DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 030   TM 021 734

AUTHOR   McCarthy, Christopher; And Others
TITLE   A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic Model
                of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences.
PUB DATE   Apr 94
NOTE   44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                American Educational Research Association (New
                Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
                Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Affective Behavior; Counseling; Data Analysis;
                *Evaluation; *Experience; Graduate Students; Higher
                Education; Models; *Qualitative Research; Research
                Methodology; Stress Variables; *Therapy
IDENTIFIERS   Multidimensional Approach

ABSTRACT
        I. Roseman, M. Spindel, and P. Jose (1990) had
previously demonstrated that specific appraisals of events led to
discrete emotional responses, but this model has not been widely
tested by other research teams using alternative research methods.
The present study utilized four qualitative research methods, taught
by Patti Lather at the 1994 American Educational Research Association
(AERA) Professional Development Winter Institute, to examine data
obtained from 35 Master's level counseling students about their
emotions and cognitive appraisals during stressful events. The
results of this study verified that individuals process stressful
events much as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted, but that each of the
four research paradigms disclosed different aspects of the data.
(Contains 26 references.) (Author/SLD)

ED 371 030

A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic

Model of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences

Christopher McCarthy, M.A.

Greg Brack, Ph.D.

Rebecca Beaton, B.A.

Kenneth B. Matheny, Ph.D, A.B.P.P.

Department of Counseling and Psychological Services

Georgia State University

Correspondence regarding this paper should be addressed to:

    Christopher McCarthy, MA
    Department of Counseling and Psychological Services
    University Plaza, School of Education
    Georgia State University 30303-3083

Running Head: COGNITIVE APPRAISAL

Abstract

Roseman, Spindel, & Jose (1990) had previously demonstrated that specific appraisals of events led to discrete emotional responses, but this model has not been widely tested by other research teams using alternative research methods. The present study utilized four qualitative research methods, taught by Patti Lather at the 1994 AERA Professional Development Winter Institude, to examine data obtained from subjects about their emotions and cognitive appraisals during stressful events. The results of this study verified that individuals process stressful events much as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted, but that each of the four research paradigms disclosed different aspects of the data.

A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic

Model of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences

"Qualitative analysis...is the search for patterns in
data and for ideas that help explain the existence of
those patterns...Don't look for closure in the process.
If you're doing it right, it never stops." (Bernard,
1988, p.319).

Many alternatives to "traditional" quantitative

research methods are gaining widespread attention from

social scientistis, including those in the helping

professions. In fact, the American Educational Research

Association Professional Development Winter Institute

(January 14-15, Clearwater, FL) was titled "Gender

issues in methodology: Data analysis in the crisis of

representation."   The workshop which focused on

qualitative techniques of interest to the emerging field

of feminist researchers was taught by Patti Lather,

author of Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy

with/in the postmodern (19). Workshop participants

were introduced to four techniques of "reading data,"

especially data typically characterized as "qualitiative

data." Lather titled these four approaches: CLOSE

READING/REALIST TALE, CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/

CRITICAL TALE, SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE READING,

POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE

TALE. Each of these readings will be reviewed in detail

below, but the key point to using all of them on the

same data base is to provide a multi-dimensional analysis of the data.

The primary premise of this approach is that with multiple perspectives of the same data, results will emerge that would be missed if only one of the four analyses is used alone. Of course, this is analogous to the emergence of three dimensional vision from the uniquely different perspective of two eyes working in tandem (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Therefore, the purpose of the present paper is to describe the application of these four specific qualitative research methods to the data collected as a component of a study of the retrospective cognitions of individuals during times of stress.

Why Choose An Qualitative Research Approach?

Qualitiative research methodolgy has a rich and varied history, and it is becoming extremely popular with helping professionals. There are several reasons for the growing use of this paradigm. First, qualitative research methodology covers a diverse number of specific methods that are ei 1 uniquely suited to various facets of the helping enviornment. In this paper, four of these methodologies are examined in detail (Jacob, 1987). Second, qualitative methods allow the researcher to gather data in much the same format as it occurs in the helping professionals environment

(Aiach, Cebe & Broclain, 1990; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992).
Third, the rich and extensive historical traditions of
qualitative research provides important guidelines to
alternative research approaches (Jacob). Fourth, the
very nature of defining and analyzing the reliability
and validity of qualitative data brings into question
theoretical assumptions of the study and data
colllection. Such questions are particularly
appropriate and welcomed by applied social scientists
(Kirk & Miller). Fifth, qualitative methods allow
researchers to explore both the "emic" (subjective) and
"etic" (objective) perspectives of the data (Bernard,
1988). Sixth, many of the theories popular to applied
social scientists (i.e., systems theory, process
modeling, etc.) seem particularly well suited to
investigations by qualitative researchers (Moon, Dillon,
& Sprenkle, 1990). Finally, many of these qualitative
approaches open up often intense and explosive debate
among researchers about the political and ideological
issues involved in applied social science research
(i.e., see Lather, 1986, 1991, & 1992). Thus, while an
almost endless list of benefits (and disadvantages) of
qualitative approaches can be provided, qualitative
research orientations can offer an exciting perspective
to data analysis.

Why Use These Four Methods (or Tales)?

Only the four specific types of approaches listed
above (and taught at Lather's workshop) are used in the
present study for several reasons. First, the entire
issue of the theoretical underpinnings of Lather's
feminist focus has attracted much attention (i.e., see
Peplau and Conrad, 1989) and serves as an excellent
backdrop to test the assumptions of applied cognitive
psychology, especially the use of such models as
Roseman's appraisal/emotion linkages reviewed below
(Roseman et al., 1990). Second, since AERA has
sponsored training workshops on these specific methods,
it was felt that the annual convention was an
appropriate place to report the results of using these
approaches. Third, Lather believes that these four
perspectives, while neither exhaustive nor mutually
exclusive, provide a critical movement of analysis from
the traditional to the more esoteric and fragmented
postmodern viewpoints. Fourth, these four approaches
are structured to assess the "truth claims" inherent in
each paradigm, and thus to delineate both each method's
strengths and weaknesses. Fifth, the AERA Annual
Meeting Program Committee has er hasized the importance
of incorporating alternative formats, contexts, and
approaches into educational research. Therefore, the
testing of these models for presentation at the annual

convention which was developing many new means of

representing research seemed particularly appropriate.

Finally, the "goal is to proliferate, juxtapose, create

disjunction among different different ways of reading:

to work toward a multilayered data anlysis that is

emotionally complex, loose with improvisational spirit,

and radical in its rebuke of genre expectations"

(Lather, 1994 p.3). Thus, Lather's methodology involves

a striking mult-faceted approach to qualitative data.

Why Use a Cognitive Thereoretical Model To Test?

It is no surprise to helping professionals that

cognitive-behavioral models based on cognitive

psychology have received widespread attention and

application within the clinical domain and clinical

resarch literature. Cognitive-behavioral theorists have

suggested that negative affect is linked to how

emotional events are cognitively processed (Ellis, 1967,

Beck, 1976). However, although theories of emotion have

been postulated in the science of psychology at least

since William James (1884), the precise process whereby

negative emotions develop has not been fully defined

(Roseman, 1982). Unfortunately, among all this clinical

and research attention, relatively less scholarly effort

has been extended to formal qualitative investigations

of the cognition/affect relationships which is

surprising since such research questions would seemingly be highly appropriate for qualitative studies. As will be discussed below, open-ended qualitative type data is routinely gathered as a component of the more traditional quantitative studies of Roseman and associates' model (McCarthy, Brack, Matheny, & Beaton, 1993; McCarthy, Brack, & Matheny, 1993; McCarthy & Brack, 1993). Applying Lather's approach to data commonly gathered but not formally assessed involves permits important additional insights into Roseman's model and provides an exploratory approach to cognitive models of affect.

Roseman's Model of Appraisal/Emotion Linkages

Roseman, Spindel, & Jose (1990) developed a model that illustrates specific appraisals of events are linked to specific emotional responses. They suggested that their model might be universal across all human interactions, but it has not been fully tested in applied settings. What is unique about Roseman et al.'s model is that it identifies the specific appraisal patterns that lead to discrete emotional states. They believe that appraisals are made based on the following dimensions:

Situational state - whether a specific event is consistent or inconsistent with what is desired by the individual.

Motivational state - whether the individual is seeking
something pleasurable or striving to avoid something
painful.

Probability - whether the occurrence of an event is
appraised as certain or uncertain.

Power - how much the individual feels he/she is capable
of coping with the situation.

Agency-Self - High ratings indicate the individual
appraised the situation as caused by him/her.

Agency-Other - High ratings indicate the individual
appraised the situation as caused by another person.

Agency-Circumstance - High ratings indicate the
individual appraised the situation as caused by the
circumstances of the event, and not by himself/herself or
another person.

Legitimacy - whether or not the individual believes
he/she deserved the occurrence of the event.

Based on the above appraisals, Roseman et al.
(1990) believed they could determine how the individual
would feel in a given set of circumstances. Roseman's
theory includes 10 negative emotions (disgust, distress,
sadness, fear, unfriendliness, anger, frustration,
shame, regret, and guilt) and six positive emotions
(joy, relief, affection, pride, hope, and surprise).
Based on appraisals of the dimensions, Roseman et al.

(1990) believed that specific emotional states could be identified. Table 1, derived from Roseman et al. (1990), demonstrates the specific relationships of appraisals to emotional states.

Insert Table 1 about here

For example, an event inconsistent with one's motives (appraised as low in situational state), in which the individual feels weak (appraised as low in power) and caused by oneself (appraised as high on agency-self) would result in the emotional state of shame. However, changing just one appraisal dimension will result in an entirely different emotion. If an individual appraises the event as caused by another person (appraised as high on agency-other) and all of the other appraisal dimensions remain constant, the emotion of dislike will result.

The purpose of the present study was to test Roseman et al.'s (1990) model of the cognitive appraisals which elicit discrete emotional states. This study attempted to determine whether subjects given a specific set of cognitive appraisals report emotions produced by these appraisals that are consistent with those predicted by Roseman et al. Specifically, appraisal patterns hypothesized to produce "fear" and

"anger" (two of the sixteen emotions included in Roseman
et al.'s model) were tested.

While Roseman et al. (1990) posit a generic model,
this technology has been validated in applied settings,
specifically in the realms of stress management
(McCarthy & Brack, 1993) and family of origin issues
(McCarthy & Brack, 1992). The authors of the present
study believe these results are encouraging for
cognitive-behavioral approaches to psychotherapy, as it
suggests that clinicians may be able to work backwards
from their client's emotional experiences to identify
the specific appraisals they are making of problematic
events in their lives. Each of these studies has
tested appraisal patterns by asking subjects to recall
certain emotional experiences and then to rate their
appraisals of these events. However, as a further test
of the clinical utility of this model, the present
authors believe it important to test the reversibility
of the model: whether subjects given a certain pattern
of appraisals will identify emotions consistent with
that predicted by Roseman et al.

Participants

The participants in the present study were 35
Masters level counseling students enrolled in a large,
southeastern university. The mean age of the
participants who responded to demographic questions was

32.6, with a range of 22 to 49. The subject pool was
88% female and 12% male; 76% Caucasian and 24% African-
American; 56% single, 32% married and 12% divorced. The
subjects were given extra credit in courses for
participating in this study.

Instrumentation

Two written scenarios were chosen to test Roseman
et al.'s model (1990). One scenario consisted of a set
of appraisal patterns designed, according to Roseman et
al.'s model, to elicit the emotion of "anger". The
other scenario was designed to elicit the emotion of
"fear". These emotions were chosen as they are common
therapeutic concerns in clinical settings. The subjects
were given a two-part questionnaire, one for each
scenario. In each scenario, the subjects were asked to
recall an event that fit a set of six criteria developed
according to Roseman (1982) and Roseman et al.'s (1990)
procedure for categorizing discrete differences between
specific emotions.

For each scenario, subjects were then asked to
specify the predominant emotion they felt as the result
of the event from a list of 16 specified in Roseman et
al.'s (1990) model. Subjects were also asked how long
ago the event occurred. The initial descriptors used in
the questionnaires were developed and validated by Brack

(1989). The beginning of each questionnaire asked
subjects to recall an actual event from their lives
which fit each of the appraisals hypothesized by Roseman
et al. (1990) to elicit a particular emotion.
Consistent with Table 1, in the "fear" scenario,
subjects were asked to recall an event in which: the
potential for punishment was present; they did not want
to be punished; they were uncertain whether they would
be punished; they felt weak in being able to control
what was going to happen; they deserved the punishment;
and the event was caused by circumstances, not by
themselves or another person.

For the "anger" scenario, the following conditions
were specified: the potential for punishment was
present; they did not want to be punished; they were
uncertain whether they would be punished; they felt
powerful in being able to control what was going to
happen; they did not deserve to be punished and the
event was caused by another person, not the
circumstances of the event or by themselves.

The subjects were also given a list of the 16
emotions Roseman et al. (1990) used in their model
(including "fear" and "anger") and were asked to
identify the predominant emotion they experienced as a
result of this event occurring.   Subjects were then
asked to write a story about the event.   Roseman et al.

used this procedure to facilitate recall of the event.
Following a procedure developed by Blix and Brack
(1989), the subjects were then asked to answer four
additional questions pertaining to the subject's
cognitive "frame" of this event.   This procedure was
also intended to enhance recall as well as to provide
more information for qualitative analysis of the
subject's appraisal patterns (Brack, LaClave, & Blix,
1987).   These included asking the subjects:

    1.   What meaning did this event have for you?

    2.   How did you interpret this event?

    3.   What other frames might you have used
instead?

    4. Why did you not use these other frames?

Introduction to The Four Methods of Analyses

    As discussed above, Lather has defined four ways of
representing data and reading the "truth" in that data:
CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE, CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/
CRITICAL TALE, SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE READING,
POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE
TALE.   Each form is given both a reading name and a
tale name in order to remind users that each approach is
only one of many means of analysis, and that each
analysis tells its own imperfect story.   In the first
method addressed in the present study, the CLOSE

READING/REALIST TALE, the researcher takes a rational and detached descriptive and observational approach which reflects the general tenets of realism, positivism, and empiricism as generally taught in traditional research methods courses. This approach seeks to "Construct authoritarian 'this is the way to say it,' what Haraway calls a 'god's eye point of view,' the position from nowhere/everywhere" (Lather, 1994, p. 3). This perspective seeks to delineate the research subject's point of view without the ideology or personhood of the researcher interfering in the interpretation. Thus, in the CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE the researcher attempts to fulfill the stereotypical "scientist" role.

In the second analyses, the CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/CRITICAL TALE, the researcher switches from detached and objective observer into an "interventionist ...advocate/emancipator of self and/or others" (Lather, 1994, p. 3). Typically, Lather has espoused a feminist and post-Marxist background in her writings, but in the present paper the authors have taken cognitive psychology as the discourse to advocate. As discussed above, applied aspects of cognitive psychology have had a significant impact, and widespread appreciation, among helping professionals, and the purpose of its use in this analysis is to make overt the underlying advocacy

of the model often covertly latent in other research
programs. In essence, the trends, meanings, and
specifics of the Roseman model found in the data are
exposed. By embracing and honestly pursuing the models
legitimacy within the data, the reader is also
confronted with the blatent advocacy of the analysis,
and thus not covertly manipulated by the researcher into
accepting the research as either objective or non-
ideological.

The third method of analysis, the SITUATED
READING/REFLEXIVE READING, is where the role of
researcher is abandoned and the uniquely personal
experience of the research for the research team is
explored. The research team attempts to find our own
voice and experience so that the reader of the project
understands our psychosocial anchors to the data and the
role of the project upon our lives. The objective and
removed role of scientist is now totally abandoned and
replaced by the "gut level" human interface with the
data.

Finally, in the POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL
READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE TALE, the goal is "to grasp both
specificity and discontinuity...to present knowledge in
fragmented way...to leave the reader to interpret the
events, to use data as vivification instead of 'proof'"

(Lather, p. 3). This critique of the entire theoretical and empirical nature of the project dissects what was missing, manipulated, hidden, subverted, inscribed, and simplified. The goals is to fragment the study until readers are forced to confront the very essence of the construct "research" and its application to the data. Through such fragmentation, "truths" buried under a variety of historical, empirical, and political formats are "freed" and able to compete for inclusion in the readers consciousness.

In summary, the multiple analyses perspectives taught and encouraged by Lather open up both disturbing and exciting trends which confirm and disconfirm traditional research models and the process of "doing research." Below we examine each as applied to our data.

CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE: Procedures and Results

In this section, our approach to the data is the "traditional" concerns of reliable and valid trends discerned from the subjects' open-ended answers. The issue of establishing the reliability and validity of results for qualitative analyses is beyond the scope of the present paper but interested readers are referred to Atkinson, Heath, and Chenail (1991), Jacob (1987), Kirk and Miller (1986), and Lather (1986, 1991) for thorough discussions of this topic.

In the present study, a two step analysis of the
data was conducted.   In the first step a purely
descriptive analysis of the modal responses of the
various described emotions for each of the scenarios was
conducted.   The modal responses of reported emotions,
followed by the percentage of subjects endorsing the
emotions for the "fear" scenario, were: fear (endorsed
by 26%), distress (19%), frustration (13%), and guilt
(13%).   In the "anger" scenario, "fear" was again the
dominant emotion (endorsed by 29%), with distress and
frustration reported by 13% of subjects.   These results
seem to indicate that self-reported incidents of emotion
did not follow the constructed scenarios according to
Roseman et al. (1990).

The next step of the analysis was to examine
individual responses to determine general themes, or
patterns of responding in the scenarios.   In doing this,
a qualitative review, using procedures developed and
validated by Brack et al. (1988; 1989) was conducted to
determine the most significant themes in the subjects'
responses.   Consistent with this methodology, two coders
were used to examine salient themes.   Hereafter, these
coders will be referred to as coders A and B.   Coder A
was generally unfamiliar with the Roseman model and the
research techniques used to generate the data.   In

following the procedures for discerning themes for
qualitative data described by Brack et al., the coder
was instructed to inspect the written responses of the
subjects and to discern whatever trends and results that
could be summarized from the data. The coder met with
the research team several times to discuss and clarify
the emerging themes apparent to the coder. It is
important to note that the coder was assured that there
were no "right answers" or hidden agendas and that
whatever results were identified were important to the
project. After several of these meetings, the coder
provided the researchers with a written list of the
identified themes and the subjects who demonstrated
responses representative of these themes. Next, a
second coder was obtained and was taught the coding
system constructed by coder A. (Note: Coder A instructed
coder B.) Coder B then independently rated all of the
subject's responses noting first whether the identified
themes were present in the data at all, and then
specifically whether these themes were present in the
subjects attributed by coder A. Finally, coder B also
identified subjects displaying the themes, but missed or
misattributed by Coder A. Over all the subjects, there
was over 90% agreement among the coders on theme
attribution, and the coder B assured the researchers
that the identified themes were present in the data.

Coder A identified one predominant theme as salient for all subject responses: whether the subjects perceived themselves as actir from a position of low power or high power.   Whether or not subjects endorsed the emotion the scenario was designed to elicit, several permutations of the low/high power theme were represented:

1.   Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power but also described an awareness of the possibility of framing the event in a different way.

2.   Subjects reported an awareness of the possibility of viewing themselves as powerful during the event, but perceived punishment in the event caused the subjects to act as if they had low power.

3.   Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power but did not evidence any an awareness of that the event could have been framed as high power.

4.   Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power, but the coder (coder B) believed that the subject was really describing a situation of high power.

5.   Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power, and, as the event progressed, began acting out of a frame of high power.   This occurred because of fear of punishment or because of the circumstances of the event. One subject who originally acted out of a frame of how

power was forced into a frame of low power due to the
circumstances of the event, but then described
themselves as acting out of a frame of high power.
Clearly, though while all of the identified themes do
not match cleaning with the Roseman model, the aspects
of the power dimension seem highly salient in the
subjects responses. Still, the two coders did not
determine that all aspects of Roseman's appraisals were
clearly apparent in the subject's written responses.

To evaluate the accuracy of the subjects'
recalled appraisals, two additional coders were used to
check whether or not subjects were describing events
consistent with the appraisal pattern specified in each
scenario. Six of the 35 subjects' questionnaires were
used to train the coders. The remaining 29 sets of
questionnaires were evaluated. For each set of two
questionnaires, each coder was asked to read the
subjects' description of the recalled event and
indicate, for each of the appraisal dimensions, whether
the subject's response fit the indicated appraisal (for
example, gave a story in which they were high in "power"
as asked), contradicted the indicated appraisal (for
example, gave a story in which it was clear they were
low in "power" when they were asked to provide a story
in which they were high in "power"), or whether the
subjects' appraisal on that given dimension could not be

discerned from the story. The overall coefficient of agreement for the two coders was 73%. While this may judged to be lower than the reliability expected of a standardized psychological instrument, the authors of this study considered this acceptable, as this is much higher than could be expected by chance (given that each coder had 3 options from which to choose). The reliabilities for each of the appraisal dimensions varied considerably: situational state 94%; motivational state 89%; power 62%; legitimacy 57%; agency 64%; probability 64%.

Based on ratings of subject responses, only 18% of the scenarios were rated as being consistent for each of the six appraisal dimensions specified. The percentage of appraisal dimensions which were "correct" is as follows: situational state 98%; motivational state 92%; power 57%; legitimacy 65%; agency 80%; probability 76%. Thus, on situational and motivational state, the subjects responses were overwhelmingly in agreement with the model. Additionally, agency and probability appraisals were largely in the predicted direction.

In summary, it is a clear that a purely descriptive approach to analyzing the relationship of appraisal patterns to reported emotions underestimates the accuracy of Roseman et al.'s (1990) model. In the

examination of the qualitative aspects of the data, it
is clear that the model is supported, but that subjects
may move beyond predicted emotions to other feeling
states over time. It is believed that the dynamic
interplay between appraisals, emotions, and other
factors such as time, which have significant clinical
implications for helping professions, is not fully
apparent from this type of data analysis which will be
illustrated below.

CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/CRITICAL TALE: Procedures
and Results

A second set of coders were utilized in this phase
of the study (labelled Coders C and D). Unlike Coder A,
Coder C was extensively familiar with the Roseman model
and had participated in several more traditional
quantitative studies of Roseman's data. (Note: It is
also important to recognize that Coder C was an author
on the present paper.) Since the goal of this approach
was to serve as Roeman's advocate in analyzing the data,
Coder C represented by far the most appropriate initial
coder for this phase. After coder C had rated the data
and identified the relevant themes, a second coder was
obtained and trained by coder C in this coding method.
Coder D then independently rated the data using coder
C's sytem. The two coders agreed on theme
identification and subject placement over 90% of the

time.   At this point, it is crucial to point out that
two different coding systems were identified and
reliably rated by trained coders, yet as will be shown
below, there are significant differences among the
coding systems.

The salient themes for coder C were:

1.   When specific anger scenario responses were
examined, it became clear why the subjects did not
always report anger as the dominant emotion in scenarios
specifically set up to produce this emotion.   In many
cases, the subject reported the experience of anger
during a description of the event but reported
resolution of the event leading to a different dominant
emotion at the end of the event.   For instance, one
subject identified their dominant emotion as fear for an
event, but it was clear from the qualitative analysis
that the subject did experience anger at some point
during the event.   The feeling of fear seemed most
directly associated with the subject's predominant
emotion after resolution of the event.   This pattern was
consistently identified throughout many of the anger
scenarios.   This suggests that anger may not be
perceived by subjects as an acceptable emotion with
which to end an event, but that it is present during the
event as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted.

2. A second theme identified was that in the "fear" scenarios, there was a close relationship between fear and distress. The distinction between the two, according to Roseman et al. (1990), is the appraisal of "certainty/uncertainty". This distinction was not supported in the analysis of subject responses in this study. However, the scenario as presented to subjects may not have sufficiently emphasized this appraisal dimension to allow subjects to clearly make a distinction between the two emotions. For the "fear" scenario, Roseman et al.'s model was otherwise supported by subject responses.

3. The theme identified was that the duration of the event and how long ago it occurred seem to impact the way the event was cognitively processed. One example identified in the qualitative analysis is that as feelings of fear persist over time, they are re-appraised as distress.

4. In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of fear, even though subjects used emotional terms such as "scared", "fearful", and "afraid" in their descriptions of the event, they did not endorse the emotion of fear as the predominant emotional experience of the event.

5. In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of anger, several subjects seemed to turn anger into "pride" as a result of actions that they took. Through

the process of reappraisal, the subject came to view
themselves as more powerful and the event moved into the
"self-caused" realm.

6.   In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of
anger, several subjects seemed to have difficulty in
owning "power" in the ability to control what might
happen in the event described. The lesser the degree of
power, the further respondents seemed to move away from
the emotion of anger and the closer to the emotion of
fear. In these scenarios, it seemed difficult for the
subjects to target another person as responsiυle for the
event. It seemed that perceptions of power decreased as
appraisals of "circumstance-agency" increased and
"agency-other" decreased.

In conclusion, overwhelmingly, the coders using this
analysis endorsed the validity of Roseman's model as
describing and framing these trends and providing a
context for the diversity and richness of the subjects'
data.

SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE TALE: Procedures and Results

        Next we address the more personal and describe the
reactions, relfections, and experiences of the research
team to the data and the research paradigm. First, we
begin with Coders A and C who had the closest contact
with "organizing" the "raw data." One important

distinction that must be made in the reflexive tales for
coders A and C is that coder C was thoroughly familiar
with Roseman et al.'s (1990) model, whereas coder A was
relatively unfamiliar with the model. Coder C reported
feeling much more concerned about finding the "right"
themes in the data (i.e., evidence for Roseman et al.'s
1990 model). Coder A was uncomfortable with the initial
ambiguity of the task; however, after being reassured by
the other members of the research team that there were
no "correct" themes to be found in the data, felt "freed
up" to pursue the task. Both coders reported uneasiness
about the ambiguity of this type of research, as it
conflicted with their empirical training in graduate
school. Specific reflexive tales for each of coders
is detailed below:

Coder A: Coder A experienced initial uncertainty about
what was expected in analyzing the data. However, as
mentioned above, this coder was encouraged by the
research team to "simply read the data and look for
whatever themes seemed appropriate." Interestingly,
while coder A felt empowered to examine the data and
find her own themes, she was struck by the passivity of
many of the subjects in this study. They seemed to
readily adopt the role of victim in many situations and
seemed to have trouble recognizing the power they held
in various situations. Unlike coder C, coder A was

struck by the diversity of subject responses - i.e., the divergent ways in which subjects responded to each of the scenarios.

Coder C: Coder C was concerned with the acceptability of the qualitative analysis. She felt inhibited because of a fear that this analysis would not be acceptable to other researchers. There was also difficulty in the organization of the material. Coder C felt that both examining the material and uncovering themes of relative importance was a very subjective process. It seemed impossible to remain within the traditional role of the researcher as an impartial observer; instead, coder C felt interwoven into the process. Coder C was also unsettled to discover how closely subjects fit Roseman et al.'s (1990) model. It was almost as if individuals are hard-wired to experience specific emotions once appraisals have been made of a situation.

Other Members of the Research Team: The other members of the research team also experienced some discomfort at applying these methods to the data. Specifically, much questioning occurred about the appropriateness of the data for these analysis. The uncertainty of defining the data as "qualitative" (i.e., "What exactly is qualitative data?") and the concern about presenting such methods at a national conference also created

alternate waves of anxiety and excitement about this
project.   On several occassions, the research team
expressed deep concern about the "usefulness" of these
methods, and the dramatically different orientation of
the analysis to the data as opposed to more traditional
quantitative methods.   This was especially a concern
with the research members who had extensive training in
advanced quantitative methods.   More than once, these
members expressed regret about "getting involved in this
project!"   This mixed acceptance/rejection of the
methods of the model created a growing sense of tension
as the deadline for presentations drew close.   Pressure
for coders and writers to complete their tasks only
exacerbated the concerns over using these techniques.
The time and effort needed to complete this project was
severely underestimated by the research team, and only
with extensive concerted effort was the deadline for
completion met.   Yet, simultaneously, the process was
both freeing and liberating in that "correctness" of the
results was rapidly replaced by an acceptance of
alternative, but not competitive, perspectives.   In all
cases, the research team felt that the project was both
an important professional and personal developmental
step.   Members remarked that research would "never seem
the same" and that many issues previously ignored or
missed by previous studies were now glaringly evident.

Such insights lead to a "maturation" and "end of
innocence" about "the objective empirical approach." We
believe that these insights alone justified the effort
and discomfort experienced during the study.

POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE
TALE: Procedures and Results

A complete description of this phase of the
research would require an entire paper in and of itself
alone. Easily, this phase could be described as both
the most disruptive and emotionally unsettlingly
research activities any member of the reasearch team had
experienced. Unfortunately, due to time constraints and
scheduling conflicts, the entire research team was
unable to "deconstruct" the project together, and
instead several meetings of various members of the team
were conducted. These meetings were initially
structured along Lather's deconstructive tale questions
listed above. In particular, the initial discussions
centered around the "weaknesses" of the study, the
previously unrecognized ideological agendas, implicit
assumptions, etc. Also, an attempt was made to
determine what results had been missed, minimized,
and/or distorted by the previous analyses and design
constraints. As Lather would expect, eventually the
discussion centered upon political and gender issues

related to the research team's functioning and the project's procedures.

The issue of "gender" and "power" received extensive attention during these discussions. Three of the authors are male and have extensive training in quantitative methodology (one is a Full Professor, one an Assistant Professor, and one a Doctoral Ph.D. Candidate). The remaining author and all the coders were female and Masters level students. Thus, early in the discussions, the issue of "hierarchy" of authority and power was explored, especially as the female members of the research team had less knowledge about research methodology, publication/presentation procedures, etc. These discussions, occasionally intense and direct, reviewed the ways that power was used within the team and how the "female" aspects of the members could become devalued as the stress and strain of the project mounted. In particular, the "hierachy" was recognized to become more "efficient" and "task focused" as the project neared completion. Also, differential treatment of various members of the team by the hierarchy was recognized. Certain team members were "allowed" more emotional expression than others, and various feedback loops among the members were recognized to exacerbate each person's basic interpersonal style. Clearly, though, the deconstructive phase opened up various

issues surrounding how gender and power were utilized.

Additionally, the very nature of deconstruction was examined as to whether all team members were equally deconstructed and whether less powerful members were allowed to choose not to particiapte. While all members were assured of their power to refuse to participate in the process, it was recognized that participation was an implicit and covert assumption of the project. The deconstructive approaches are by nature both fragmentary and frequently emotionally turbulent, and most members of the team eventually experienced some discomfort and soul searching during this "self-reflective" phase.

A related issue is the demarcation of authors/coders/subjects. It is difficult to discern where the research team began and the subjects ended. Since the research decisions were made by the "hierarchy", participants were clearly only passively involved in shaping such decisions. Yet, the very nature of data gathering of cognitive/emotional reactions to stressful events introduced potential discomfort in the very individuals we sought to understand. Perhaps even more importantly, the subject's voice was largely restricted to the written word gathered at one time. Further, the fact that the subjects provided retrospective self-report data raises questions about how accurate the data

is, and how conscious and honest the subjects were with
the research team.   Though subjects were assurred of
anonymity, in all honesty no study is totally
confidential and anonymous.

Even the very nature of "author" was called into
question by this study.   While efforts were made to
allow all the authors and most of the coders feedback
into the written form of the article, again time
constraints, scheduling problems, and deadlines lead to
a differential amount of participation in the "final
product" of this paper.   The written product thus
reflects more of some members impressions, views, and
voices, than other members.   While such differnential
responsibilities and effects are common and widely
accepted among researchers, readers should reflect upon
the nature of writing style, editorial decisions, and
choice of phrases as important delimiters to the readers
awareness of "what actually occurred."

A further trend discerned during deconstruction was
the "press" of the team to validate the Roseman model.
While previous studies had attempted to remain
"objective and impartial," the research team had built up
a large number of studies that had repeatedly explored
and replicated the general trends predicted by Roseman.
Clearly, the research team had become "ego invested" in
the model.   Coder C reported that her familiarity with

Roseman et al.'s (1990) model predisposed her to select subject's words and phrases that fit the model. This might have caused her to miss information that did not fit the hypothesized appraisal-emotion relationship.

Coder A was not as familiar with Roseman et al.'s (1990) model and, therefore, did not experience the same bias towards confirming the accuracy of the model. A dominant set for this coder, however, was that of the influence of external pressure on the individual - i.e. the pressure to "fit in" and to see oneself as having less power. Thus, this coder saw many of the scenarios in terms of whether or not individuals saw themselves as having power.

Additionally, the very nature of reversing Roseman et al.'s (1990) model (i.e., giving subjects a certain pattern of appraisals and then asking them to derive a label for their emotion) appeared to be a difficult task for many subjects. For instance, subjects displayed reluctance in choosing just one emotion, and some seemed to have difficulty in interpreting the appraisal scenarios. It seemed that interpreting what was asked by each questionnaire was a highly individual process. The entire data collection procedure asked the subjects to conform more to the model, than the model had to conform to the subjects. In summary, the deconstruction

phase brought many aspects of the study into awareness
and served as a potent impetus for members of the team
to confront each other, their research assumptions, and
the very nature of data gathering.

Overall Discussion

The Roseman model has the potential to facilitate
important advancements in the theoretical and clinical
applications of the helping professions. The ability to
clearly, concisely, and empirically sketch the
interrelationships of various emotions (and especially
"negative" affect) and specific appraisals has been an
elusive dream of applied cognitive psychology for
decades. The authors have used the basic tenets of this
theory in clinical applications (McCarthy, Brack,
Matheny, & Beaton, 1993). For example, clients
reporting emotions such as shame and guilt are likely to
be appraising these events as unwanted but caused by
themselves. Additionally, they are viewing themselves
as less deserving of a positive outcome. According to
Roseman et al. (1990), in helping a client move away
from an emotion such as this, a clinician might work
with them on appraising events differently. They might
explore ways in the circumstances are responsible for
the event (which in Roseman et al.'s model leads to
frustration) or another individual is responsible (which
in Roseman et al.'s model leads to anger]. To move from

negative emotions to positive emotions, the client may
need to view themselves as more deserving of a positive
outcome. The authors of this paper are not suggesting
that therapists persuade their clients to distort
reality, but rather be open to possible alternatives to
the way in which they have framed the event. McCarthy
et al. (1993) found that clients can successfully work
backwards from emotions to appraisal sets.

The clinical significance of the study is that if
Roseman's model is shown to be valid, then therapists
working with clients who are struggling with issues in
which one of the negative emotions in this study is a
significant factor, now have a clue as to the cognitive
appraisals that the clients are making. The appraisal
patterns which produce these emotions also suggest
specific ways in which client's thinking may be changed
to produce affective change. If, as Lather has
contended, research can have significant emancipatory
effects for the disadvantaged members of society, then
surely the millions of individuals suffering from
depression, anxiety, shame, etc., may be offered
significant assistance.

In general, the authors believe that this study
tentatively supports theorists, such as Ellis (1967) and
Beck (1976), who believed that individuals react to the

world based on cognitive interpretation of events.
Both theorists have developed psychotherapeutic
techniques that follow the assumption that one's mode of
thinking influences the way one feels about an event.
One of the guiding principles behind their intervention
strategies is that by helping individuals change their
cognitions about an event, the way they react
emotionally is also affected. Roseman et al.'s (1990)
theory, supported by this study, indicates which
appraisals lead to which emotions. The authors hope
that, in the future, cognitive therapists will not only
tell their clients that their thinking can be changed,
but also can tell them specific ways they may alter
their thinking to handle unpleasant feelings.

Yet, each form of reading the data augmented our
understanding of the model and our participation with
it. While Roseman's model did not receive widespread
support from the REALIST TALE, the CRITICAL TALE was
quite supportive, which was, of course, its purpose.
Even more enlightening, though, is the results of
discerning related but distinct coding schemes that can
both be reliably rated and empirically supported. The
beauty of Lather's approach is that neither result must
be exclusively correct, but instead are important co-
contributors to full understanding of the model.
Perhaps it was the PROCESS of the study, more than its

products, that are most useful for further research on
this topic. The authors strongly recommend other
research teams incorporate these views into their work,
but such workers need to be warned that the process is
both exciting and disruptive but never boring! The
authors of this study feel further research is warranted
in this area to more fully assess the importance of this
theory for the field of counseling.

References

Aiach, P., Cebe, D., & Broclain, D. (1990). What cancer
    tells us about general practice. Birth of an
    hypothesis. Social Science Medicine, 30, 1241-
    1246.

Atkinson, B., Heath, A., & Chenail, R. (1991).
    Qualitative research and the legitimization of
    knowledge. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy,
    17, 175-180.

Beck, A.T. (1976). Cognitive therapy and emotional
    disorders. New York: International Universities
    Press.

Bernard, H.R. (1988). Research methods in cultural
    anthropology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blix, S. & Brack, G. (1989). The effect on pediatric
    nurses of a suspected case of Munchausen's Syndrome
    by Proxy. General Hospital Psychiatry, 10, 402-
    409.

Brack, G. (1989). Effectiveness of a therapeutic
    reframing package upon an individual's self-
    concept, perception of stressor and anxiety level
    during times of stress. Unpublished doctoral
    dissertation, Indiana University.

Brack, G., LaClave, L.J., & Heumann, K. (1989).
    Consultation of the medical frontier: A preliminary
    survey of the attitudes on infant intensive care

nurses. General Hospital Psychiatry, 11, 174-181.

Brack, G., LaClave, L., & Blix, S. (1988). The

psychological aspects of bone marrow transplant: A

staff's perspective. Cancer Nursing, 11.

Brack, G., LaClave, L., & Blix, S. (1987). A survey of

the attitudes of burn unit nurses. Journal of Burn

Care and Rehabilitation, 8, 299-306.

Ellis, A. (1967). Rational-emotive psychotherapy. In

D. Arbuckle (Ed.), Counseling and psychotherapy.

New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jacob, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: A

review. Review of Educational Research, 57, 1-50.

James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? Mind, 9, 188-

205.

Henwood, K.L., & Pidgeon, N.F. (1992). Qualitative

research and psychological theorizing. British

Journal of Psychology, 83, 97-111.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and

validity in qualitative research. Newbury Park,

CA: Sage.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in opening

ideological research: Between a rock and a soft

place. Interchange, 17, 63-84.

Lather, (1991). Getting smart. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational

research: Feminist and post-structural

perspectives.   Theory into Practice, 31, 87-99.

Lather, (1994).   Gender issues in methodology: Data

analysis in the crisis of representation.   American

Educational Research Association Professional

Development Winter Institute,   January 14-15, 1994,

Clearwater, FL.

McCarthy, C. & Brack, G. (1992, August).   Cognitive

appraisals of emotional events within the family of

origin.   Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of

the American Psychological Association, Washington,

D.C.

McCarthy, C. & Brack, G. (1993, April).   The impact of

cognitive appraisals on emotions produced by

stressful events.   Paper presented at the Annual

Meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, Atlanta, GA.

McCarthy, C., Brack, G., & Matheny, K. (1993, November).

The relationship of cognitive appraisals to stress

coping resources in stressful events.   Paper

presented at the Division 17 Southeast Regional

Conference, Gainesville, FL.

McCarthy, C., Brack, G., Matheny, K., & Beaton, R.

(1993).   A new therapeutic model for integrating

affect and cognition.   Paper presented at the

Division 17 Southeast Regional Conference,

Gainesville, FL.

Moon, S.M., Dillon, D.R., & Spenkle, D.K. (1990).   On
     balance and synergy: Family therapy and qualitative
     research revisited.   Journal of Marital and Family
     Therapy, 17, 187-192.

Peplau, L.A., & Conrad, E. (1989).   Beyond nonsexist
     research: The perils of feminist methods in
     psychology.   Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13,
     379-400.

Roseman, I. (1982).   Cognitive determinants of
     emotions.   Unpublished doctoral dissertation.   Yale
     University.

Roseman, I., Spindel, M., & Jose, P. (1990).   Appraisals
     of emotion-eliciting events: testing a theory of
     discrete emotions.   Journal of Personality and
     Social Psychology, 59, 899-915.

Table 1:   A simplified version of the Roseman model

| | Positive emotions Achieved | | Negative emotions Did not achieve | | |
	Rewards	Avoided Punishment	Rewards	Avoided Punishment	
Circumstances Caused					
Unknown		SURPRIZE			
Uncertain		HOPE	FEAR		Weak
Certain	JOY	RELIEF	SADNESS	DISTRESS	Weak
Uncertain		HOPE	FRUSTRATION		Strong
Certain	JOY	RELIEF	FRUSTRATION		Strong
Other Caused					
Uncertain	LIKING		DISLIKE		Weak
Certain	LIKING		DISLIKE		Weak
Uncertain	LIKING		ANGER		Strong
Certain	LIKING		ANGER		Strong
Self Caused					
Uncertain	PRIDE		SHAME/GUILT		Weak
Certain	PRIDE		SHAME/GUILT		Weak
Uncertain	PRIDE		REGRET		Strong
Certain	PRIDE		REGRET		Strong