1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**SURREPTITIOUS OBSERVATION OF COMPLIANT RESPONDING
USING THE REAL-SIMULATOR PARADIGM.**

**by
Nadina Ouaida**

**A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts**

Department of Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
December, 1993**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89848-8

Canada

Name Nadina Oueda

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Social Psychology

SUBJECT TERM

0451

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0488
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0401
Literature 0294
General 0295
Classical 0297
Comparative 0298
Medieval 0316
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
General 0770
Accounting 0454
Banking 0338
Marketing 0385
Canadian Studies 0501
Economics 0503
General 0505
Agricultural 0508
Commerce-Business 0509
Finance 0510
History 0511
Labor 0358
Theory 0366
Folklore 0351
Geography 0578
Gerontology 0578
History 0578
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
General 0938
Criminology and Penology 0631
Demography 0628
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
Individual and Family Studies 0630
Industrial and Labor Relations 0700
Public and Social Welfare 0344
Social Structure and Development 0709
Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
General 0308
Anatomy 0309
Biostatistics 0379
Botany 0329
Cell 0353
Ecology 0369
Entomology 0793
Genetics 0410
Limnology 0307
Microbiology 0317
Molecular 0416
Neuroscience 0433
Oceanography 0821
Physiology 0778
Radiation 0472
Veterinary Science 0786
Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0425
General 0996
Medical 0425
Earth Sciences 0996
Biogeochemistry 0996
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Polynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0382
Physical Therapy 0573
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Agricultural 0487
Analytical 0488
Biochemistry 0738
Inorganic 0490
Nuclear 0491
Organic 0494
Pharmaceutical 0495
Physical 0754
Polymer 0405
Radiation 0605
Mathematics 0986
Physics 0606
General 0608
Acoustics 0607
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0798
Atmospheric Science 0759
Atomic 0609
Electronics and Electricity 0610
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0752
Fluid and Plasma 0611
Molecular 0756
Nuclear 0611
Optics 0463
Radiation 0346
Solid State 0984
Statistics 0346
Applied Sciences 0984
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0765
Petroleum 0554
Sanitary and Municipal 0790
System Science 0428
Geotechnology 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis:

**"Surreptitious Observation of Compliant Responding
Using the Real-Simulator Paradigm"**

submitted by Nadina Ouaida, B.A.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University
December 13, 1993

ABSTRACT

The surreptitious observation paradigm was used to compare the behaviour four groups of subjects: a) low hypnotizable controls, b) high hypnotizable controls, c) low hypnotizables administered the CSTP and d) low hypnotizable subjects administered the Carleton Skills Training Package (CSTP) after being explicitly instructed to fake their way through the CSTP. Subjects in all four groups were individually post-tested twice using the Hypnotic Aptitude Test (HAT), once while alone and once with an experimenter present. During these two sessions, the subjects' behaviour was surreptitiously recorded via video camera.

High hypnotizable and CSTP subjects responded similarly during both intervals of the HAT and their self ratings of behaviour corresponded to their actual behaviour as videotaped . Simulators failed to respond to the suggestions while alone but rated themselves as having responded at this time. These findings contradict the hypothesis that skills training can be accounted for parsimoniously by compliance to the demands of the experiment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Briefly, I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude and/or acknowledgment to all of you who accompanied me through the most grueling year of my adult life. I think you know who you are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	i.
Acceptance Sheet	ii.
Abstract	iii.
Acknowledgements	iv.
Table of Contents	v.
List of Tables	vi.
List of Figures	vii.
List of Appendices	viii.
 Introduction	 1
The Carleton Skills Training Package	3
Compliance and the CSTP	5
The Effect of Rapport on Skills Training	8
The Real-Simulator Paradigm	9
Complete versus Partial Skills Training	10
Surreptitious Observation of Compliant Responding	12
Purpose	14
Hypotheses	15
Method	15
Subjects	15
The Surreptitious Observation Design and the HAT	16
Procedure	16
<i>Part One</i>	16
<i>Part two</i>	18
Dependent Variables	19
<i>HAT Self Scores</i>	19
<i>HAT Judges' Scores</i>	19
<i>Role Incongruity</i>	19
Results	20
HAT and the Treatment Groups Effect	20
Role Incongruity	26
Discussion	28
References	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	ANOVA Summary Table for Groups: Judges' and Self Scores of HAT at Experimenter Absent and Experimenter Present	21
2	Mean HAT Scores for Low Control, CSTP, High Control and Simulating Subjects in the Experimenter Absent and Experimenter Present Conditions	22

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
1	Group by Ratings Simple Interaction at Experimenter Absent Condition	23
2	Group by Ratings Simple Interaction at Experimenter Present Condition	24
3	Frequency of Role Incongruous Behaviour Exhibited by Groups	27

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A: Modification Instructions	40
Appendix B: Audio Training Information	52
Appendix C: Transcript of Model's Verbalizations During Suggestions	66
Appendix D: Transcript of Interviews Between Model and Hypnotist	70
Appendix E: HAT Simulator Instructions	77
Appendix F: Pre HAT Instructions	78
Appendix G: HAT Auditory Procedure	79
Appendix H: HAT Questionnaire	90
Appendix I: HAT Procedure and Scoring Instructions	95
Appendix J: HAT Hypnotic Response Rating Scale	97
Appendix K: HAT Debriefing Form	98
Appendix L: CSTP Simulation Instructions	99

Controversy exists over whether hypnotizability is a stable trait or a modifiable skill. Trait theorists consider hypnotizability to be a stable characteristic of the individual (e.g., Hilgard, 1965). Contemporary trait theorists acknowledge the influence of social psychological variables on hypnotizability levels, nonetheless, they consider these variables to play a secondary role to stable dissociative abilities (Bowers, 1976; Perry, 1977).

The grounds for viewing hypnotizability as a trait stem from three main lines of evidence. These include the high re-test reliability of hypnotizability scores using the same hypnotist, the high re-test reliability of hypnotizability scores using different hypnotists, and the high correlations over hypnotizability tests differing in induction procedures and item content (Perry, 1977).

Early attempts at modifying hypnotizability levels provided support for the trait perspective. Numerous training techniques such as EEG biofeedback, as well as trainings aimed at relaxation, meditation, and personal growth produced only small and often nonsignificant increments in hypnotizability levels which tended to dissipate over time (for reviews see Diamond 1977; Spanos 1986). Thus, when combined, the data concerning high test-retest correlations appeared to support the hypothesis that levels of hypnotizability remained stable, even in light of modification attempts. Perry (1977) also postulated that modification gains may be inflated by the type of instruments used in follow-up sessions. He pointed out that most hypnotizability scales (e.g., HGSHS:A and SHSS:A, B & C and CURSS) contain a fair number of common items.

Thus, similarities may lead subjects to become test wise to suggestions, further inflating hypnotizability gains.

Much evidence indicates that situational factors such as, the experience of the hypnotist (Hilgard, 1965; Kroger, 1963; Weitzenhoffer, 1957), the type of information given about hypnosis (i.e., whether favorable or unfavorable) (Cronin, Spanos, & Barber, 1971), and the manner in which hypnotic instructions are presented to the subjects (Barber & Calverley, 1964a, 1964b), may affect how well subjects initially respond to hypnosis. Consequently, trait theorists (e.g., Perry, 1977) argued that initial scores of hypnotizability should not be used as indices of hypnotizability since numerous extraneous variables inhibit subjects' potential to experience actual levels of hypnosis. On this basis, trait theorists have postulated the idea of plateau hypnotizability. Plateau hypnotizability is defined as, the level of hypnotizability attained after several hypnotic sessions following which no further increases in hypnotizability level occurs. Supposedly, repeated testing on hypnotizability scales will divert subjects of common fears and misconceptions. Consequently, plateau levels of hypnotizability purportedly reflect an underlying capacity to experience hypnosis more directly than do initial levels of hypnotizability. According to trait theorists, plateau hypnotizability must be reached before modification training is begun in order to reduce the incidence of inflated hypnotizability produced by artificially low baselines.

According to the social psychological perspective, the concept of plateau hypnotizability can be misleading (Spanos, 1986). Trait theorists adhere to the belief that hypnotizability is a stable

characteristic of the individual. At the same time, however, the trait theory hypothesizes that hypnotizability levels will increase over repeated exposures to hypnosis. If subjects' hypnotizability levels do in fact increase over repeated measures, then hypnosis ultimately should be described as non-stable. Contrary to the trait theory, however, levels in hypnosis are unlikely to increase following mere repeated exposure to hypnotic test situations (Barber, 1965; Hilgard, 1965; Spanos, Radtke, Hodgins, Bertrand, Stam & Moretti, 1983b; Spanos, Cobb & Gwynn, 1984). In fact, initial hypnotizability scores are found to correlate highly with plateau hypnotizability scores (Shor, Orne & O'Connell, 1962). Thus, the existence of plateau hypnotizability has not been substantiated by empirical evidence.

The Carleton Skills Training Package

In opposition to trait theorists, social psychological researchers (Diamond, 1972; Sarbin and Coe, 1972; Spanos, 1986) consider hypnosis to be a skill learned through experience. These investigators hypothesized that hypnotic responding could be modified through training and by changing subjects' attitudes. In 1986, Gorassini and Spanos developed a program called the Carleton Skills Training Package (CSTP). This program was designed to enhance hypnotizability through practice and training. The training package included three components, namely: information designed to facilitate positive attitudes and motivations toward hypnosis, information about imagery-based strategies which enabled subjects to experience the subjective effects of suggestions, and information designed to facilitate an active interpretation of the test demands. Subjects were informed that hypnotic responses involved an active

doing, rather than a passive happening. However, the idea that responses could be made to feel involuntary by imagery absorption was also instilled in the subjects. Numerous studies implementing the CSTP have demonstrated its effectiveness in modifying hypnotizability (e.g., Gfeller, Lynn & Pribble, 1987; Robertson, McInnis & St.Jean, 1991; Spanos, Burgess, Roncon, Wallace-Capretta & Cross, 1993; Spanos, Robertson, Menary, & Brett, 1986). Studies implementing the CSTP found that approximately 50 percent of trained subjects who pre-tested as low hypnotizables scored as high hypnotizables following training (e.g., Gfeller et al., 1987; Gorassini and Spanos, 1986; Spanos, de Groh and De Groot, 1987; Spanos, Robertson et al., 1986; Spanos, Robertson, Menary, Brett and Smith, 1987). Within these studies, substantial gains were obtained on both behavioural and subjective dimensions of hypnotizability post-tests (e.g. Gfeller, Lynn, Pribble and Kvinge, 1985; Gorassini and Spanos, 1986; Spanos et al., 1985; Spanos et al., 1987). These gains were stable over multiple post tests and over time (e.g., Gorassini and Spanos, 1986; Spanos, Cross, Menary and Brett, 1988; Spanos, DuBreuil and Gabora, 1991; Spanos, Flynn and Niles, 1989-90), across varying hypnotizability scales (Gfeller et al., 1985, Gorassini and Spanos, 1986; Spanos, Flynn et al., 1989-90); and across novel test suggestions (Gfeller et al., 1985; Spanos et al., 1987; Spanos, Lush and Gwynn, 1989). Studies using the CSTP also showed skill-trained subjects to be comparable to untrained high hypnotizables on all dimensions of their hypnotizability post-tests (Burgess, DuBreuil, Jones and Spanos, 1990-91; Gfeller et al., 1985; Spanos, Cross et al., 1988).

Compliance and the CSTP

Recently, the reliability and validity of the widely used CSTP has been questioned (Bates, Miller, Cross and Brigham, 1988). Bates et al. (1988) used the CSTP to investigate: 1) whether increases in hypnotic responsiveness obtained at Carleton University could be replicated, 2) the influence of demand characteristics on hypnotizability gains, 3) the stability of hypnotizability gains (i.e., to make sure gains could not be accounted for in terms of plateau hypnotizability), and 4) whether initial gains would be maintained over time (four months post training). Subjects were assigned to one of three groups: subjects in group 1 were exposed to similar demands as the CSTP subjects in Spanos' experiments (i.e., replication group), subjects in group 2 were exposed to a revised version of the CSTP where the demand characteristics purportedly were removed from the training and post-test situations, and group 3 consisted of control subjects who did not receive training. Under these circumstances, the CSTP did increase hypnotic responsiveness in the replication group, but the gains were relatively modest and these gains were not maintained at follow up. Conversely, subjects in the experimental group (i.e., revised CSTP group) failed to show gains following training. It was argued that the demand characteristics of the CSTP may have influenced hypnotizability gains in the Spanos studies since subjects were explicitly told that the training should help them to become more responsive. Thus, it was concluded that hypnosis was not modifiable, rather that CSTP induced hypnotizability gains were mediated by compliance.

Examination of the study by Bates et al. (1988), revealed several factors that could account for the failure to attain large and sustained hypnotizability gains. To begin, these researchers indicated that the cultivation of rapport was discouraged by the experimenters. However, in the Carleton Laboratory, trainers are encouraged to develop rapport with subjects. Bates et al. (1988) hypothesized that the high rapport established between the experimenter and the subjects in the Carleton Lab induced compliance to the explicit demands of the experiment. In other words, under high rapport conditions, the subjects probably gave in to the demands and responded to suggestions, simply because they did not wish to offend or hurt the feelings of the experimenter. According to this hypothesis, the trained subjects did not experience actual subjective changes in response to the suggestions following training. Instead, they simply faked their behavioural responses in the absence of the corresponding subjective experiences (Burgess et al., 1990-91). Furthermore, Bates et al. (1988) found only small gains four months following training. This was not surprising, however, in light of the relatively small gains initially found following CSTP training.

Despite the arguments of Bates et al. (1988, see also Bates, 1990), much research suggests that demand characteristics, rapport and compliance are insufficient to explain gains in hypnotizability following CSTP training. In 1989, Spanos et al., designed a reporting-bias paradigm to directly assess compliance-induced responding that was independent of experiential change. Subjects were asked to rate the loudness of a tone on three separate trials, 10

seconds after its termination. The first tone was administered in order to establish baseline loudness scores. Prior to the second tone, subjects were administered an hypnotic suggestion for deafness. Significantly less loudness was reported by highly susceptible subjects on Trial 2 than on the baseline trial. The deafness suggestion was then cancelled and subjects were exposed to the same tone a third time. Following the third tone, but prior to reporting its loudness, subjects were administered an instruction designed to induce reporting bias (i.e., compliance) (e.g., you probably drifted into hypnosis on this last trial and heard very little of the tone). Subjects who were exposed to the compliance instruction after presentation of the third tone reported the tone as significantly less loud than subjects who were not given the instruction. The researchers concluded that the Trial 3 loudness reductions reported by subjects given the compliance instruction could only reflect an instruction induced reporting bias rather than actual differences in experienced loudness. These results, indicated that hypnotic responding was at least in part mediated by some form of compliance.

In 1990-91, Burgess et al. compared the responding of subjects who attained high hypnotizability without training (natural highs), CSTP subjects and low controls using the reporting-bias paradigm. The results were consistent with those of Spanos et al. (1989), in that the low controls reported the loudness of the three tones as equal and the natural highs responded to the deafness suggestion by reporting that the Trial 2 tone was less loud than the baseline trial tone. The natural highs also demonstrated a reporting bias effect by

rating the Trial 3 tone as significantly less loud than the baseline tone. In opposition to Bates' compliance hypothesis, however, CSTP subjects responded to the deafness suggestion on Trial 2 but failed to display a significant reporting bias on Trial 3. Thus, the CSTP subjects showed no more reporting bias than natural highs. Hence, the compliance hypothesis which states that CSTP subjects give in to social pressures by failing to report actual subjective experiences was not substantiated.

The Effect of Rapport on Skills Training

Bates et al., (1988) argued that high rapport in the training situation lead to compliance to the demands of the experiment. This part of the compliance hypothesis has also been seriously challenged. In a two part study Spanos, Flynn and Niles (1989-90) demonstrated that rapport facilitated hypnotizability gains when paired with the CSTP, but that rapport alone was insufficient to explain the gains in hypnotizability experienced by trained subjects. In the first experiment, two groups of subjects were exposed to equivalent levels of rapport (as indicated by their ratings of the experimenter). Those in one group were administered the CSTP, while those in the other were administered a training procedure that emphasized passivity and relaxation. Spanos et al. (1989-90), found that subjects in the passive training group failed to demonstrate increased levels of hypnotizability despite high levels of subject/trainer rapport. The CSTP subjects, however, exhibited substantial gains in hypnotizability. In a second experiment, subjects received either low subject/trainer rapport or high subject/trainer rapport. Both groups of subjects were exposed to the CSTP. At post test, subjects in the

low rapport group failed to show significant increases in hypnotizability, while those in the high rapport condition showed large gains. Spanos, Flynn et al. (1989-90) concluded that the effect of skill training was mediated by the level of subject/trainer rapport, however, rapport was not sufficient to explain post test hypnotizability gains.

The Real-Simulator Paradigm

It is generally agreed that hypnotic suggestions involve strong demands for appropriate responses. Moreover, the overt responses called for by most suggestions are easy to fake. Thus, it is difficult to assess the extent to which hypnotic responding is influenced by compliance to experimental demands as opposed to actual changes in subjective experience. In order to monitor compliant behaviour in hypnotic responding, Orne (1959) developed the real-simulator paradigm. Within this paradigm, low hypnotizables were administered instructions informing them that they were required to fool the experimenter into believing that they were excellent hypnotic subjects. The experimenter remained unaware as to subjects' actual hypnotizability levels. Orne (1959) initially assumed that subjects' hypnotic behaviour could not be faked well enough to fool experienced hypnotists. Contrary to this belief, however, he found that simulators imitated hypnotic responding well enough to fool the experts.

Spanos and Flynn (1989) used the real-simulator paradigm with the CSTP to examine the compliance hypothesis. Subjects were assigned to one of four groups: group 1 consisted of skill trained subjects; group 2 consisted of simulating subjects administered the

CSTP; group 3 consisted of simulating subjects who had not been administered the CSTP; and group 4 consisted of high hypnotizable controls. The instructions given to subjects in group 2 were designed to induce them to fake the behaviour of subjects who had been transformed by training into high hypnotizables. Subjects in the two simulating groups responded in a similar manner on all post test measures of hypnotizability. Contrary to the compliance hypothesis, simulators in both groups also tended to exceed the responding of both trained subjects and natural highs. Moreover, trained subjects tended to respond in a similar manner to natural highs. The researchers concluded that compliance (i.e., faking) could not fully account for the increases in hypnotizability levels displayed by trained subjects.

Complete versus Partial Skills Training. Spanos and colleagues identified the interpretational component of the CSTP as essential to the success of modification training. Spanos, et al. (1986), hypothesized that hypnotizability gains would not be found following CSTP training if the interpretational information was removed from the package. Without this information, it was hypothesized that subjects would fail to understand their role in the hypnotic test situation. The researchers assigned subjects to either a complete CSTP group or to a partial CSTP group. Subjects in the partial group were not given any interpretational information about hypnosis (i.e. that suggestions involve an active doing as opposed to a passive happening but at the same time that responses to suggestions can be made to feel involuntary). However, subjects in both conditions were exposed to strong demands for enhanced hypnotizability. Only the

subjects administered the complete CSTP showed increases in hypnotizability levels following training. Thus, these findings also suggest that compliance alone is insufficient to explain training-induced hypnotizability gains.

In response to the findings of this study, Bates (1990) argued that the differences in hypnotizability between complete and partial CSTP subjects could be accounted for by the differing demands of each condition. Bates' (1990) hypothesis predicts that the behaviour of partial CSTP simulators should parallel that of partial CSTP subjects not instructed to fake. In order to test this hypothesis, Spanos, Wallace-Capretta, Burgess, DuBreuil, Liddy and Cross (1993) administered the CSTP to four groups of low hypnotizable subjects. Subjects in the first group received the complete CSTP, subjects in the second group received the partial CSTP, subjects in a third group were simulators administered the complete CSTP, and subjects in a fourth group were simulators administered the partial CSTP. Subjects in a fifth group were low hypnotizable controls. As predicted, the post test responding of non simulating complete CSTP subjects was significantly higher than that of the nonsimulating partial CSTP subjects. Contrary to Bates (1990), however, subjects in both the complete and partial CSTP simulation groups failed to differ in their responding. Furthermore, the post test responding of both simulating groups tended to exceed that of the complete CSTP nonsimulators on all measures of hypnotizability. In short, both the partial and complete CSTP contain strong and equivalent demands for compliance. Consequently, the failure of the partial nonsimulators to display high hypnotizability following training

cannot be explained in terms of exposure to only weak compliance demands. Instead, Spanos, Wallace-Capretta et al. (1993), concluded that subjects in the partial CSTP group who were not exposed to the crucial interpretational component of the training procedure did not learn how to generate the subjective and behavioural responses called for by the suggestions. As a result, these subjects did not respond to the post test suggestions since doing so would violate demands for honesty. Thus, contrary to Bates (1990) argument, subjects in the partial CSTP group in fact ignored the compliance demands and instead failed to exhibit high hypnotizability despite those demands.

Surreptitious Observation of Compliant Responding. Kirsch, Silva, Carone, Johnston and Simon (1989), addressed the issue of compliant responding using the real-simulator paradigm in a surreptitious observational study. Two post-tests of hypnotizability were administered to two groups of subjects (one group of high hypnotizable subjects and one group of low hypnotizable subjects instructed to simulate the behaviour of highly hypnotized subjects). Subjects were informed that the purpose of the study was to determine whether people became more deeply hypnotized while alone, as opposed to when the experimenter was present. In the first post test, subjects were administered a taped hypnotizability test while alone in the experimental room. Unbeknownst to the subjects, however, their responses were surreptitiously taped via hidden video camera. In the second post test, subjects were administered the same hypnotizability test, but in the presence of the experimenter. Simulators were significantly less responsive to

suggestions when unaware of being observed. On the other hand, non simulating subjects did not behave differently in the experimenter absent and experimenter present conditions. Thus, Kirsch et al. (1989) concluded that compliance to experimental demands could not be considered the sole determinant of hypnotic responses elicited by highly hypnotizable subjects.

Spanos, Burgess, Roncon, Wallace-Capretta and Cross (1993), also addressed the compliance hypothesis in a surreptitious observation study using the real-simulator paradigm. This study replicated and extended that by Kirsch et al. (1989). Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993), surreptitiously videotaped and compared the responding of four groups of subjects. The videotapes were viewed by two independent judges in order to yield two scores, namely the frequency of overt responding to the hypnotic suggestions and the degree to which subjects failed to adopt the hypnotic role. The groups consisted of: 1) subjects administered skills training using the CSTP, 2) high controls, 3) simulators instructed to fake responding as highly hypnotized subjects and 4) low hypnotizable controls. All of the subjects were tested for hypnotizability using the Hypnotic Aptitude Test (HAT) (Botto, Osborne and Brett, 1980), both while alone and while the experimenter was present. According to the compliance hypothesis, skill trained subjects fake hypnotic responding, in order to please the experimenter. Thus, based on the compliance hypothesis, one would expect similar responding from the skill trained and simulating subjects during the experimenter absent condition. In opposition to the compliance hypothesis, however, skill trained subjects behaved differently from simulating

subjects during the experimenter absent condition. In fact, skill trained subjects performed in a manner similar to high hypnotizable controls, both while alone and when the experimenter was present. Moreover, skill trained and high hypnotizables subjects tended to respond highly to suggestions both while alone and while the experimenter was present. Conversely, simulators exhibited lower levels of hypnotic responding when alone than during the experimenter present condition. Viewing of the videotapes also revealed that subjects in the simulation group failed to adopt the hypnotic role (i.e., role incongruity). In fact, an analysis of this measure revealed a significant difference across the groups. Contrary to Bates' (1990) compliance hypothesis, subjects in the simulation group scored significantly higher on role incongruity than both the CSTP and high hypnotizable subjects. Thus, Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993), concluded that compliant responding was insufficient to explain the increased responsiveness exhibited by CSTP subjects.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed study was to replicate and extend the study by Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993), the only difference being that all of the simulating subjects were administered the CSTP. Bates (1990) argued that simulators might respond differently than skill trained subjects because the simulators have not been exposed to the demands of the CSTP. With respect to the Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993) study, this hypothesis suggests that CSTP training may have sensitized subjects to cues indicating that they were being observed in the experimenter absent condition. The present study addressed this issue by administering the CSTP to both low hypnotizable

subjects instructed to fake behaving like highly hypnotizable subjects (simulators) and to low hypnotizable subjects not given any instructions (standard skill trained subjects).

HYPOTHESES

It was hypothesized that skill-trained subjects would learn to develop the requisite behaviours and experiences called for by hypnotic suggestions. It was expected that both the natural high hypnotizables and the skill-trained subjects would respond equally and to a high degree to the suggestions, regardless of the presence or absence of the experimenter. In addition, it was predicted that the self ratings of behaviour of the natural high hypnotizable and CSTP subjects would correspond to their actual behaviour as videotaped and that these subjects would adopt the hypnotic role throughout the entire experiment. In contrast, it was predicted that the simulators would respond only when the experimenter was present, regardless of the fact that they had been administered the CSTP. It was also anticipated that these subjects would display behaviour that was incongruent with hypnotic responding while alone in the experimental room.

METHOD

Subjects

Forty Carleton University undergraduates (aged 17 years and older) volunteered to participate in this study. These subjects pre-tested on the objective dimension of the Carleton University Responsiveness to Suggestion Scale (CURSS:O), as either low hypnotizables (scores 0-2) or high hypnotizables (scores 5-7). Subjects received course credit for their participation.

The Surreptitious Observation Design and the HAT

All of the subjects participated in the final session of the study which consisted of two post-tests of the Hypnotic Aptitude Test (HAT; see appendices G to K). The HAT is an hypnotic susceptibility test of approximately 25 minutes in duration, and includes an audio-taped hypnotic induction procedure and six suggestions. However, the amnesia suggestion (forgetting their mother's first name) was omitted in this study because this suggestion involves leaving a written record that could be observed by the experimenter.

Procedure

The 30 low hypnotizables were randomly assigned to three conditions. Those in one group underwent the CSTP in one session and the HAT in a second session. Those in a second condition were administered simulation instructions before CSTP administration and again before HAT administration. Those in a third group were controls administered the HAT without prior administration of the CSTP. The 10 high hypnotizables underwent the HAT twice without preliminaries.

Part One

A group of 10 low hypnotizables were administered a skill-training session using the CSTP (see Appendices A to D). The CSTP takes approximately one and a half hours to be administered. It is individually administered and consists of 3 components: 1) information aimed at enhancing attitudes towards hypnosis by dispelling myths and misconceptions about it 2) an emphasis on the importance of becoming involved in one's imaginings and 3) interpretational information which explains that hypnotic responding

is an active doing as opposed to a passive happening. This information was provided both by the experimenter and by a video-taped model who responded successfully to suggestions, and then explained the interpretation that guided her responding. Both the experimenter and the video-taped model indicated that suggested responses do not just happen, but must instead be enacted. However, an emphasis was placed on the idea that enacted responses could be made to feel involuntary through absorption in suggestion-related imaginings. In the final phase of training, subjects were given four new suggestions which were neither preceded by interpretational information nor followed by feedback. Subjects who underwent skill-training were post-tested on the HAT on two successive trials (part two) in order to obtain an index of their hypnotizability gain.

A second group of 10 low hypnotizables were administered a modified version of Orne's (1959) simulating instructions (see Appendix E & L). These subjects were administered a skill-training session using the CSTP (see Appendices A-D). They were also told that, in this session, they were to fake their way through the CSTP training and later post tests by behaving like a low hypnotizable who becomes highly hypnotizable after training. These subjects were also administered two HAT post-tests (part two).

A third group of 10 low hypnotizables (low controls) also received two HAT post-tests but they were not administered the CSTP.

Finally, a fourth group of 10 highly hypnotizable subjects participated in this study. These subjects were not administered the CSTP, however, they did participate in the two final HAT sessions.

Part Two

Within six weeks of previous testing, subjects in all four groups of the experiment attended a follow up session involving two successive trials of the HAT.

Immediately preceding the second part of the experiment, low hypnotizables in the simulating condition were given the instructions to simulate their hypnotic responding.

Subjects were then brought to the experimental room, where they were greeted by the second experimenter, who was kept unaware of the subject's group membership. The second experimenter then provided each subject with details about the two post-test trials (see Appendix F). Subjects were then told that the second part of the study was designed to monitor whether people respond differently while alone as opposed to when an experimenter is present. Thus, subjects were administered the same tape-recorded hypnotic induction and suggestions twice, first while alone and then again with the experimenter present. It was explained that the tape-recorded induction and suggestions would last for about 25 minutes, and that at its conclusion, the experimenter, who would knock before entering, would replay the tape and observe their responses.

After these instructions, the tape player was started, and the experimenter left the room. At the conclusion of the tape, subjects completed a questionnaire designed to assess the extent to which they behaviourally and subjectively experienced the suggestions.

The experimenter then entered the room and replayed the tape. Following the tape, the subjects were given another similar questionnaire to assess their experiences of the suggestions.

Both sessions were videotaped via hidden video-camera, and the subjects' responses were rated by two external judges, both of whom were kept naive as to group membership.

Dependent Variables

HAT Self Scores: Each individual was given an objective self score for each administration of the HAT (Appendix H). The objective score is obtained from question #1 for the five items. If A is circled, the individual receives 2 points. If B is circled, the individual receives 1 point. No points are given for C. The total objective score ranges from 0 to 10.

HAT Judges Scores: Two independent judges rated subjects' overt responding to the HAT suggestions during the two administrations of the HAT (Appendix J). The extent to which the subjects responded to each of the five suggestions was rated from 2 to 0. Subjects received a score of 2 if they successfully responded to the suggestion. A score of 1 was given to subjects who only partially responded to the suggestion. No points were given to subjects who either made no attempt to perform the overt behaviour or who failed to respond successfully to the suggestion.

Role Incongruity: The frequency and extent to which subjects enacted role incongruent behaviour during the hypnotic induction and test suggestions of the HAT was rated by two independent judges. The behaviour of the subjects during this phase of HAT administration was monitored via observation of the videotapes.

Examples of role incongruous behaviours included: fixing one's clothing, yawning, looking around the room, magazine reading, scratching, nose picking, nose flicking, underarm smelling, talking, and eye opening.

RESULTS

HAT and the Treatment Groups Effect

A 4 x 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA was used to analyze HAT scores. The analysis included one between subjects variable (the four treatment groups: low controls, CSTP skill trained subjects, high controls and simulators) and two within-subjects variables (the two ratings: judge ratings and self ratings, and the two HAT intervals: experimenter absent and experimenter present). The three way treatments x ratings x interval interaction was significant, $F(3,36)=4.58$, $p < .01$. The ANOVA summary table is given in Table 1 and the corresponding means are in Table 2. These results are displayed in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

The three way interaction was analyzed further in terms of two 2-way group x rating simple interactions, one for the experimenter absent condition and the other for the experimenter present condition. The group x ratings simple interaction in the experimenter absent condition was significant, $F(3,36)=7.07$, $p < .01$. This interaction was broken down further by examining the simple main effects of judge and self ratings at each level of group.

There were no significant differences between the judge and the self ratings on the HAT for the low control, high control or CSTP treatment group subjects. Conversely, the self ratings of subjects in the simulation group during the experimenter absent condition of the

TABLE 1
ANOVA Summary Table for Groups: Judges' and
Self Scores of HAT at Experimenter Absent
and Experimenter Present

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
Group	565.52	3	188.51	12.17	p<.001
Within Cells	557.58	36	15.49		
Interval	18.91	1	18.91	4.57	p <.05
Group X Interval	27.57	3	9.19	2.22	n.s.
Within Cells	148.78	36	4.13		
Ratings	5.26	1	5.26	1.61	n.s.
Group X Ratings	72.62	3	24.21	7.42	p <.001
Within Cells	117.38	36	3.26		
Interval X Ratings	26.41	1	26.41	9.00	p <.01
Group X Interval X Ratings	40.27	3	13.42	4.58	p <.01
Group X Ratings @ Exp. absent	65.70	3	21.90	7.07	p <.01
Group X Ratings @ Exp. present	2.14	3	0.71	<1	n.s.
Group @ Exp. present Ratings @	451.04	3	150.35	48.55	p <.01
Exp. present Pooled Error	0.31	1 72	0.31 3.10	<1	n.s.
Ratings @ Lows @ Exp. absent	2.45	1	2.45	<1	n.s.
Ratings @ CSTP's @ Exp. absent	2.45	1	2.45	<1	n.s.
Ratings @ Highs @ Exp. absent	0	1	0	<1	n.s.
Ratings @ Sims. @ Exp. absent	105.80	1 72	105.80 3.10	34.16	p <.01
Pooled Error Group @ Judges' ratings @ Exp. absent	134.60	3	44.87	4.87	p <.01
Group @ Self ratings @ Exp absent	118.20	3	39.40	4.28	p <.01
Pooled Error		49	9.21		
Within Cells	105.58	36	2.93		

Note: Sims.=Simulators;
Interval=Experimenter absent/experimenter present

TABLE 2
Mean HAT Scores for Low Control, CSTP, High Control
and Simulating Subjects in the Experimenter Absent
and Experimenter Present Conditions.

Group	Exp Absent				Exp Present			
	S		J		S		J	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
LOW	4.20	3.12	3.50	2.80	2.80	2.97	2.60	3.06
CSTP	7.70	2.11	7.00	2.83	8.00	2.11	7.80	1.87
HIGH	7.80	2.25	7.80	1.75	7.20	2.53	7.60	1.96
SIMS	8.70	1.418	4.10	4.10	8.60	1.43	8.60	0.88

NOTE: n = 10/grp
S = self ratings
J = judge's ratings

Figure 1
4x2x2 Mixed ANOVA (Group by Ratings by Interval Interaction)

Figure 2
4x2x2 Mixed ANOVA (Group by Ratings by Interval Interaction)

HAT were significantly higher than those ratings made by the judges, $F(1,36)=34.16, p < .01$. Thus, these results reveal that the subjects in the low control, CSTP treatment and high control groups were honest and accurate in reporting their responses during the experimenter absent condition, whereas simulating subjects tended to falsely report that they responded to more of the suggestions than they actually did.

Next, the simple main effects of group at each level of the ratings was assessed. An examination of the judges ratings during the experimenter absent condition revealed significant differences across the four groups, $F(3,49)=4.87, p .01$. Post hoc comparisons using Fisher's Least Significant Difference test indicated that skill trained subjects (CSTP group) ($M=7.00, SD=2.83$) and high controls ($M=7.80, SD=1.75$) did not differ in their responding while alone. Furthermore, while alone, subjects in both the high control and CSTP groups responded significantly higher than both the low controls ($M=3.50, SD=2.76$) and the simulating subjects ($M=4.10, SD=4.91$). Subjects in the latter two groups failed to differ significantly from one another.

The simple main effect of group for self ratings was also significant, $F(3,49)=4.28, p < .01$. Post hoc comparisons of the self ratings using Fisher's Least Significant Difference test indicated that the ratings made by subjects in the low control condition ($M=4.20, SD=3.12$) were significantly lower than the self ratings of the subjects in the CSTP ($M=7.70, SD=2.11$), high control ($M=7.80, SD=2.25$) and simulation groups ($M=8.70, SD=1.42$). In other words, while alone, the subjects in the low control group reported overtly responding to

fewer of the suggestions of the HAT than did the subjects in the CSTP, high control and simulating treatment groups. No other significant differences were found across the groups.

The group $\times$ ratings simple interaction in the experimenter present condition did not attain significance, although the simple main effect for the groups was significant, $F(3,72)=48.55$, $p < .01$. Post hoc comparisons using Fisher's Least Significant Difference test revealed that the low controls ($M=2.70$, $SD=3.09$) had significantly lower scores on the HAT while in the room with the experimenter than the three remaining groups, high controls ($M=7.40$, $SD=2.11$), CSTP's ($M=7.90$, $SD=1.99$) and simulators ($M=8.85$, $SD=1.15$). No other significant differences were found across the groups.

Role Incongruity

When role incongruity scores were examined, there were extreme scores, especially in the high hypnotizable group. Therefore, instead of using a parametric analysis, we classified subjects as either having one or no instances of role incongruous behaviour. An analysis of these data using Chi Squared revealed significant differences to exist across the four groups. This analysis revealed that simulators enacted more role incongruous behaviour than subjects in the three remaining groups who consequently did not differ from one another. The frequencies of role incongruous behaviour for the four groups are presented in Table 3 and displayed in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Frequency of Role Incongruous Behaviour Exhibited By Groups

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study provide further support for the hypothesis that CSTP training cannot be explained solely in terms of compliance. In conjunction with past findings, the present findings demonstrated that CSTP-induced increases in hypnotizability result from a combination of factors. To begin, compliance research has emphasized the similarity in hypnotic responding of CSTP and high hypnotizable subjects. Using the reporting-bias paradigm, Burgess et al. (1990-91) documented that CSTP subjects respond in a similar manner to natural high hypnotizables. CSTP subjects administered a suggestion for reporting bias did not exhibit any more loudness reduction of a Trial 3 tone than did high hypnotizable subjects. Thus, the compliance hypothesis which states that CSTP subjects simply give in to social pressures by faking behaviour and misreporting their actual subjective experiences was not substantiated.

The success of the CSTP has also been linked to the degree of rapport established between the experimenter and the subject. Recall the demonstration by Spanos, Flynn et al. (1989-90) that rapport facilitated gains in hypnotizability although it was insufficient to account fully for these gains. Under equivalent levels of rapport, subjects administered a passive training procedure failed to match increases in hypnotizability experienced by CSTP subjects. In a second experiment, CSTP subjects exposed to high levels of rapport showed significantly greater increases in hypnotizability than subjects in a low rapport CSTP group. Thus, rapport worked in

conjunction with CSTP skills training to create increases in hypnotizability levels.

Research adopting Orne's (1959) real-simulator paradigm has also tended to disconfirm Bates' (1988, 1990) compliance hypothesis. According to Bates, simulators cannot be used to validate the success of CSTP training since simulators have not been exposed to the CSTP. With this theory in mind, Spanos and Flynn, (1989) compared a standard group of CSTP subjects with two groups of simulators (one group administered the CSTP and another group not exposed to the training procedure). Contrary to Bates (1990), subjects in the two simulation groups failed to differ in their responding at post test. Furthermore, standard CSTP subjects exhibited responding that was different from subjects in the two simulation groups.

Research concerned with pinpointing the critical components of the CSTP also provided evidence against Bates' (1989, 1990) compliance hypothesis. Recall the study by Spanos et al. (1986) where subjects in a partial CSTP group (i.e., interpretational component of the CSTP removed), who were exposed to equivalently strong demands for enhanced hypnotizability as standard CSTP subjects, failed to show the significant increases in hypnotizability exhibited by subjects in the latter group. As predicted, the removal of the interpretational component of the training procedure inhibited partial CSTP subjects from experiencing the hypnotic suggestions as these subjects were not instructed how to become involved in their imaginings. As a result, the researchers concluded that the interpretational component of the CSTP was necessary for successful skills training to occur (Spanos et al., 1986).

In response to these findings, Bates (1990) hypothesized that increases in hypnotizability exhibited by complete CSTP subjects indeed resulted from compliance to the demands of the experiment and that partial CSTP subjects did not respond highly to the suggestions because they were not exposed to the same demands as the complete CSTP subjects. This hypothesis predicts that the behaviour of nonsimulating subjects in a partial CSTP group would parallel the behaviour of simulating partial CSTP subjects since these simulators would not be exposed to all of the demands necessary to fake successful completion of the CSTP.

In order to address this issue, Spanos, Wallace-Capretta et al. (1993) compared the hypnotic responding of simulators administered the complete and partial CSTP with nonsimulating subjects administered the complete and partial CSTP. No differences in responding between the two simulation groups emerged at post test. Moreover, both groups of simulating subjects responded to significantly more of the post test suggestions than the nonsimulating complete CSTP subjects who in turn showed substantially greater increases in hypnotizability than the nonsimulating partial CSTP subjects. Thus, contrary to Bates (1990), the post test hypnotizability increases of simulating subjects administered either the partial or complete CSTP were the same, indicating that the demands for heightened responsiveness remained following the removal of the interpretational component. With this finding in mind, Spanos, Wallace-Capretta et al. (1993) concluded that the differences between partial and complete nonsimulating CSTP subjects could not

be accounted for in terms of the exposure of the two groups to different levels of demand for enhanced hypnotizability.

The surreptitious observation paradigm has enabled opponents of the compliance hypothesis to further demonstrate differences in the behaviours of simulators and CSTP subjects. Using this paradigm, Spanos, Burgess et al., (1993) found that simulators did not respond to hypnotic suggestions while alone in an experimental room. Conversely, the behaviour of CSTP subjects failed to differ significantly from that of high hypnotizable controls. The researchers concluded that CSTP training could not be explained entirely in terms of compliance to the demands of the training since, the CSTP subjects, like natural high hypnotizable subjects, continued to respond to suggestions when unaware of being observed .

In response to these findings, proponents of the compliance hypothesis might argue that skills training may have sensitized CSTP subjects to cues indicating that they were being watched while alone in the room, hence causing them to make the overt responses to the suggestions. Since simulators in the Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993) study were not exposed to skills training, they may not have become sensitized to the same cues. The present study addressed this concern by administering the CSTP to one group of simulating and one group of nonsimulating subjects. Subjects in these two groups, along with a group of high and low controls were administered the Hypnotic Aptitude Test (HAT) twice, once while alone and once with an experimenter present. Their responses were surreptitiously observed via hidden video camera. As in previous studies (i.e., Spanos, Burgess et al., 1993), the simulators in the present study,

failed to adopt the hypnotic role while alone in the experimental room. Instead, these subjects responded as successfully trained subjects only during the experimenter present condition. As predicted, the skill trained subjects responded to suggestions in a manner that was indistinguishable from the high controls across the two intervals of the HAT. Subjects in these groups responded highly to the suggestions both while alone in the room and when the experimenter was present. Also as expected, the subjects assigned to the low control group responded to very few of the hypnotic suggestions of the HAT, and this behaviour was consistent across the two intervals of the experiment. Once again, CSTP-induced hypnotizability gains did not result solely from compliance to experimental demands regardless of whether simulators were exposed to skills training.

In accordance with the surreptitious observation study of Kirsch et al. (1989), the simulating subjects in this study misdescribed the manner in which they had actually responded to the HAT when alone. These subjects reported successfully making the overt responses of the HAT while alone in the room. Viewing of the videotapes, however, revealed that they did not actually respond to the degree that they reported. On the other hand, subjects in the CSTP group, like those in the high control group accurately described their responses while alone. Subjects in these groups responded to suggestions as strongly when the experimenter was absent as when he was present, and subjects' self ratings in both sessions mirrored the ratings of the judges. Control subjects also reported their experiences accurately when alone. However, these subjects

responded to suggestions much less strongly than did CSTP and high control subjects. These findings are consistent with the social psychological hypothesis that skill trained subjects are not merely complying to the demands of the experiment and that hypnotizability is indeed a modifiable skill.

In an effort to replicate the findings of Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993), subjects in this study were rated on the frequency with which they exhibited role incongruent behaviour. Spanos, Burgess et al. (1993) developed a measure of role incongruity which involved assessing behaviours that indicated a lack of involvement in the hypnotic role (i.e., the extent to which subjects enacted behaviour that was not congruent with being deeply hypnotized). In the previous study simulators scored significantly higher than CSTP and high control subjects on measures of role incongruity. Furthermore, CSTP and high controls failed to differ significantly on the extent to which role incongruity was exhibited. The present study successfully replicated these findings. As in the previous study, the present simulating subjects exhibited significantly greater levels of role incongruous behaviour than CSTP and high control subjects while alone in the experimental room. Once again, CSTP-induced hypnotizability gains did not result solely from compliance to experimental demands. Thus, the results of this study further disconfirm the compliance hypothesis put forth by Bates and colleagues.

REFERENCES

- Barber, T.X. (1965). Measuring 'hypnotic-like' suggestibility with and without 'hypnotic induction'; psychometric properties, norms, and variables influencing response to the Barber Suggestibility Scale (BSS). *Psychological Reports*, 16, (Monograph Supplement 3-V16) 809-844.
- Barber, T.X. and Calverly, D.S. (1964a). An experimental study of 'hypnotic' (auditory and visual) hallucinations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 13-20.
- (1964b). Effect of E's tone of voice on 'hypnotic-like' suggestibility. *Psychological Reports*, 15, 139-144.
- Bates, B.L. (1990). Compliance and the Carleton Skills Training Program. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 7, 159-164.
- Bates, B.L., Miller, R.J., Cross, H.J., & Brigham, T.A. (1988). Modifying hypnotic suggestibility with the Carleton Skills Training Program, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 120-127.
- Botto, R.W., Osborne, L.W. & Brett, J.D. (1980, September). *A brief, multi-item, group assessment of hypnotizability: Preliminary findings*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal.
- Bowers, K.S. (1976). *Hypnosis for the Seriously Curious*. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole.
- Burgess, C.A., DuBreuil, S.C., Jones, B. & Spanos, N.P. (in press). Compliance and the modification of hypnotizability. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*.

- Cronin, D.M., Spanos, N.P., & Barber, T.X. (1971). Augmenting hypnotic suggestibility by providing favorable information about hypnosis. *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*, 13, 259-264.
- Diamond, M.J. (1972). The use of observationally presented information to modify hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 79, 174-180.
- Diamond, M.J. (1977). Hypnotizability is modifiable: An alternative approach. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 25, 147-166.
- Diamond, M.J., Steadman, C., Harada, D. & Rosenthal, J. (1975). The use of direct instructions to modify hypnotic performance: The effects of programmed learning procedures. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 84, 109-113.
- Gfeller, J., Lynn, S., & Pribble, W. (1987). Enhancing susceptibility: Interpersonal and rapport factors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 586-595.
- Gfeller, J., Lynn, S., Pribble, W., & Kvinge, D. (1985). Enhancing hypnotic susceptibility: interpersonal and rapport factors. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Gorassini, D.R. & Spanos, N.P. (1986). A social cognitive skills training program for the successful modification of hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1004-1012.
- Hilgard, E.R. (1965). *Hypnotic Susceptibility*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Hilgard, E.R. (1977). *Divided Consciousness*. New York: Wiley.
- Hilgard, E.R. (1989). Simulation, compliance and skill training in the enhancement of hypnotizability: Discussion Commentary. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 6(1), 9-11.
- Kirsch, I., Silva, C.E., Carone, J.E., Johnston, J.D., & Simon, B. (1989). The surreptitious observation design: An experimental paradigm for distinguishing artifact from essence in hypnosis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 98, 132-136.
- Kroger, W.S. (1963). *Clinical and experimental hypnosis: In medicine, dentistry and psychology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Orne, M.T. (1959). On the nature of hypnosis: Artifact and essence. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 277-299.
- Orne, M.T. (1979). On the simulating subject as a quasi-control group in hypnosis research: What, why, and how. In E. Fromm and R.E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in Research and New Perspectives*. New York: Aldine.
- Perry, C. (1977). Is hypnotizability modifiable? *The International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 25, 125-146.
- Robertson, L.A., McInnis, K., & St.Jean, R. (1991). Modification of hypnotic susceptibility using the Carleton Skills Training Program. A replication. Unpublished manuscript, University of Prince Edward Island.
- Sachs, L.B. (1971). Construing hypnosis as modifiable behaviour. In A. Jacobs and L.B. Sachs (eds.), *Psychology of Private Events*. New York: Academic Press.

- Sarbin, T.R. & Coe, W.C. (1972). *Hypnotic Behaviour: The Psychology of Influence Communication*. New York: Holt.
- Shor, R.E., Orne, M.T. & O'Connell, D.N. (1966). Validation and co-validation of a scale of self-reported personal experiences which predicts hypnotizability. *Journal of Psychology*, 53, 55-57.
- Spanos, N.P. (1982). A social psychological approach to hypnotic behaviour. In G. Weary & H.L. Mirel (Eds.), *Integrations of Clinical and Social Psychology*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Spanos, N.P. (1986). Hypnosis and the modification of hypnotic susceptibility: A social psychological perspective. In Peter L.N. Naish (Ed.), *What is Hypnosis? Current Theories and Research*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Spanos, N.P. (1990). More on compliance and the Carleton Skills Training Program. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 7, 165-170.
- Spanos, N.P., Burgess, C.A., Roncon, V., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Cross, P. (1993). Surreptitiously observed hypnotic responding in simulators and in skill-trained and untrained high hypnotizables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 391-398.
- Spanos, N.P., Cobb, P., & Gwynn, M.I. (1984). The Carleton University Responsiveness to Suggestion Scale: stability and reliability under conditions of individual administration. *Psychological Reports*, 54, 123-128.
- Spanos, N.P., Cross, W.P., Menary, E.P., Brett, P.J., & de Groh, M. (1987). Attitudinal and imaginal ability predictors of social

- cognitive skill-training enhancements in hypnotic susceptibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 379-398.
- Spanos, N.P., Cross, W.F., Menary, E. & Smith, J. (1988). Long-term effects of cognitive skill-training for the enhancement of hypnotic susceptibility. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 6, 1-8.
- Spanos, N.P., de Groh, M., & de Groot, H. (1987). Skill training for enhancing hypnotic susceptibility and word list amnesia. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 4, 15-23.
- Spanos, N.P., DuBreuil, S.C., Gabora, N.J. (1991). Four-month follow-up of skill-training-induced enhancements in hypnotizability. *Contemporary Hypnosis*, 8, 25-32.
- Spanos, N.P. & Flynn, D.M. (1989). Simulation, compliance and skill training in the enhancement of hypnotizability: Main Paper. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 6(1), 1-8.
- Spanos, N.P. & Flynn, D.M. (1989). Compliance, imaginal correlates and skill training: Author's Reply. *British Journal of Experimental and Clinical Hypnosis*, 6(1), 12-15.
- Spanos, N.P. Flynn, D.M. & Niles, J. (1989-90). Rapport and cognitive skill training in the enhancement of hypnotizability. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 245-262.
- Spanos, N.P., Lush, N.I., & Gwynn, M.I. (1989). Cognitive skill-training enhancement of hypnotizability: Generalization effects and trance logic responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 795-804.

- Spanos, N.P., Radtke, H.L., Hodgins, D.C., Bertrand, L.D., Stam, H.L. & Moretti, P. (1983b). The Carleton University Responsiveness to Suggestion Scale: Relationships with other measures of susceptibility, expectancies and absorption. *Psychological Reports*, 53, 723-734.
- Spanos, N.P., Radtke, H.L., Hodgins, D.C., Stam, H.L., & Bertrand, L.D. (1983). The Carleton University Responsiveness to Suggestion Scale: Normative data and psychometric properties. *Psychological Reports*, 53, 523-535.
- Spanos, N.P., Robertson, L.A., Menary, E.P., & Brett, P.J. (1986). Component analysis of cognitive skill training for the enhancement of hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 95, 350-357.
- Spanos, N.P., Robertson, L.A., Menary, E.P., Brett, P.J., & Smith, J. (1987). Effects of repeated baseline testing on cognitive-skill-training-induced increments in hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1230-1235.
- Spanos, N.P., Wallace-Capretta, S., Burgess, C.A., DuBreuil, S., Liddy, S., & Cross, P. (1993). The Modification of Hypnotizability utilizing the Carleton Skills Training Package and compliant responding. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University.
- Spanos, N.P., Warnock, S., & de Groot, H.P. (1990). Cognitive skill training, confirming sensory stimuli, and responsiveness to suggestions in subjects unselected for hypnotizability. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 24, 133-144.
- Weitzenhoffer, A.M. (1957). *General techniques of hypnotism*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

APPENDIX A

Modification Instructions

You have been chosen for this study because you have shown low susceptibility in a previous hypnosis session. We believe that people show low responsiveness to suggestions because they are not quite sure how they should be thinking or acting in response to suggestions. Research has shown that instruction and practice can significantly increase an individual's responsiveness. So today's session is a practice/training session.

The procedure is this: First you will hear a lengthy introduction to hypnosis. It will outline some of the myths and misconceptions of hypnosis. For example, hypnosis is not a trance state, there is no loss of control, no loss of consciousness. The person responding to suggestions is in complete control, very aware of his/her mind and body. In fact, the person who is responding hypnotically is probably more aware and more in control of directing his or her mind than at any other time during the day. The sleep suggestion in the "induction" is there to help people become calm and relaxed in order that they may concentrate. (May be some discussion on any of these myths, according to the subject.)

Following the taped introduction to hypnosis, you will hear an introduction to the first suggestion. There will be four suggestions presented in all. After each one is introduced, you will view a videotape of a subject responding to the suggestion. She has practiced the skill which you are going to learn today. You will notice that this tape is not of a spontaneous session such as this one.

Rather, it is a condensed presentation of many points which we wanted to communicate to you.

The subject on the videotape will be verbalizing her responses throughout the session so that you will know what kinds of things she is thinking about. You will not be expected to do this. Following this, you will see a short interview during which the major points will be clarified. Pay close attention to these points.

Then you will have an opportunity to practice responding to the suggestion yourself. In this way, we will work with four suggestions together, using the videotape as a model. At the very end of the session, after you have practiced the four suggestions, you will be given four different suggestions which will be presented one after the other. You will respond to this series without any instructions or coaching. This is your opportunity to demonstrate whatever skills you have acquired during the session in a spontaneous manner. Do you have any questions about the procedure?

Arm Rising Suggestion

EXPERIMENTER ROLLS THE AUDIO TAPE UNTIL THE LAST LINE OF THE ARM RISING SUGGESTION; "Here is the subject responding to the arm rising suggestion." THEN STOP THE AUDIO TAPE AND TURN ON THE VIDEO TO PLAY THE RESPONSE AND THE INTERVIEW FOR THIS SUGGESTION.

Discussion with Subject

You will notice that there are two parts involved in responding to any suggestion; the physical and the mental. For example, for the arm rising suggestion, the subject must physically raise her arm.

Some "thing" does not come along and raise it for her. However, it feels like it's going up by itself because of the mental imaginings.

You must concentrate on a mental image which is consistent with the suggestion, such as imagining that your arm is being pumped up with helium or whatever. Some people find that imagining balloons attached to their arm is a good image to work with. Others relate to that sensation you get when you are in the water and your arm floats upwards. Pick a mental image that you can relate to. One that you can work with. If you start with one type of mental imagining and find you cannot focus on it for the full length of the suggestion, feel free to incorporate another imagining.

The subject, you will notice, did not limit herself to the details provided by the suggestion. She elaborated upon the suggestion by thinking about the hose leading to the pump and the details of the pump itself. She mentions that she did not let criticisms or comments about what she was doing, arise. The mind can only attend to one thing at a time, and she kept it concentrated on the experience of the suggestion. Any inner verbalization must be in keeping with the suggestion, "It's light", etc., not "this is dumb" or "it's heavy."

Feedback between these mental and physical aspects reinforce each other. The physical movement of the arm rising reinforces the mental image which, in turn, reinforces the physical movement. The result is that there is a feeling of lightness and the feeling that it is going up by itself. You must make it feel as if it is going up by itself.

HELPFUL HINTS IF THE SUBJECT HAS TROUBLE

You will notice that as you take a deep inhalation your upper body moves. Try, if you are having trouble with beginning the physical movement, raising your arm with each breath, letting it rest on the exhalation and raising it more on the next inhalation. Deep breathing and relaxation are appropriate to a suggestion which involves lightness. Use a mental image that is familiar to you. Keep the arm loose, not tight or clenched. Otherwise, the feedback is of heaviness, etc. So pick an image to work with, I'll play the suggestion and you try it, using the things you have just seen and we have talked about. Sit back and close your eyes.

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE TAPE OF THE ARM RISING SUGGESTION. UNOBTRUSIVELY, THE EXPERIMENTER SCORES THE SUBJECT ON THE OBJECTIVE MEASURE. IF THE SUBJECT RAISES HIS/HER ARM MORE THAN SIX INCHES, THE SUBJECT PASSES THE OBJECTIVE ASPECT OF THE ITEM AND RECEIVES A "1". IF THE SUBJECT DOES NOT RAISE HIS/HER ARM MORE THAN SIX INCHES, THE SUBJECT FAILS THE OBJECTIVE ASPECT OF THE SUGGESTION, WILL GET A "0" AND WILL HAVE TO TRY IT AGAIN. AS SOON AS THE SUGGESTION IS OVER, THE EXPERIMENTER GIVES THE SUBJECT THE TWO-PAGE, TWO-QUESTION SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE ITEMS. NO TALKING WITH THE SUBJECT UNTIL THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN ANSWERED, SCORING ON THE SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONS IS AS FOLLOWS:

THE SUBJECT MUST RESPOND TO BOTH QUESTIONS WITH A (c) OR (d) IN ORDER TO PASS THE SUBJECTIVE ITEMS. IN ORDER FOR THE SUBJECT TO MOVE ON TO THE NEXT SUGGESTION, HE/SHE MUST HAVE PASSED THE OBJECTIVE ITEM AS WELL AS BOTH SUBJECTIVE

QUESTIONS. A "0" ON THE OBJECTIVE WITH PASSES ON THE SUBJECTIVE DOES NOT ALLOW THE SUBJECT TO MOVE ON. CONVERSELY, A PASS ON EITHER OR BOTH SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN OVERALL PASS ON THE SUGGESTION UNLESS THE OBJECTIVE SCORE IS A "1". THIS SCORING PROCEDURE IS USED FOR EACH SUGGESTION DURING THE SESSION. THE SUBJECT MAY REPEAT EACH SUGGESTION ONLY ONCE.

IF THE SUBJECT MUST REPEAT THE SUGGESTION, THE EXPERIMENTER REINFORCES ANYTHING POSITIVE ABOUT THE SUBJECT'S RESPONSE. ASK WHAT MENTAL IMAGE THE SUBJECT USED, AND PERHAPS SUGGEST AN ELABORATION OR A DIFFERENT ONE. REITERATE THE MAJOR POINTS OF THE RESPONSE AND MAKE SURE THEY ARE CLEAR TO THE SUBJECT. EMPHASIZE STRONG CONCENTRATION AND INVOLVEMENT. CHECK VERBALIZATION FOR JUDGEMENTS OR CRITICISMS DURING THE RESPONSE. PERHAPS THE SUBJECT IS TRYING TOO HARD OR IS TOO RIGID. SOMETIMES, TOO MUCH EFFORT SERVES ONLY TO REMIND THE SUBJECT THAT THEY ARE UTILIZING SOME STRATEGIES AND THEREFORE DOES NOT ALLOW THAT SENSE OF "INVOLUNTARINESS" TO DEVELOP.

IF THE SUBJECT MUST REPEAT THE SUGGESTION, ROLL THE SECOND TAPE (WHICH ONLY HAS THE PRACTICE SUGGESTIONS ON IT), SCORING PROCEDURE IS THE SAME AS THE ABOVE. THE SUBJECT GOES ON TO THE SECOND SUGGESTION REGARDLESS OF THE SCORE. IF THE SUBJECT DID NOT IMPROVE, TELL THEM IT IS A DIFFICULT ONE AS IT GOES AGAINST GRAVITY, AND THAT MOST PEOPLE FIND THE NEXT SUGGESTION MUCH EASIER.

Hand Lock Suggestion

ROLL THE AUDIO TAPE UNTIL THE VOICE SAYS: "She will verbalize aloud the appropriate kind of thoughts and imaginings one should have during the suggestions." THEN PLAY THE VIDEO OF THE SUBJECT RESPONDING AND THE INTERVIEW.

Discussion with the Subject:

This suggestion is easier for a lot of subjects because it is easier to enter into the physical part of the suggestion. As you were told on the tape, the challenge to try to pull your hands apart is part of the suggestion. By the time you are asked to try to pull your hands, you should be so involved in your imagining, it will feel as if you really cannot pull them apart. Also, as you were told for the first suggestion, you are not limited to using the image given in the suggestion. If you find it easy to imagine your hands welded like two cold blocks of steel, that is fine. But if you find this a difficult situation to imagine, feel free to imagine anything you like as long as it is consistent with the idea that you cannot get your hands apart. Some people have found it useful to imagine that their hands are glued together or bound together by heavy string or chains.

When asked to try to pull your hands apart, you can reinforce your mental image by pressing down on your fingers and pushing on your palms as your hands are clasped together (demonstrate for subject). This way, you can actually make a moderate physical effort to pull your hands apart, while ensuring that they will not actually come apart. The pressure of the pulling/pushing of the fingers and palms creates a tension that easily reinforces a "can't pull apart" feeling. Do not try too hard though, because you want it to seem that this is not happening through any effort on your part. In other

words, you want to seem as if you are trying, but somehow just cannot get them apart. If you have ever tried to move something impossibly heavy or stuck, you will know the feeling of "can't do it" and be able to bring that feeling to the hand lock suggestion. The inner dialogue should be along these lines; "It's stuck", "I can't pull them apart", etc. Okay, I will play the suggestion now. By the way, you may put your hands on your lap if you want.

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE TAPE WITH THE SUGGESTION AND SCORES ACCORDING TO OBJECTIVE "PASS" (1) (IF THE HANDS DID NOT COME APART) OR "FAIL" (IF THE HANDS DID COME APART). AFTER THE SUGGESTION IS OVER, GIVE THE SUBJECT THE TWO QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE DURING THIS SUGGESTION SCORE THESE AS IN THE ARM RISING SUGGESTION.

Book Suggestion

PLAY THE INTRODUCTION ON THE AUDIO TAPE AND THEN AT "pay careful attention" STOP IT AND TURN ON THE VIDEOTAPE FOR THE RESPONSE AND THE INTERVIEW. STOP VIDEO.

Discussion with the Subject:

For this suggestion, it is important to embellish the imagining with as many details as you can. First, pick a place on the table where you are going to imagine the book to be. Once your eyes are open, just keep looking at that place on the table. Of course, you will not see a real, concrete book, but in your mind's eye you can trace the outline of where the book would be if it was really there. Imagine what angle it's on. Is it even with the edge of the table? Off to the side? And so forth. Imagine where you will be moving it with your hand. Think about the size of the book, how much space it

would take up on the table, what colour it is, what the title looks like and where it is on the book, is the book paperback or hard cover? etc.

Have you got a desk at home or in the library where you habitually study? If so, maybe you would like to imagine that you are sitting there studying and that you are going to change to another topic, so you want to move this book to the side.

Pick a book you know, something you are familiar with. If you want, you can imagine that you brought it with you and you have just placed it on the table. You may use a magazine, if you wish. Also, some subjects have said that a simple cover is best and they can "see" it more clearly than one with a complex design or colour scheme.

Make sure that you have the image firmly in your mind's eye before you open your eyes. You may experience a slight "jolt" or disconcerted feeling when you first open your eyes, but just calmly continue to hold the image and "build" it on the table in front of you. It is important that you involve yourself with the suggestion, without distraction, for the whole time. If the image fades or the concentration wanes, just bring it back by working with one of the details of the book. Like the other suggestions, this one involves a physical movement, that of pushing the book aside. Even if you are having difficulty imaging the book there, follow through on the physical motion of pushing the book aside. While you are doing this, imagine what the book would feel like against your hand and how much pressure it would take to push it aside.

HELPFUL HINTS: IF THE SUBJECT HAS TROUBLE WITH THIS SUGGESTION, FOR EXAMPLE, THEY SAY THEY CANNOT SEE THE BOOK, TELL THEM THAT THIS SITUATION IS SOMEWHAT LIKE THAT OF CHILDREN PLAYING HOUSE IN THE BACKYARD. THEY IMAGINE THAT THE LAWN IS DIVIDED INTO DIFFERENT ROOMS OF THE HOUSE AND THEY ALL TAKE CARE TO WALK THROUGH THE "DOORWAYS" INSTEAD OF THE "WALLS", EVEN THOUGH EVERYONE WOULD READILY ADMIT THAT THEY DON'T SEE WALLS OR DOORWAYS OR ROOMS. SIMILARLY, HERE YOU WANT TO BEHAVE AS IF THE BOOK YOU HAVE IN MIND IS REALLY THERE.

Now that you have a book in mind, sit back and relax. I am going to play the suggestion now.

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE SUGGESTION. THE SUBJECT PASSES THE OBJECTIVE ITEM IF HE OR SHE PUSHES THEIR HAND ACROSS THE TABLE. WITH PASSING THE SUBJECTIVE ITEMS, THE SUBJECT IS ALLOWED TO GO ON TO THE NEXT SUGGESTION. IF THE SUBJECT NEEDS A SECOND TRIAL, ASK: What book were you using? (maybe it's too vague or complex). What difficulty did you experience? Were you commenting on what you were doing? Were you able to "see" the book first, clearly, in your mind's eye?

Amnesia Suggestion

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE AUDIO TAPE FOR THE INTRODUCTION TO THE SUGGESTION UNTIL IT SAYS, "attend carefully to what she does". THEN ROLL THE VIDEOTAPE FOR THE DEMONSTRATION AND INTERVIEW WITH THE SUBJECT.

Discussion with the Subject:

If you want, you can do what the subject on the tape did and spend the whole time thinking of other things so that the memories of the suggestions will not come to mind. If any of them do pop into your thoughts, write it or them down right away and continue to distract yourself so that the other suggestions will not come back along with it.

If you find it difficult to distract yourself, you might want to try a different technique. You could try imagining that you are in the type of situation where you know someone's name, but when it comes time to introduce that person, you simply cannot remember it. Or you might imagine what it feels like to be writing an exam and are unable to recall the answer to a question you studied the night before. A good thing to do in this case is to look at the blank piece of paper to feel that certain vague and unfocused feeling. Some subjects find it useful to imagine that the suggestions are written on a blackboard. When the suggestion to forget is played, they then imagine that it is being erased. Any time they feel an urge to recall the suggestions, they just imagine that the blackboard is wiped clean and do not pursue the matter any further. When the amnesia suggestion is cancelled, they imagine the suggestions are being written on the board again. Some people find that music is a powerful distraction. Once they click into a song or a jingle, they are oblivious to any other.

Some people are able to just let their minds wander and need make little or no effort to distract themselves from focusing on the suggestions. They have things to think about, memories to contemplate, homework questions to consider, etc. Whatever

technique you decide to use, it is important that you make believe that you are doing nothing to make the suggestions go away, that it requires little effort. You want it to feel like you are trying to remember them, but just cannot. If your attention is on other things, it will feel as if the suggestions have "gone away". Okay, I am going to play the suggestion now. Sit back and relax.

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE SUGGESTION AND PROVIDES BLANK PAPERS TO THE SUBJECT AT THE APPROPRIATE TIMES. SCORE OBJECTIVE RESPONDING. AFTER THE SUGGESTION IS OVER, THE EXPERIMENTER GIVES THE SUBJECT THE SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONS. REINFORCE THE SUBJECT'S RESPONDING. IF THE SUBJECT FAILS THE SUGGESTION, FIND OUT WHAT THE DIFFICULTY IS AND MAKE SUGGESTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL RESPONDING.

The Test Suggestions:

Okay. Now I'm going to play the tape with four different suggestions on it. They will be presented without any discussion or dialogue between us. This is your chance to utilize the skills you have developed today. The suggestion will be introduced and there will only be enough time for you to respond. Just follow along and attend carefully to the suggestions. Afterwards, we will talk a bit more.

THE EXPERIMENTER PLAYS THE AUDIO TAPE. IT HAS A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCEDURE FOR THESE NEW TEST SUGGESTIONS AND THEN GOES RIGHT INTO THE FIRST ONE. THE EXPERIMENTER PROVIDES PAPER FOR THE AMNESIA SUGGESTION. THE EXPERIMENTER SCORES EACH ON THE OBJECTIVE MEASURE, AS

IT IS HAPPENING. AT THE END OF THE FOUR-ITEM TEST, THE EXPERIMENTER HANDS THE SUBJECT THE SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONS. ONCE AGAIN, NO TALKING WITH THE SUBJECT UNTIL HE OR SHE HAS COMPLETED ALL THE QUESTIONS. WHEN THE SUBJECT HAS ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS, REINFORCE HIS OR HER PARTICIPATION, IMPROVEMENT ETC. THEN SAY: that is the end of the session today. The skill you have practiced today may be utilized in other situations. As well, any time you are called upon to respond to suggestions, you should use the techniques that you have learned and worked with here.

THE EXPERIMENTER SCHEDULES FOR THE NEXT SESSION, WHICH IS THE POST-TEST OF SUSCEPTIBILITY.

APPENDIX B

Audio Training Information

Remember how in old movies the hypnotists would have the subject fixate on a dangling pocket watch? As the subject followed the watch with his or her eyes, the hypnotist would suggest repeatedly in a low voice something like: "You are becoming sleepy; your eyelids are getting heavier and heavier and are closing, closing completely; you want to go to sleep; you are falling, falling into a deep, deep sleep". In one form or another, these kinds of instructions are still presented by hypnotists to their subjects today. You may recall that in your last session in this lab, you were presented with these kinds of instructions, albeit without the watch. You were repeatedly told by the voice on the tape recorder that you were falling into a deep sleep.

It was once commonly believed that giving subjects repeated instructions to go to sleep would cause them to go into a hypnotic trance. When in this trance, the subject was believed to come under the direct control of the hypnotist. The hypnotist was believed to take over the hypnotized subject's will and thereby become able to command the subject's mind and body to do practically anything. The subject was thus viewed as an automaton or robot, who was fully subject to the commands of the hypnotist.

This view of hypnosis is one of the great misconceptions in the history of psychology. Subjects in a hypnotic session are, in fact, fully awake and are in full control of all their actions. The repeated instructions for sleep do not cause you to go into a "trance" in which you "lose control of your actions" and become a "robot". No such

hocus pocus is involved in hypnosis. Hypnosis has nothing whatsoever to do with any loss of consciousness, trances, or a loss of control. Far from involving a loss of control, hypnosis actually involves a skill that is within the full control of the individual. It is a skill that anyone can learn and master, if given proper instructions and enough practice. In this sense, it is no different than learning the skills required to ride a bicycle, to swim, or to solve mathematical problems. The repeated instructions for sleep simply serve the purpose of enabling you to relax and put your mind on learning the hypnotic skill.

Few people are ever taught the hypnotic skill, and as a consequence, few people are able to produce hypnotic responses. Asking the subject who has never learned the hypnotic skill to respond hypnotically is similar to asking a person who has never learned to swim, to swim the length of the pool. Clearly, the non-swimmer has first to learn how to swim before being able to swim the length of the pool. Similarly, the subject who has never learned the hypnotic skill has the first to learn this skill before being able to produce hypnotic responses.

In order to enable you to learn the hypnotic skill, I am going to show you exactly what this skill involves and then give you plenty of opportunity to practice it. Learning the hypnotic skill is fully within the capabilities of normal individuals provided they know just what it is that they must do. In fact, research shows that any well-adjusted person of your age is fully able to learn the hypnotic skill provided he or she puts forth sufficient effort. As in learning any new skill, learning this skill is completely within your control and is

quite rewarding to master. In addition, individuals who learn the hypnotic skill find it a very interesting experience.

What the hypnotic skill involves is that you make believe something. Before I describe this skill in more detail, let me give you an example. You are probably familiar with the Charlie Brown comic strip. In it, Charlie Brown's dog, Snoopy, is often pictured sitting on his doghouse wearing a helmet and a scarf, paws outstretched, and gritting his teeth. Snoopy gets deeply involved in a make-believe situation. He imagines himself to be in a situation in which he is a World War I flying ace in the air somewhere over Germany, in hot pursuit of the Red Baron. He gets so involved in his make-believe actions that, for the moment, he actually believes he's flying an airplane somewhere over Germany. He simply forgets that he's really a dog on a doghouse. It's plain to see that Snoopy is in total control of his actions.

Let us more carefully analyze what Snoopy is doing. First off, he himself creates an entire make-believe situation. He does this through the direct control of his imagination. He actively imagines such things as the clouds around him, his own airplane and that of the Red Baron's, the roar of the engines, and everything else that is part of such a situation. In short, through his imagination, in which he is in direct control, he creates an entire make-believe situation.

However, it is important to understand that the hypnotic skill involves more than simply imagining a particular situation. A further analysis of the Snoopy example will illustrate what I mean. He went one step further and actually became a part of that situation. He completely replaced the situation he was in formerly

with a new one. He let the "World War I" situation completely replace the one in which he was merely "a dog on a doghouse". This had the interesting effect of making the "World War I" situation seem real, because it was the only one to which Snoopy was directing his attention. According to modern psychology's definition of hypnosis, Snoopy was hypnotized because he was so preoccupied with his imaginings of the make-believe that he forgot they were make-believe.

This skill is therefore not unusual nor mysterious. It's a rather common occurrence and what is meant when someone is said to be "absorbed", or "deeply involved", or "really into" their thoughts and imaginings. This skill is, of course, totally within your control, for you can initiate or terminate it whenever you like. To further illustrate the degree of control you have in hypnosis, think of what young children are like when they play. Needless to say, they quite readily get involved in make-believe. Nonetheless, even children possess the ability to shift from the real to the imaginary world and back again whenever they like. For instance, when Mother beckons that supper is ready, a child easily shifts his or her attention from the make-believe world to the real world goal of satisfying his or her hunger.

It's worth noting that we never lose our skill at becoming deeply involved in our imaginings of make-believe. For one reason or another, however, we simply do not do it as much as children do. At any rate, you will not doubt be surprised at how good you are at this skill. Our research suggests that you will get better and better at it the more you get a chance to practice.

Now, what are you going to make-believe? You will not be asked to do things as extreme or as potentially embarrassing as being a World War I flying ace or a famous movie star. Instead, you will be asked to involve yourself in some simple make-believe actions of a non-embarrassing kind. Soon you will be presented with some suggestions, four in all, not much different from the ones you were presented with the last time you were in the lab. It is these suggestions that will provide you with the make-believe situation that you will involve yourself in.

The first suggestion you will be presented is an arm rising suggestion. It will inform you of exactly what it is you are to make believe. It will specifically tell you that your arm is like a hollow balloon being pumped up with helium, and that the helium being pumped in makes your arm so light that it rises into the air by itself. In response to this suggestion, you must do everything that is required of someone making believe such a thing: you must lift your arm up, and you must imagine that the arm is really a hollow balloon that is being pumped full of helium, and anything else you wish to imagine that is consistent with such a make-believe situation.

Of course your arm will not really go up by itself. You must raise it. However, you can make it feel like it is going up by itself by focusing on the make-believe situation that your arm is hollow and being filled with helium. As long as you focus in and elaborate on this make-believe situation and do not let yourself think about other things, the arm will feel like it is going up by itself.

You must become very deeply involved in the make-believe and actually make it seem real. Becoming involved requires that you

keep your attention only on the things the suggestion tells you to imagine. You must rivet your attention on the hollow arm, its lightness, the fact that it's going up by itself, and so on. Don't imagine or pay attention to anything that is unrelated to the make-believe situation. Attending strongly to imaginings of the make-believe situation only, will help prevent the possibility of irrelevant thoughts entering your mind and shaking you out of the make-believe world.

Before you are given an opportunity to respond to this suggestion, you will be shown a videotape of another subject responding to it. When this subject's responses were taped, she had already gone through a good deal of practice at responding to this suggestion and several others. I am presenting you her responses to give you a clearer idea on how properly to respond to this suggestion. When I roll the tape, you will see the subject, you will hear the arm rising suggestion being played in the background as she responds to it, and you will observe that the subject verbalizes many of her thoughts aloud. She was asked to do this as a means of illustrating to viewers, such as yourself, that all of her thoughts and imagining during the suggestion are on the make-believe situation, and on nothing else. (PLAY VIDEOTAPE OF MODEL)

Arm-Rising Suggestion

Close your eyes. Place your right arm straight out in front of you at shoulder height. (PAUSE.) Imagine that your right arm is light and hollow, like a balloon, and that it is gradually being pumped up with helium. The helium is lighter than air and it is causing your hollow arm to become lighter and lighter and to rise in the air. It's

slowly rising into the air. More and more helium is being pumped into your arm, and the arm is getting lighter and lighter and just continues to rise. (WAIT 25 SECONDS.) Relax your arm now and place it on the table and continue to relax.

The next suggestion to be presented is the hand-lock suggestion. It will tell just what you are to make believe. It will initially tell you to fold your hands. Then it will tell you to imagine that your hands are really two hunks of steel that are welded together. Following this, the suggestion will challenge you to pull the hands apart. Despite this challenge, don't pull the hands apart. Instead, make believe that the hands are unable to come apart by virtue of their being welded together. You see, the challenge is all part of the make-believe. It is meant to establish the fact that the hands are so tightly welded together that despite your best efforts, you simply cannot get them apart.

Remember what the hypnotic skill involves. You must let yourself become so deeply involved in the make-believe that it actually seems real. Do this by only imagining and thinking things that are connected with the make-believe situation.

Now, observe the subject responding to the hand-lock suggestion. As she is being presented with the suggestion, she will carry out all the suggested actions and, in addition, she will verbalize aloud the appropriate kinds of thoughts and imaginings one should have during this suggestion. (PLAY VIDEOTAPE OF MODEL.)

Hand-Lock Suggestion

Close your eyes. Place your hands on the table, and clasp them together, interlacing the fingers. (PAUSE.) Imagine that your hands

are two pieces of steel that are welded together so that it is impossible to get them apart. They are two pieces of steel welded together. When I ask you to pull your hands apart, they will be stuck and will not come apart no matter how hard you try. Okay, try to pull them apart. (WAIT 25 SECONDS.) Okay, now relax, the suggestion is over, your hands can come apart again.

The next suggestion will tell you that you see a book on the desk in front of you even though there is really no book there. The suggestion will start out by telling you to close your eyes and will tell you that the book is on the desk in front of you. It will suggest that you see the book once you open your eyes. The suggestion will then instruct you to open your eyes and actually see the book. In response to this suggestion, you are to make yourself see the book and, in addition, you are to make believe that the book you are seeing is physically there and part of the natural setting of the room, and not simply something you are artificially making appear. The main idea, then, is to make the book you see seem like a natural part of the room. Just let yourself become totally involved in making believe that the book is really there.

There is another thing. Towards the end of the suggestion you will be asked to push the book off to the side. This action is also part of the make-believe. Even as you do it, continue to make believe there is really a book there.

Now, observe the actions of the subject on the videotape when she is presented with the suggestion to see the book. As before, she will verbalize aloud the appropriate kinds of imaginings and

thoughts one should have when acting in response to this suggestion. Pay careful attention. (PLAY VIDEOTAPE OF MODEL.)

Book Hallucination Suggestion

Place your hands on your lap and close your eyes. (PAUSE.) I'm not sure if you've noticed, but there is a book of mine on the desk in front of you. It is an average-sized book, one like hundreds you've seen. It is right there in front of you on the desk. Open your eyes and look at the book sitting there on the desk. (WAIT 20 SECONDS.) To avoid the book being in your way, why don't you just slide it off to the side. (WAIT 10 SECONDS.) The image of the book is now fading. It has faded completely and you can no longer see the book.

The next suggestion is one that will tell you that you are forgetting something you know. Specifically, the suggestion will state that the memories of the suggestions you were presented earlier in this session are fading completely from your mind. The suggestions I am referring to are, of course, the arm-rising suggestion, the hand-lock suggestion, and the suggestion to see the book. In response to the suggestion to forget, you are to make yourself forget the other suggestions. Do this by concentrating deeply on something other than the memories, thereby distracting yourself from them. By distracting yourself in this manner, you will be unable to remember the suggestions.

The suggestion to forget also requires that you make believe that the suggestions are actually fading from your memory all by themselves and that you are doing nothing to make them go away.

Therefore, you are to make believe that your forgetting is something that just happens to you, not something that you are causing.

As usual, you are to become deeply involved in this make-believe. Only attend to the make-believe situation, namely, that your memories of the suggestions are just fading away by themselves.

There is another matter. At one point in the suggestion, you will be challenged to remember the suggestions and write them down on a piece of paper. Despite this challenge, you are to continue to distract yourself from the suggestions while making believe you really cannot remember them. The challenge is all part of the make-believe situation. It is meant to further establish the fact that, despite your best efforts to remember the suggestions, you simply cannot; they're gone.

To summarize: Your task is to become so deeply involved in the make-believe that you won't notice that it's really you who is preventing the recall of the memories.

Following the challenge to remember the suggestions, there will be a one-minute pause in which you will be able to write down any of the suggestions that you remember. This, in turn, will be followed by the cancellation of the forgetting; that is, the voice will say that you can remember the suggestions again. Once this is done, you will be asked again to write the suggestions down on another piece of paper that will be provided. It will be all right at this point to stop distracting yourself, stop making believe, and actually write down the names of the suggestions on the paper.

Now, observe the subject on the videotape respond to this once. As she is presented with the suggestion, she will again verbalize her thoughts. Notice that her thoughts and imaginings are on things other than the memories of the suggestions. Notice also that she continues to distract herself even when she is provided with the challenge to try to remember the suggestions. The important thing to grasp here is that she directs her attention to other things, yet never admits or even thinks that what she is doing is in any way connected with forgetting the suggestions. By doing this, she can do all the suggestions required; she can forget the suggestions presented earlier, and she can simultaneously make believe that she has done nothing to make the suggestions go away. Attend carefully to what she does. (PLAY VIDEOTAPE OF MODEL.)

Amnesia Suggestion

Close your eyes. As you recall, you were given three suggestions. However, a funny thing is beginning to happen. The memory of these suggestions is fading, fading completely. In fact, you are totally unable to remember what these suggestions were. Nevertheless, I want you to try to remember them---even though this will be impossible. Open your eyes and write down the suggestions that you can remember on the sheet of paper on the desk. You will be given one minute to do so. Begin. (WAIT ONE MINUTE.) Time is up.

Now the memories are returning. They are becoming more and more clear. In fact, you can remember all the suggestions that were presented. Write down all of the suggestions on the paper provided. Again, you will have one minute. (WAIT ONE MINUTE.) Time is up.

Instructions for Test Suggestions

In a moment, you will be presented with four more suggestions that are different from the ones you've just been presented. In addition, the upcoming suggestions will be presented one after the other with only sufficient time in between for you to make a full response; that is, you will be presented with a suggestion, given ample opportunity to respond to it, and then be presented with the next suggestion right afterwards, and so on.

You will not be given the extensive instructions you were given before. You will not, for instance, be told what an upcoming suggestion is, nor will you be given any instructions on how exactly to respond to such a suggestion. The reason why I am taking these measures is because you already know how to go about responding hypnotically, so going over the instructions again will probably be dull and boring for you. There is another even more important reason: Suggestions presented in this manner will require that you apply the skills you've learned to new tasks. As a good hypnotic subject, you must be able to respond hypnotically to any suggestion you are presented, even if you have not received it before or have not been given instructions on how to respond to it. With the basic skills you have now learned and with a little effort and creativity on your part, you will no doubt be able to respond hypnotically to any new suggestions that you are presented.

Now, close your eyes and take half a minute to rehearse mentally the hypnotic skill and really get yourself psyched-up to respond hypnotically to each of the fur new suggestions to be

presented. I'll present the suggestions beginning in 30 seconds.
(AFTER 30 SECONDS, THE TEST SUGGESTIONS ARE PRESENTED.)

Arms Apart

Close your eyes. Place both of your hands straight out in front of you at shoulder height, with the palms facing one another and with the fingertips of one hand touching the fingertips of the other. Imagine that a force is beginning to make the hands repel one another. The force is getting stronger and stronger. It's getting so strong that it is beginning to push your hands apart. It's getting stronger and stronger and your hands are moving further and further apart. (WAIT 20 SECONDS.)

The force is no longer active. Place your hands back on the table. Continue to relax.

Hearing the Voice

You are taking a course in the history of psychology and you are now in the classroom. In a moment, the professor will ask in what country Sigmund Freud was born. Of course, you know from your studies that it was Moravia. As you can hear, the professor is already asking several other questions about Freud, and he is just getting to the country of birth question. (WAIT 20 SECONDS.) Okay, he's calling on someone else. You can lower your hand. Perhaps he'll call on you in tomorrow's class. Keep your eyes closed and continue to relax.

Head Lowering Suggestion

Now, imagine that a force is pushing down on top of your head, causing it to feel heavy. It feels like someone has placed the palm of their hand on the top of your head and is pushing downward. Your

head is being pushed down with such force that your chin is moving toward your chest. The force continues to push, making your head feel heavier and heavier, making it fall forward more and more. (WAIT 20 SECONDS.) The hand is no longer pushing on your head and you can sit up again and relax. Continue to relax.

Amnesia Suggestion

As you recall, you were just given three suggestions. However, a funny thing is beginning to happen: The memory of these suggestions is fading, fading completely. In fact, you are totally unable to remember what these suggestions were. Nevertheless, I want you to try to remember them, even though this will be impossible. Open your eyes and write down the suggestions on the sheet of paper on the desk. You will be given one minute. Begin. (WAIT ONE MINUTE.) Time is up.

Now the memories are returning. They are becoming more and more clear. In fact, you can remember all the suggestions that were presented. Write down all of the suggestions on the piece of paper provided. Again, you will have one minute to do so. (WAIT ONE MINUTE.) Time is up.

APPENDIX C

Transcript of Model's Verbalizations During Suggestions

Arm-Rising Suggestion

(Hypnotist) Place your right arm straight out in front of you at shoulder height. (Pause.) Imagine that your right arm is light and hollow like a balloon, and that it is gradually being pumped up with helium. The helium is lighter than air and it is causing your hollow arm to become lighter and lighter and to rise in the air. More and more helium is being pumped into your arm, and the arm is getting lighter and lighter and just continues to rise. (Wait 25 seconds.)

(Model) It's going up by itself. It feels hollow. I can see the pump. I can feel the arm being pumped up. It's really light. It's moving up by itself. It just keeps getting lighter and is going up by itself. It's just getting lighter and lighter.

(Hypnotist) Relax your arm now and place it on the table.

Hand Lock Suggestion

(Hypnotist) Place your hands on the table and clasp them together, interlacing the fingers. (Pause.) Imagine that your hands are two pieces of steel that are welded together so that it is impossible to get them apart. They are two pieces of steel welded together. When I ask you to pull your hands apart, they'll be stuck and won't come

apart no matter how hard you try. (Wait 10 seconds.) Okay, try to pull them apart. (Wait 20 seconds.)

(Model) They're really stuck together. This is impossible. They're welded together. They're just two hunks of steel welded together. I can't get them apart.

(Hypnotist) Okay, relax. Your hands are no longer stuck together. You can pull them apart. Continue to relax.

Book Hallucination Suggestion

(Hypnotist) Place your hands on your lap and close your eyes. (Pause.) I'm not sure if you have noticed, but there is a book of mine on the desk in front of you. It's an average-sized book, one like hundreds you've seen. It's right there in front of you on the desk. Open your eyes and look at the book sitting there on the desk. (Wait 20 seconds.)

(Model) There it is. I can see it on the desk. I see the book sitting there. It's kind of vague and fuzzy.....a vague, coloured outline of the book; but it's there.

(Hypnotist) To avoid the book being in the way, why don't you just slide it off to the side. (Wait 20 seconds.)

(Model) I'll just push it over there and get it out of the way.

(Hypnotist) The image of the book is now fading. It's faded completely and you no longer see the book.

Amnesia Suggestion

(Hypnotist) As you recall, you were just given three suggestions. However, a funny thing is beginning to happen; the memory of these suggestions is fading, fading completely. In fact, you are totally unable to remember what these suggestions were. Nevertheless, I want you to try to remember them---even though this will be impossible. Open your eyes and write down the suggestions that you can remember on the sheet of paper on the desk. You will be given one minute. Begin. (Wait one minute.)

(Model) It's funny. I can't seem to remember any of the suggestions. All I can feel is a real heaviness all over my body, but especially in my feet. My feet are tingling; they're just heavy and tingling. It's a funny sensation. It feels kind of nice. It reminds me of lying on the beach, letting the sun tan my body. Watching the people go by and the children...

(Hypnotist) Time's up. Now the memories are returning. They are becoming more and more clear. In fact, you can remember all the suggestions that were presented. Write down all of the suggestions on the piece of paper provided. Again, you will be given one minute to do so. (Wait one minute.)

(Model) Now that I think of the suggestions, I can remember them quite clearly.

APPENDIX D

Transcript of Interviews Between Model and Hypnotist Arm-Rising Suggestion

H: So, how did you find responding to this one?

M: It was really good. With practice, I got better and better at it.

H: I see.

M: It's just like you said; it's like learning any skill like swimming or math. It just takes coaching and practice. And this skill: It's really important that you use your imagination. You have to picture all the make-believe events in your mind.

H: Like what?

M: Well, for instance, I just let myself imagine that my arm was hollow. I could see it that way in my mind; you know, I could see my hollow arm with the air hose attached to it. I even imagined the pump. It was just like the air pumps that they have at gas stations. I could see the pump and the hose coming from it and pumping up my hollow arm.

H: I see.

M: And there's another really important thing. You really have to let yourself get into it. That really made the difference like you said it would. Like, I didn't just sit back and say "Hey, I'm imagining all this." Commenting on it would have just ruined the feeling. I just did it. I just let myself get totally engrossed in imagining my arm as hollow and being pumped up, and when I did, it all felt like it was really happening.

H: So, it felt real.

M: That's right. That's the point of all this, isn't it? You've got to make it feel real.

H: Yes, exactly.

M: There's a real knack to it. I found myself getting better at it as I practiced.

H: Very good!

Hand-Lock Suggestion

H: How was this one?

M: Good, I think I'm really getting good at the skill now.

H: Yes, you sure are.

M: I just let myself feel everything that was suggested. It really felt like my hands couldn't come apart.

H: Anything else?

M: I just pictured that my hands were too heavy, cold blocks of steel that were welded together. I got so into these thoughts that they actually felt that way.

H: What about when you were told to try to take them apart?

M: I just kept on imagining that they were welded together. That's the point of all this, isn't it? I mean, to continue to make believe they're welded together no matter what?

H: That's right.

M: If I'd stopped imagining and admitted to myself that they could come apart, then sure, of course I could have made them come apart. But that wasn't the point of the suggestion. The point was to get involved in the make-believe no matter what. So I just kept really involved in imagining my hands were welded chunks of steel. And I did this until the suggestion was completely over.

H: Very good. That's just what I wanted you to do. Anything else?

M: Uh. No, I can't think of anything.

Book Hallucination Suggestion

H: How did you find this one?

M: Well, before I was even asked to open my eyes, I had everything pictured in my mind. Like, I pictured the desk and I pictured the book on it. I pictured all the details of how the book would be positioned on the desk and how the book itself would look. I could see the book near the edge of the desk and on the book I could see the little call-number sticker and the stamps and everything.

H: And when you opened your eyes?

M: You know, it's funny. Opening my eyes didn't make much of a difference.

H: How do you mean?

M: Well, everything I pictured when I had my eyes closed, I let carry over to when I had my eyes open. I didn't let a thing change. I let myself see the book on the exact spot when they were open as I had pictured it when they were closed.

H: I see what you mean. That's quite clever. Anything else?

M: There's another thing. It's really important to concentrate as deeply as possible. Like I know it's important to concentrate on all the suggestions, but it's especially important with this one. You can't let your thoughts wander for a second. You really have to let yourself see the book there all the time.

H: Uh h-u-u-m.

M: There's a real knack to this. It's a skill just like you said it was, but it's a strange one. It's a skill at not noticing that you're really acting.

Amnesia Suggestion

H: How was this one?

M: Pretty good. I just let my attention drift away from the memories of the suggestion.

H: So it was you who caused your forgetting.

M: Sure, in a way. You can only remember things by sort of stopping what you're doing and letting yourself think back to what you're supposed to remember.

H: Ah yes, I see.

M: I just didn't stop and let myself think back. Instead, I just let my mind become preoccupied with other things.

H: Like what?

M: For instance, I noticed that my feet felt heavy and tingling, and so I just concentrated on these sensations in my feet. As long as I did that, and didn't shift my attention back to what I was supposed to remember, then I really couldn't remember.

H: Yes, I see. What about when you were told to try and remember the suggestions?

M: Well, it's like with the other suggestion...you know, when I was asked to try to separate my hands. I didn't stop thinking of my hands as stuck and welded together. For the suggestion to forget. I just kept on distracting myself. The point of the suggestion was to keep up the forgetting no matter what, so that's what I did.

H: Yes, that's right. Anything else?

M: No....Well except that, like I said before, there's a real knack to this. You can really get good at it once you practice. You can really feel yourself getting better at controlling your mind to do all these things.

H: Almost everyone finds that.

M: Like, you can actually turn the make-believe into reality...and get good at it! It's actually kind of fun.

H: You know, almost everyone finds that, too.

APPENDIX E

HAT Simulator Instructions

If you recall in one of your sessions, in this experiment, you participated in a training program with Nadina. Prior to that session you were instructed by a member of this lab to do your very best to FAKE behaving as though you were a subject who undergoes a training and becomes very responsive to suggestions. In today's session I would again like you to respond in this way. That is, I do NOT want you to actually become a highly hypnotizable subject. Instead, I want you to fake your responses to appear as though you have successfully completed the training program. Remember, do NOT fill out the questionnaires honestly or report on them what you actually feel. Instead, fill them out the way you believe that a subject who was exposed to the training procedure and was successful would fill them out.

APPENDIX F

Pre-HAT Instructions:

"The purpose of this study is to see whether people experience hypnosis more deeply when alone or when an observer is present. The observer, will be giving you two trials of a taped hypnotic induction and suggestions, once when you are alone and a second time while he/she is in the room with you. I will introduce you to them, and he/she will provide you with more details about the procedure."

All subjects are read these instructions by the experimenter. Simulators will be given the simulator instructions following the above pre-HAT instructions.

APPENDIX G

Hypnotic Aptitude Test: Auditory Procedure

Before beginning I would like to give you some information about hypnosis. I think all of us have formed some preconceptions about what hypnosis is like. Most of these come from old movies with the hypnotist dangling a watch or from stage shows where people run around acting foolishly. Let me assure you that what you will experience today will be nothing like either of those two situations. First of all you will not be asked to do anything foolish, embarrassing, or self-revealing. We are not here for entertainment purposes. In fact, I hope today's session will be beneficial to you. Second, a lot of the mysticism surrounding hypnosis comes from ancient grade B movies where a watch is twirled and the individual falls into a trance under the control of the hypnotist. Such false notions have created many problems for individuals seriously desirous of employing hypnosis as a positive means of self-control.

Let's take some of the myths one at a time. First of all the idea of a trance. Many people think of entering hypnosis as the same as entering a sleep-like trance where they will be unaware of what is happening and under the control of the hypnotist. This is clearly not the case. While you may or may not experience cognitive or mental differences, you will find that you will have full awareness of all the experiences you are having. You may even be aware of what's going on around you, although because you are not paying close attention to it, this awareness may be diminished. At any rate, you will find that your mind is very active and you are aware of what's going on at all times.

Some people report an interesting phenomenon referred to as dissociation. Those people who experience dissociation report that they seem to be watching themselves perform the various tasks suggested. Again, you may or may not experience this phenomenon.

Another common myth is that following hypnosis you will have no recollection of what occurred. Again, this is untrue. Unless suggested otherwise, you will generally remember all that occurs. Sometimes for testing or clinical purposes, specific suggestions concerning amnesia or forgetfulness will be given. These serve a specific function along with the other suggestions. But unless they are given, you will generally remember everything. However, you will find that hypnosis is often similar to a long lecture, and just as one tends to forget all that is said one also tends to forget some of the specifics of hypnosis. This is a normal occurrence and to be expected.

As you may be gathering by now, hypnosis is a very individual experience. Not only is what you experience very likely to be different from what others may experience, but you may have different experiences from one time to the next. Regardless of how you experience hypnosis, I think you will find it to be most pleasant.

While it is true that hypnosis is very individual, there are a few general findings we can state about the process of being hypnotized and who is hypnotizable. First of all, it is generally found that those individuals who have good imaginations tend to be more hypnotizable. In addition those individuals who are able to get involved in books they are reading or movies and television programs they are watching also tend to be good hypnotic subjects.

Finally, contrary to common belief, intelligence is related to hypnotizability in that people who are more intelligent tend to be more hypnotizable.

Sometimes people will enter into hypnosis thinking of it as a battle of wills, saying "I'm going to show the hypnotist that I can't be hypnotized; I can fight it." Let me assure you that if you do not want to be hypnotized there is no way you will be. It is not hard not to be hypnotized. It is simply a matter of not paying attention. Anybody can resist being hypnotized. What is difficult is to experience what hypnosis is like. In order to experience hypnosis you need to pay very close attention to what is being said. It is very important not to allow yourself to be distracted. If you work very hard you should be able to experience at least some of the suggestions.

Also, people often wonder whether or not they will do things they normally wouldn't do, or do things against their will. This stems from the idea that the hypnotist has control of you. Quite the contrary, you are the one who is controlling how hypnotized you let yourself become. I am not controlling you, nor am I hypnotizing you. You are hypnotizing yourself. I am merely serving as a guide for you. All I am doing is giving you words; suggesting that you imagine certain things. Whether or not you do them and how much you allow yourself to experience is totally within your own control. Thus, you have complete control over how hypnotized you allow yourself to become. In fact, rather than losing control under hypnosis, people find they have even greater control of themselves and what they experience with hypnosis. Thus, one of the main advantages of hypnosis is that it allows a greater degree of self-control.

Again, I am not hypnotizing you; you are hypnotizing yourself. In this sense all hypnosis is self-hypnosis. I am merely serving as your guide; you are the one who controls what you will allow yourself to experience.

Finally, the best way to know what hypnosis is like and what it is like to experience suggestions is to let your imagination flow with the suggestion and let the hypnosis take its course. In other words, you need to become a willing participant rather than a critical observer. There is no need to test yourself or continually ask yourself if you are hypnotized. This only serves to distract you. As I said, at the end of the session you will remember everything that has occurred, and at that time you can reflect back on what happened and what you experienced.

At this time I would like to give you the opportunity to actually experience what hypnosis is like. Just sit back in your chair, get comfortable and relaxed. Please remember to sit upright in your chair at all times. Do not rest your head on your hands and do not cross your legs. Keep your hands comfortably relaxed in your lap. Just sit upright and get as comfortable as possible. Close your eyes and relax. That's it . . . just close your eyes, keep them closed and relaxed. As I said it is very important that you pay close attention to my voice and what I am saying. Other thoughts may tend to pop into your mind. There are two ways in which you can deal with these thoughts. One is to actively push them out of your mind. If a random thought pops into your mind, push it out and bring yourself back to my voice and what I am saying. Some people find it very helpful to repeat my words to themselves. Remember you are

hypnotizing yourself. Therefore, repeating my words to yourself can be very helpful.

Other people find that the best way to deal with these random thoughts is to just let them pass through their mind. Just sit back passively and watch these thoughts gently flash through your mind. It is almost like watching slides on a screen. That's it, just sit back and watch the thoughts pass by. Notice how comfortable and relaxing it is not to have to worry about or dwell on these thoughts. Just sit back and let them pass through your mind. Flashing through like slides on a screen. It is so nice to have this time to yourself where you don't have to make any decisions, don't have to think or worry about anything at all; just sit back, remain calm, controlled and relaxed. In a minute I would like you to take three very deep, slow breaths and when you do I want you to think about breathing in relaxation and breathing out tension. All right now, take a very deep, slow breath. Breathe in relaxation and breathe out tension . . . pushing all the tension out from your body and breathing in deeply and slowly . . . feeling warmth and relaxation flowing into your body and spreading, spreading from your lungs to all areas of your body. Just feel the tension draining down, down and away. As you breathe slowly and deeply, you become more and more relaxed, more and more comfortable. Relaxed . . . calm . . . controlled . . . and at ease. Feel the warmth and relaxation spreading to your neck and your head, your arms and your hands, your back, stomach, legs and feet. All the relaxation spreading throughout your body. Warmth and relaxation spreading as the tension drains down, down and away. Breathing deeply and slowly, as the relaxation spreads to all areas of

your body. All the tension draining down, draining away as the warmth and relaxation flows in and the tension flows out. Relaxed and comfortable, calm, controlled, and at ease. Notice how good it feels to let yourself become relaxed and comfortable, relaxed and at ease, and how much more in control you are as you become relaxed and comfortable and at ease. Notice the pleasant feeling spreading throughout your body as the relaxation continues. You're doing very well. If there is still any tension anywhere in your body, just let it drain down and away. Let relaxation flow in and tension flow out.

You can become even more relaxed than you are now. Become even more deeply relaxed than you are now if you want to . If you allow me to guide you I can help you become even more relaxed, more deeply hypnotized, more comfortable, calm and controlled than you are now.

I would like you to picture yourself at the top of a staircase. A very safe, secure staircase with ten steps and they are numbered from one to ten. Look at each step and the number on it. Notice the shape of the number, the colour. Perhaps some are small, some large. Perhaps some are black or green, red or yellow. It doesn't matter what the numbers are like, but each step has a number and in a minute I'm going to ask you to slowly walk down the staircase, one step at a time; and with each step become more and more deeply relaxed, more and more deeply hypnotized, so that when you get to step number 10 you'll be completely relaxed, deeply hypnotized, but totally aware at all times of what I am saying and the experiences you are going to have. You'll feel more calm, relaxed, controlled and pleasant than ever before.

All right, approach the edge of step number one. Look at the number on the step. Notice it's size, it's shape, and colour. And now, step down step number one as you go deeper and deeper into hypnosis. More and more relaxed, calm, controlled, and hypnotized. Now look at step number two and step down, down step number two as you go deeper and deeper into hypnosis. Always aware of my voice and what I am saying. Aware of how calm, controlled and relaxed you feel. Step number three, as you go down, deeper and deeper into hypnosis. Four, more and more hypnotized. And now step down step number five. Halfway there, as you go deeper and deeper into hypnosis. Always aware of my voice and the pleasant experiences you will have. Feeling very calm, very controlled, very relaxed and very hypnotized. Step number six, as you step down, deeper and deeper into hypnosis. Seven. Down, down into deep, deep hypnosis. Feeling very heavy, very leaden, very calm, controlled and relaxed. Eight, deeper, deeper into hypnosis. Nine, almost there, as you go deeper and deeper. Ten, deeply hypnotized. Very deeply hypnotized. Feeling very pleasant, very calm, controlled, and relaxed. Always aware of my voice and what I am saying. Finding it easy to imagine and experience the suggestions given. If at any time you find yourself drifting back up the steps before we are finished you can simply bring yourself back down to step number ten and remain calm, controlled, relaxed, and hypnotized until we are done. You will find this experience to be a very pleasant, enjoyable one. The key to experiencing hypnosis is to let your imagination flow with the suggestions given. If you do this you will find that thinking about something is almost like actually

having it happen. The more you think about it the more it will seem as if it is real. Let me give you an example.

1. Please hold both arms up in the air out in front of you. That's right, both arms up in the air, straight out in front of you. Up in the air, straight out in front of you. I want you to imagine something interesting in your right hand. What I'd like you to imagine in your right hand is a very heavy pail. That's right, a heavy bucket. Wrap your hand around the handle. Grasp it tightly and feel the heaviness pulling your right hand and arm down. Fill the bucket with heavy wet sand, a shovel full at a time and feel it moving down. Slowly at first, but as you fill the bucket with heavy wet sand, your right hand and arm begin to move down, down, farther and farther. It gets so heavy, so, so heavy, too heavy to even hold up. You could hold it up if you wanted to, but it's just not worth the effort. Notice how much heavier your right hand and arm feel than your left. Your right hand and arm are getting heavier and heavier. The more you think about the heavy bucket filled with heavy wet sand, the heavier it becomes. The heavier it becomes, the more your right hand and arm move down, down (wait 10 seconds). All right, that's fine, that's good. You can let go of the bucket now and return your hands to your lap and just become very relaxed, very comfortable, very at ease. Your hand and arm feel normal again and you feel very calm, controlled, relaxed, and at ease. As you noticed, by thinking about something, by really picturing it, it feels as if it's actually real.

2. That was a very pleasant experience. Let's try something else now. Again, hold both hands and arms out in front of you, up in the air, straight out in front of you. This time have your palms facing

A resolution test chart featuring several groups of horizontal and vertical lines of varying thicknesses. Each group is accompanied by a numerical value indicating the resolution level. The values include 1.0, 1.1, 1.25, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2.0, 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 3.2, 3.6, 4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.6, 6.3, 7.1, 8.0, and 9.0. The chart is used to measure the resolving power of imaging systems.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

each other. Hold your arms and hands about a foot apart. About a foot apart, palms facing each other. I'd like you to imagine that a force in both of your hands is pulling your hands together. Perhaps there are powerful magnets in each hand, or perhaps a rope is tied between them. It doesn't matter what it is but a very strong force is pulling your hands together. Your hands and arms are starting to move. They are pulsating, slowly pulsating, drawing together. The more you think about this force the stronger it becomes. The stronger it becomes, the more your hands move together. Slowly at first, but then faster and faster. Feel your hands being drawn together. Closer . . . closer . . . your hands are moving closer and closer together. Feel the force draw them tighter and tighter against each other. Closer and closer (wait ten seconds).

3. That's fine. Now just join your hands together if they have not already done so. Join your hands together and tightly press them together. Interlock your fingers, tightly interlock your fingers. Feel how tightly your hands are pressed together, so tightly glued together that you could not separate them if you tried. In fact, the more you try, the more tightly glued together they become. You will find the more you try to pull them apart the more tightly glued together they become. They are very tightly glued together. Tightly stuck together. Try to pull them apart, just try (allow ten seconds). All right, that's fine. That's fine, stop trying to pull them apart now and just relax. Your hands can be pulled apart very easily now. No more glue, no more tightness. Place your hands in your lap and relax. Again, you can see how thinking about something makes it feel as if it's actually occurring, as if it's real.

4. Just continue to relax now. Very calm, very controlled, very relaxed. You have been so relaxed, so calm, so pleasantly at ease and your eyelids have been comfortably closed and relaxed. Now that I call your attention to your eyelids you become aware of a growing heaviness in your eyelids; notice how heavy and relaxed your eyelids feel. They've been tightly closed for some time. They are very heavy, your eyelids seem as if they are weighted with lead. Your eyelids feel weighted with lead. Extremely heavy, heavier and heavier, more and more heavy. The more you think about your eyelids, the heavier they become. They're so heavy, so heavy, too heavy to open. Your eyelids are so heavy, so weighted that when I ask you to try to open them a little later you will find that it is too hard to even try to open them. In fact, the harder you try, the heavier they become. They are so heavy, so tightly closed that you cannot open them no matter how hard you try. Try to open them. Just try (allow ten seconds). That's fine. Stop trying to open your eyes. Let them remain shut. They are no longer heavy and you could open them if you wanted to, but it's not necessary to do so. Just let them remain relaxed and closed. Very pleasantly closed, very comfortably closed. That's fine. Just continue to stay relaxed and calm, controlled and at ease, pleasantly hypnotized, deeply hypnotized.

5. I'd like you to pay very close attention now to what I am going to tell you next. This has been a very pleasant and enjoyable experience and we're just about finished. However, there is one thing I'd like you to think about before you awaken. Shortly, I shall count backwards from ten to one, and as I count you'll find yourself

awakening. When I get to one you'll be totally awake, fully alert. Wide awake, but still very relaxed and comfortable. However you're going to notice one very interesting thing occur after you awaken. One very unusual but extremely interesting thing. Upon awakening you'll notice that there is an itch in your nose. In fact, even now as I mention it you may notice a slight tickling sensation. Just a slight tickling. This tickling, this itch, is growing stronger and stronger so that when I get to one and say you are wide awake, you will need to scratch your nose. This itch will be a very bothersome, very tickling sensation, and it will not go away until you scratch your nose. When I get to one and say you are wide awake, you will scratch your nose. You will scratch your nose and the bothersome, tickling sensation will disappear. Your nose will tickle until it is scratched. All right, in a moment I'm going to help you to wake up by counting backwards from ten to one. Ready now? Ten. Feel the energy starting to flow back into your body and your nose beginning to tickle. Nine. Energy flowing back into your body. Eight. Energy coming into your body as you are awakening and becoming alert. Seven. Waking up. Six. Five. Half way. Four, becoming awake and alert. Three. Two. One. Wide awake, fully alert. Open your eyes. Any remaining drowsiness you may feel will quickly pass. Wide awake (allow ten seconds). I would now like you to take your pencil in your hand and open the questionnaire booklet (pause). Please fill out the information in the questionnaire booklet.

APPENDIX H

HAT Questionnaire

- I. The first thing you were asked to do was to hold both hands out in front of you and imagine a heavy bucket filled with wet sand in your right hand.

1. How far down did your right hand move before you were told to stop?

- A. All the way down
- B. More then six inches but not all the way down
- C. Less than six inches down

2. How similar was the sensation of heaviness you experienced compared to the sensation you would have experienced had you actually been holding a bucket of heavy wet sand?

Exactly	Fairly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not At All
The Same	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

II. Next you were asked to place both hands in front of you imagine a force was pulling your hands together.

1. How close together did your hands move before you were asked to put them together?

A. My hands touched together before being asked to put them together

B. My hands were less than six inches apart by then

C. My hands were more than six inches apart by then

2. How similar were the sensation of hand attraction compared to what you would have experienced had there actually been a real force pulling your hands together?

Exactly	Fairly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not At All
The Same	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

III. Next you were asked to imagine your hands being tightly glued together.

1. When you were told to try to pull them apart, how far apart were you about to pull them before being told to take them apart?

- A. Not at all
- B. A little but not completely apart
- C. Completely apart

2. How similar were the sensations of your hands being stuck together compared to what you would have experienced had your hands actually been stuck together?

Exactly	Fairly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not At All
The Same	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

IV. Next you were asked to imagine your eyelids as heavy as lead and too heavy to open.

1. How closed did your eyes remain before you were asked to stop trying?

A. Remained completely closed

B. Opened slightly or briefly

C. Opened completely

2. How similar were the sensations of eye heaviness compared to what you would have experienced had your eyelids actually been weighted with lead?

Exactly The Same	Fairly Similar	Somewhat Similar	Slightly Similar	Not At All Similar
---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-----------------------

V. Next you were told to imagine a tickle or itch in your nose.

1. Did you scratch your nose?

A. I scratched my nose

B. I noticed a sensation but did not scratch my nose

C. I neither noticed a sensation nor scratched my nose

2. How similar were the sensations of your nose itching or tickling compared with what you would have experienced had you actually had something tickle your nose?

Exactly	Fairly	Somewhat	Slightly	Not At All
The Same	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

VII. Other comments:

APPENDIX I

Hat Procedure and Scoring Instructions

The Hypnotic Aptitude Test (HAT) is totally self contained. The only introductory remarks necessary are logistical: 1) Individuals wearing contact lenses should remove them; 2) Individuals should have enough room to be comfortable; 3) Any individual wishing to cease participation should simply remain seated quietly so they do not disturb others in the room. The scale is easily administered live or by means of tape recording to a single individual or groups as large as can be conveniently and safely accommodated.

Suggested time are given in the booklet for administration. The total scale should take 32 minutes. The scoring booklet can be easily completed in 4-8 minutes.

Scoring

Each individual is given two scores: objective and subjective. The objective score is obtained from question #1 for the six items. If A is circled, the individual receives 2 points. If B is circled, the individual receives 1 point. No points are given for C. The amnesia item may be corroborated by checking page 3 of the individual's answer book. The total objective score ranges from 0 to 12.

The subjective score is obtained from question #2 for the six items. It is scored from 4 to 0: 4 = "exactly the same", 0 = "not at all similar". The total subjective score ranges from 0 to 24.

For our purposes it was necessary to eliminate the amnesia suggestion. In our experiment we attempted to create a low demand situation for responding, when the observer was present. The amnesia suggestion would directly contradict our efforts and

therefore was omitted. In this case the maximum total objective score that could be achieved would be 10 and the maximum subjective score would be 20.

APPENDIX J

HAT Hypnotic Response Rating Scale

Subject # _____ Rater _____

- A. How far down did the subject's hand move before being told to stop?

All the way down 2
 More than six inches, but not all the way down 1
 Less than six inches down 0

- B. How close did the subject's hand move before being told to put them together?

The hands touched 2
 The hands were less than six inches apart by then 1
 The hands were still more than six inches apart 0

- C. How far apart was the subject able to pull their hands before being told to take them apart?

None at all 2
 A little but not completely apart 1
 Completely apart 0

- D. How closed did the subject's eyes remain before they were asked to open them?

Remained completely closed 2
 Opened slightly or briefly 1
 Opened completely 0

- E. To what degree did the subject scratch or rub their nose?

Definitely scratched or rubbed it 2
 They twitched their nose or moved their hand toward their face, but did not touch their nose 1
 They did not respond at all 0

Total.....(max=10)

APPENDIX K

HAT Debriefing Form

You were chosen for this two-part study because you initially showed low susceptibility in the first hypnosis session using the Carleton University Responsiveness to Suggestion Scale. We believe that people score low in susceptibility because they are not sure how they should be thinking or acting. Research has shown that instruction and practice can significantly increase an individual's responsiveness.

Traditionally, hypnosis was believed to involve an altered state of consciousness in which an individual was thought to enter a trance and lose control of his or her actions. As you have learned from this session, we believe that hypnotic responding does not involve altered states or a loss of control; rather, the individual is fully conscious, and maintains complete control over his or her actions. In this way, hypnotic responding can be viewed as a skill which is fully within the capabilities of most individuals to learn and master.

If you have any questions or ethical concerns regarding this experiment, please contact any or all of the following faculty members:

Dr. N.P. Spanos, 788-2600 ext. 2683 (Faculty Supervisor)

Dr. L. Paquet, 788-2600 ext. 2692 (Chair of the Ethics Committee)

Dr. W. Jones, 788-2600 ext. 2648 (Chair of the Psychology Department)

APPENDIX L

CSTP Simulator Instructions

We much appreciate your participation in our previous hypnosis session. Today I would like you to take part in a very interesting experiment that is somewhat different from this last session. In your last session, you attempted to go into hypnosis and found it quite difficult to respond. Although you may have perhaps experienced some suggestions to a slight degree, it was not possible to feel much else.

In today's experiment you will be working with Nadina. Nadina will administer to you a training program designed to teach people who score low in hypnotic susceptibility, how to become highly hypnotizable people who are capable of responding very well to hypnotic suggestions.

In today's session, however, you will have a very special task. During the session with Nadina I do NOT want you to actually become a highly hypnotizable subject. Instead, I want you to do your very best to FAKE behaving as though you are a subject who undergoes training and becomes a subject who is very responsive to suggestions.

Basically, we are interested in finding out how well people are able to successfully fake their way through the training procedure. Our preliminary results indicate that intelligent subjects who pay careful attention to what Nadina tells them are able to figure out how hypnotizable subjects who receive this kind of training are supposed to behave.

Nadina will know that some subjects are faking through the training session and that some are not. However, she will not know who is who. If she figures out that you are faking she will stop the experiment. So, as long as Nadina does not stop the session you are doing fine and should keep doing whatever you are doing to fool her. Remember, your task is to fool Nadina into believing that you have been transformed into a highly hypnotizable subject.

I can't tell you how to behave or what to do in order to convince Nadina that you have learned to become a highly responsive subject. You have to use whatever cues you get from Nadina and whatever you can learn from the situation to figure out how a highly responsive subject would behave.

During the training session Nadina will be giving you suggestions. She will also be asking you to fill out questionnaires about your experiences. It is very important that you respond to all of the suggestions in the way that a hypnotizable subject would behave. It is equally important that you fill out all of the questionnaires in the way that you believe someone trained to be a highly responsive subject would answer them.

Remember, do NOT fill out the questionnaires honestly or report on them what you actually feel. Instead, fill them out the way you believe that a subject who was exposed to the training procedure and was successful would fill them out.

During the training session you will be asked to carry out various imagery tasks and will be asked to try and subjectively experience various suggested effects. It is not important for you to try and actually experience any of these things. However, it is VERY

important that you PRETEND to have the experience that you believe a non faking subject would have.

I would like you fake throughout the whole session with Nadina. Never let her know that you are faking. Continue to fake that you have become a highly responsive subject for the entire time you are in the presence of Nadina. We will be the only ones who will know that you were faking and it is important to the success of the experiment that you not let on to Nadina or to anyone else that you were faking.

One final thing, Nadina is a nice person and therefore subjects sometimes feel guilty about faking or about trying to fool her. It is important that you do not feel this way. This is a very important study and the only way certain scientific questions can be answered is by asking some subjects to fake their way through procedures. Remember, Nadina does know that some subjects are faking, it's just that she doesn't know who is and who isn't. So, don't feel badly about fooling her. By doing it successfully you are helping the experiment.

END

2 0 0 7 - 9 4

FIN