19
96	F	B	NEG	21