|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Schema | Definition |
| 1 | Attachment Schema | *1. Must relate to an attachment relationship (partner, parent, child, sibling, very close friend) 2. Might express attachment related fears (abandonment, being alone, rejection) 3. Might express styles or beliefs related to attachment relationship (compulsive self-reliance, over-dependence) or cognitions that reflect these styles ('people never care about me', 'I can't let people in', 'all men are users') 4. Might express feelings of unlovability, unlikability, unattractiveness 5. Might express feelings of failing or being bad at role in attachment relationship (family member, friend, partner, but not coworker) 6. Caregiving themes (e.g. compulsive caregiving, fear of being a burden)* |
| 2 | Competence Schema | *1. Must relate to view of self in the context of competence domain (e.g. work, education, or other task) 2. Might refer to failure, competence, perfection, or a self-evaluation linked to competence, finances 3. Refers to uselessness/inadequacy only if specific to work, education, or other specific competence (i.e. not global - 'I am useless', also not relationship failure, but rather 'I'm useless at...') 4. Might refer to themes of perfection 5. ~~Might refer to theme of global success/failure or relationship role failure~~ 6. Job defines worth* |
| 3 | Global Self-Evaluation | *1. Relates to self-esteem, self-confidence, shame, self-worth, being no good, inferior, not nice 2. Global statement of being useless/inadequate (e.g. 'I'm useless' but not 'I'm useless at') 3. Themes of blame and deserving what you get because the self is seen as bad 4. Evaluation of self, such as stupid, horrible, selfish, not worthy, deserving of bad things (e.g. 'my fault', 'I'm useless', 'I'm inadequate', 'I'm a terrible person') 5.* ***Global statement of failure ('My life is a failure' or 'I'm a failure as a person')*** *6.* ***Difference between Global Self-Evaluation and Attachment: if it is about unlovability or unlikability as observation of current state ('No one likes me', 'I have no friends') or fear of future ('No one will like me'), it's attachment, while if it is about self as not deserving of love ('I do not deserve to be loved’) it's global self-evaluation*** |
| 4 | Health/Medical Concerns | *1. Refers to physical health (incl. weight or mental health) 2. Expresses fears about sanity, side effects of medication, disability, physical pain 3. Refers to bodily symptoms* |
| 5 | Control/Power | *1. Refers to perceptions of control/being out of control 2. Conscientiousness (e.g. 'if a job's worth doing…') and having a choice 3. Refers to feelings of being trapped 4. Power/weakness themes* |
| 6 | Meta-Cognition | *1. Statements which suggest self-insight/observation of cognition (e.g. 'I have negative thinking,' or 'I have a need to be needed') 2. Reflections on own cognitive processes 3.* ***But not statements of what one might be feeling or thinking given a concrete (hypothetical) situation, (e.g. "I would feel hurt")*** *4.* ***Not so much statements of self-evaluation (e.g. "I'm a selfish person")*** |
| 7 | Other people | *1. Other people in general are good/bad/malicious/hurtful/disliking (e.g. 'people are out for themselves', '****people are generally selfish', 'most people are quite narrow minded'****) 2. Global non-attachment relationships with others (e.g. 'I am not a people person', 'I don't get on with people'),* ***but the fault needs to be seen as within oneself, otherwise it's more of an Attachment belief (e.g. 'People just don't care about me' -> Attachment)*** *3.* ***Must be global statement referring to all people, not a specific person or a very specific group of people, e.g. "their" or "my colleagues'"*** *4.* ***Not if it is specifically about attachment relationships despite being general (e.g. 'Relationships are a waste of time'), then it's only an Attachment belief*** |
| 8 | Hopelessness | *1. Refers to themes of hopelessness (e.g. there's no point to life, life has no meaning, what's the point, there's nothing I can do, life is not worth living, I won't be able to cope, no faith, no future) 2. Inevitability themes 3. Fear themes (e.g. I'm always a target, I'm not safe alone) 4. being overwhelmed by raw emotion (e.g. panic, anxiety, sadness, depression)* |
| 9 | Other people’s views on self | *1. Refers to the importance of what others think about the self (e.g. I care too much what others think of me, people think I am …) 2.* ***Must specifically mention other parties, i.e. not just feeling ashamed or unwanted for example*** *3.* ***Can be about a specific person, but must reflect other people's opinion/view, not something like "X never greets me" -> observation*** *4.* ***not being liked by others if this is not ascribed to self (e.g. "They do not like me" -> Other people's views vs. "I'm not likable" -> Attachment)*** |
| 10 | Other | *any other theme not classifiable into the above* |

# Instructions

Above is a table with ten different schemas taken from the paper by Millings and Carnelly and slightly adapted (all adaptations are indicated in bold font). Your task is to code a set of 100 statements according to how much they correspond with each of the schemas above. To this end, you will receive an excel file. Please use the following coding scheme for each statement and each schema:

* 0: the statement has absolutely nothing to do with the schema
* 1: the statement corresponds a little bit with the schema
* 2: the statement corresponds largely with the schema
* 3: the statement corresponds completely with the schema

Note that the “Other” category is hard to code with this distinction, given the lack of definition, so we code this one binary:

* 0: is not part of Other
* 1: is Other

## Pointers

Please take all statements at face value as much as possible. They are taken out of context and it is easy to come up with a story around them but try to avoid this. Also, do not substitute words that might make sense for the words that are there, e.g. “society’s” for “their.” Such stories or substitutions can greatly influence reliability as every coder might come up with a different one and thus reach different conclusions.

Do not evaluate statements based on all possible implications, but rather only use what is there.

The statements are a random sample of a large set and it is completely unknown how the coding scheme categories are distributed in the entire set. Do not try to ensure that a certain distribution is reached with your coding. If you do not use coding 1 a single time because you don’t see it fit, that’s fine too.

Do not overthink statements. It’s probably best to go with your gut feeling as much as possible since statements tend to leave much room for interpretation.

Experience has taught that it is best to do this coding by schema, i.e. first traverse all statements and code them with respect to the attachment schema before continuing to the competence schema. Doing it by statement requires the juggling of all ten schemas and their definitions in your head while coding, which makes it quite difficult and probably less consistent.