THE PLACEBO EFFECT AS A FUNCTION OF THE PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

by

Fraser Charles Simmons

B.Sc. Simon Fraser University, 1969

A THESIS SURMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department
of

Psychology

FRASER CHARLES SIMMONS 1973
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
May 1973

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Fraser Charles Simmons

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: The placebo effect as a function of the physical

and social context.

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. Jim Marcia

A. R. Blackman, Ph.D. Senior Supervisor

B. K. Alexander, Ph.D.

E. Lipinski, M.D. Health Services, S.F.U.

Morton Low, Ph.D., External Examiner, Professor or Medicine, EEG Department, Vancouver General Hospital

Date Approved: March 30, 1973

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of	Thesis/Dissertation:			
THI	E PLACEBO EFFECT AS A FUNCTIO	N OF THE PLYSIC	ΔΙ	
ANI	SOCIAL CONTEXT			
	,		·	
Author.				
	(signature)			
	Fraser Charles Simmons	·		
	(name)			
	18 May 1973			
	(date)		•	

ABSTRACT

To investigate the placebo effect for marijuana,100 male subjects received an inert red liquid purported to be the active ingredient from marijuana. Twenty-five of the subjects reported experiencing a mild high. Their ratings of how high they felt they were differed significantly (p<.01) from the group that did not respond to the placebo. In a "psychedelic" environment 36% of the subjects experienced a high, while in a "stark" setting 14% said they were high. This difference was significant at the .05 level and demonstrated the impact of the physical environment on the placebo effect. The social setting was shown to have had little influence since the per centages of subjects who reported being high were not significantly different whether the subjects were alone or in groups of 2 or 4. These findings and the placebo effect were discussed in relation to the broader area of expectancy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express special thanks to Dr. Roger Blackman for his encouragement and assistance.

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Title	
	i
Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgment	iv
Table of Contents	ν
Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Method	5
Results	7
Discussion	11
References	18
Appendix A	19
Appendix B	32
Appendix C	33
Appendix D	34
Appendix E	. 35
Appendix F	36
Appendix G	37
Appendix II	38
Appendix I	40
Appendix J	. 41
Appendix K	43

Tables

Number	Title	Page
I	Distribution of the 100 Ss in the six experimental conditions	7
II	Comparison of average 'high' ratings for the High and Unresponsive groups	8
III	Comparison of average ratings of "strength of THC received" for the High and Unresponsive groups	8
IV	Distribution of the 25 High Ss among the six experimental conditions	9
v	Distribution of the High and Unresponsive Ss under the two physical environment Conditions	9
VI	Distribution of the High and Unresponsive Ss under the three social environment conditions	10
VII	Composition of groups in which High <u>Ss</u>	11

Introduction

Psychologists are now aware that a subject's behaviour may be influenced by his perception of the performance expected of him. Thus it has been traditional that researchers have not informed subjects of the hypotheses being tested. However as Orne (1969,1970) has pointed out naive subjects search for cues (what Orne refers to as demand characteristics) which will help them determine the true purpose of the experiment. Such demand characteristics have been demonstrated to influence subjects' performance in a wide variety of experimental situations, often in a fashion which will fulfill the experimenter's predictions (see also Rosenthal 1970).

In more general terms, this can be viewed as a demonstration of the fact that behaviour is often a function of expectancy. Psychological research ranging from the influence of set on perception to the analgesic effects of hypnosis documents this pervasive human characteristic.

The form of this phenomenon of interest in the present investigation is the placebo effect. This term refers to the behaviour of subjects who, after receiving a physiologically inert substance (placebo) purported to be an active drug, report experiencing the effects to be expected from the active drug. Reviews of research on this topic (Kurland 1960, Claridge 1970) suggest that on average one-third of the subjects receiving a placebo will report experiencing the drug effects expected.

The placebo used in the present study was described as \$\insightarrow\$ tetrahydrocannabinol, the active ingredient in marijuana. This drug was selected for two main reasons. First, most of the individuals in the population from which the sample was taken (college students) were expected to have first- or second-hand knowledge of the characteristic effects of marijuana. Second, these effects (referred to as a "high") occur principally in subjective, feeling states. The high has few physiological concomitants of which the subject himself might be aware except for increased heartrate and reddening of the eyes (Low et al 1973). Weil (1972) in fact has termed marijuana the "active placebo".

There is some evidence that a marijuana high could be induced if subjects were given a placebo rather than marijuana. In the study by Weil et al (1968), nine naive subjects (who had not previously tried marijuana) smoked high, low and placebo dosages of the drug. When asked to indicate what dosage they received, most of the subjects made correct identifications but one subject rated the placebo dosage as a low dosage. Caldwell et al (1969) used marijuana cigarettes and alfalfa cigarettes (placebo) in their experiment with 20 experienced subjects (who were familiar with smoking marijuana). They report that one of their subjects commented "I could have become high from smoking the alfalfa cigarette if I hadn't been told what it was". The LeDain Commission Report (1970,p.92) summarizes results of a 1969 study by Jones and Stone in which 10 experienced subjects smoked both a •

placebo and low dose (equivalent to the Weil et al low dose). The 10 subjects rated both the placebo and low dosages as being of moderate potency and their average ratings were not significantly different. Klonoff (1973) found that approximately three-quarters of the experienced male and female subjects tested rated themselves 'minimally high' or higher after smoking a placebo. In fact 10% rated themselves subjectively 'very high' after smoking the placebo.

The studies cited indicate that some of the naive and experienced subjects were unable to distinguish between marijuana and the placebo, and would report experiencing a high after receiving a placebo.

In line with Kurland's (1960) and Claridge's (1970) reviews of placebo studies, it was proposed that approximately one-third of the subjects in the present experiment would report experiencing a high.

Tart (1971a) suggests that the placebo effect can be understood in relation to long term factors such as the culture of the individual, his personality, physiology and past experience with drugs; immediate user factors like his mood, expectations and desires; and situational factors such as the physical setting, social situation, formal instructions he receives and implicit demands he perceives. The present study investigated the effect of two of these variables (physical setting and social situation) on the placebo effect.

The nature of the physical surroundings in which the high is experienced appears to be of importance. Weil and Zinberg (1969) replicated the finding of Weil et al (1968) that experienced marijuana users reported experiencing a high in a "neutral" lab setting while naive subjects did not. More interestingly, Caldwell et al (1969) disclose that a large proportion of their experienced subjects reported the intensity of the high they experienced was reduced in a "sterile" laboratory environment. In the present study the physical environment was chosen as an independent variable which had two conditions. In the "stark" condition the experimental room was sterile and laboratory-like. In the 'psychedelic' condition the experimental room was non-sterile and non-laboratory-like. The psychedelic condition was assumed to be more like the physical environment in which an experienced user would have previously been high, and more like the setting in which a naive subject would expect to experience a high. Physical surroundings can influence the intensity of highs and might also be expected to influence the proportion of subjects who would report experiencing a placebo-induced high. It was proposed that more subjects in the psychedelic environment would report experiencing a high than in the stark condition.

Much of the literature on marijuana suggests its use is a social rather than a solitary activity. For example Russell and Tuxford (1971) surveyed 775 marijuana users and found that more than half preferred not to get high alone and that over 55% pre-

ferred social activities when they were high. The significance of the social situations in which the high is experienced has been largely overlooked by marijuana researchers. The present study investigated the influence of the other independent variable, social environment, by employing three social situations:

a) subjects by themselves; b) subjects in groups of two; c) subjects in groups of four. Claridge (1970) reports that the placebo effect can be heightened by the presence of others. It was expected that more subjects in the social situations where two or four subjects were present would report experiencing a high than in the situation where subjects were alone.

The present study was designed, therefore, to investigate the influence of the physical and social context on the placebo effect.

METHOD

<u>Design</u>: Six experimental rooms were used. The three "stark" rooms had plain grey walls and were lit by bright fluorescent lighting. The three comparably sized "psychedelic" rooms had blue-filtered lighting, posters on the walls, incense burning and electronic rock music music playing. Rooms accommodated 1,2 or 4 subjects. The rooms for 4 subjects were four times as large as the rooms for 1 or 2 subjects:

<u>Subjects</u>: The subjects were male university student volunteers • recruited by posters which read 'Wanted - male subjects for a marijuana drug study''. The first 100 volunteers who presented

themselves for testing were employed after subjects with physical or psychological problems had been identified and screened out.

Stimuli: On a table in each one of the experimental rooms was a questionnaire (Appendix A).

The following stimuli were presented:

- (a) visual a booklet of coloured sheets of paper
- (b) gustatory orange juice and after-dinner mints
- (c) olfactory vials of after-shave and perfume
- (d) haptic boards with materials of different textures affixed
- (e) auditory electronically produced sounds piped in.

The placebo was a red liquid (cherry and blackberry extract in water) which each subject took orally from a small vial.

A microphone was in evidence in rooms with 2 or 4 subjects present to record their interactions.

Producure: Subjects were briefed by means of a handout (Appendix B) and signed a consent form (Appendix C). They were then randomly assigned to one of the six experimental rooms where pre-recorded instructions indicated what they were to do. The following time schedule applied in all conditions:

		
<u>Time</u> (minutes)	Activity	Questionnaire
0	Introduction	First page
1	commences questionnaire	Sections A to C
15	First Adjective Checklist	Page D
22	Subject experiences stimuli	•.
25	Experimenter enters and administers placebo	

Time (minutes)	<u>Activity</u>	Questionnaire
35	Second Adjective Checklist	Page E
40	Subject experience stimuli	es
43	Subjective Respons	ses Page F
47	Third Adjective Checklist	Page G
51	Subjective Respons	ses Page H
55	Comments	Page I

Following the Comments section each subject was debriefed by the experimenter who explained the nature and purpose of the placebo study and answered any questions. Two of the subjects were vocal in expressing their displeasure at not receiving an active drug.

RESULTS

The 100 subjects were distributed among the six experimental conditions a shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Distribution of the 100 Ss in the six experimental conditions.

cial environment	Physical environment		
	Stark	Psychedelic	
1 <u>S</u>	8	8	
2 <u>S</u> s	14	14	
4 <u>S</u> s	28	28	
	50	50	100

They ranged in age from 17 to 38 with an average age of 20.6 (Appendix D). First and second year students predominated (Appendix D).

Table II

Comparison of average "high" ratings for the High and Unresponsive groups.

Group

Average 'high' ratings

High

2.04 (n=25)

Unresponsive

1.04 (n=75)

*t=3.16 (t_{.01},98 d.f. two tailed =2.63)

*p<.01

Appendix E shows that only two of the subjects had not previously used marijuana. Another subject who had used it "once or twice" had not experienced a high. The remaining 97 subjects reported being well acquainted with marijuana and its effects.

Table III

Comparison of average ratings of "strength of THC received" for the High and Unresponsive groups

Group	Average	strength ratings	
High	1.76	(n=25)	
Unresponsive	1.02	(n=75)	
	*t=	=1.92 (t _{.05} ,98 d.f	. two tailed =1.99)
		*.10>p>.05	

Of the 100 subjects,25 answered YES to the question 'Did you experience a high?''. An independent rater who considered each subject's written comments and (where available) tape recorded remarks also arrived at this figure.

Table IV

Distribution of the 25 High Ss among the six experimental conditions

Social environment Physical environment

		•		
		Stark	Psychedelic	:
1 <u>S</u>		0	4	
2 <u>S</u> s		4	5	
4 <u>S</u> s		3	9	
	Total	7 (14%) 2 ⁰	18 (36%)	1270

The 25 subjects comprise the High group. All had previously expreienced a marijuana high. The remaining 75 make up the Unresponsive group.

Table V

Distribution of the High and Unresponsive $\underline{S}s$ under the two physical environment conditions.

Group	Physical e	hysical environment	
	Stark	Psychedelic	
High	7	18	
Unresponsive	43	32	
Total	50	50	100
	$*\chi^2=6$.45 $(\chi^2_{.05}, 1)$ d	.f. =3.84)
		*p<.	05

Using a five point scale ranging from "not high at all" (1) to "highest I have ever been" (5), the High group rated themselves significantly higher (p \langle .01) than the Unresponsive group (Table II). Rating the strength of the THC they received, the High group's average rating was higher than that of the Unresponsive group, although the difference fell short of significance (.10>p \rangle .05, see Table III).

Table VI
Distribution of the High and Unresponsive Ss under the three social environment conditions.

Group	Social environment			
	1 <u>S</u>	2 <u>S</u> s	4 <u>S</u> s	
High	4	9	12	
Unresponsive	12	19	44	
				100
	* 7	ζ=1.13 ((χ² _{.05} ,2	d.f. =5.99)
,	*p>.05)			

The distribution of the 25 subjects in the High group is shown in Table IV. A χ^2 test revealed that significantly (p<.05) more subjects in the psychedelic environment reported experiencing a high than in the stark environment (Table V). However when the distribution of the High subjects in each of the three group size conditions was tested, a non-significant χ^2 value was obtained (Table VI).

Cocial amainamen	Physical enviro	onment
Social environmen	Stark	Psychedelic Psychedelic
	Stark	rsychederic
2 <u>S</u> s	2 High <u>S</u> s in each of 2 groups	1 High <u>S</u> in each of 5 groups
·	Total = 4	Total = 5
	2 High Ss in 1 group	4 High <u>S</u> s in 1 group
4 <u>S</u> s	1 High S in 1 group	3 High Ss in 1 group 1 High S. in 2 groups
	Total = 3	Total = 9

Table VII shows the distribution of the 21 High subjects among the conditions with 2 or 4 subjects present.

Discussion

Except for the 3 subjects who were relatively naive to drug taking, the present study attracted a large number of volunteers who were well acquainted with marijuana and a variety of other drugs. It is not reasonable to consider this group to be a representative sample of the university population, thus the results can be generalized only to a sample chosen in a comparable fashion.

Self reports are customarily taken as evidence of a subjective high. In the present study those subjects reporting a high.

rated it on average slightly above 2 on a 5 point scale, indicating they felt they had experienced a mild high. It might be argued that the overlap in distributions of the average ratings given by the High and Unresponsive groups makes the difference in average ratings inconsequential (although statistically significant). However the High group subjects' own comments (written and spoken) clearly indicated they felt mildly "stoned", and allowed an independent rater to distinguish these subjects from the Unresponsive subjects.

Both the High and Unresponsive subjects rated the THC they received as being relatively weak. The difference in their average ratings of THC strength fell short of statistical significance. Yet it is not inconsistent that some of the subjects experienced a mild high on what they considered a weak dosage while other did not.

The overall placebo response rate of 25% (25 out of 100 subjects reported experiencing a high) is lower than the usual rate of about 33%, but the range of 14% for the stark condition to 36% for the psychedelic condition includes this value. The hypothesis that approximately one-third of the subjects would report experiencing a high was considered confirmed.

The hypothesis that more subjects in the psychedelic condition would report experiencing a high than in the stark environment was confirmed. As Table IV indicates the per centages for the stark and psychedelic settings were 14% and 36% respectively;

a striking difference. This pattern of results parallels the finding by Caldwell et al (1969) that experienced users reported their marijuana-induced highs were diminished in a sterile laboratory environment. It also offers a clue as to why twice as many subjects in the psychedelic environment experienced highs. If the stark environment had the effect of diminishing a high which was at best only mild, this could account for the observation that fewer subjects in the stark condition experienced a high. One subject summarized the remarks made by many of the subjects in the stark condition when he commented "How do you expect me to get off sitting in this sterile cell for an hour?". Since the physical environment is of such importance, the results of marijuana studies conducted in laboratory settings should be generalized with caution. The term "neutral lab setting" may well be misleading.

Appendix G shows that only 2 of the 98 subjects who had previously used marijuana were alone when they first tried the drug. This finding lends support to the notion that marijuana use is a social rather than a solitary activity. Yet the dimension of presence or absence of others was not shown to be a significant factor influencing whether or not a subject experienced a high as suggested by the third hypothesis. In the groups of 2 and 4, subjects were instructed to observe the others present and rate how high they appeared to be. Tart (1971a) reports that a phenomenon known as a "contact high", whereby a non-intoxicated person feels somewhat high simply by being

in close contact with a person who is high, was mentioned by a large number of the 150 users he surveyed. In the present experiment if one member of a group responded to the placebo (got high) the contact high effect would have been expected to lead the other group members to experience a high. However the data show no clear pattern in this regard. In the psychedelic condition with 4 subjects present, 7 of the 9 High subjects came from 2 of the 4 groups, suggesting the occurrence of contact highs in these 2 groups. On the other hand, the data from the other groups does not follow this trend. Perhaps with a private event such as a marijuana high the subjects did not feel compelled to conform to a group norm as they would if some public event was being judged. While the presence or absence of others seems to have no consistent effect on whether or not a marijuana user gets high, it might influence his enjoyment of the high and in this way account in part for the social use of the drug. In relation to this, Appendix H reveals that only 12% of the subjects stated that when high they never or rarely want to interact with people more.

Only 2 naive subjects volunteered for the present study and neither experienced a high. While this is consistent with a previous finding by Weil et al (1968) and Weil and Zinberg (1969) that naive subjects did not experience a high in a laboratory setting, the small number of naive volunteers makes the present observation suggestive rather than conclusive. Also of interest *

is the fact that less than half of the subjects reported experiencing a high the first time they tried marijuana. Presumably they first experimented with the drug in a non-laboratory setting, yet many still failed to experience a high.

Tart (1971b) sampled 150 experienced marijuana users to determine how frequently common marijuana sensations occurred.

Using descriptions of sensations provided by Tart, similar frequencies were collected from the subjects in the present study.

Appendix J lists the frequencies found by both studies and shows that, with few exceptions, the frequencies are remarkably similar.

This offers a further indication that the subjects in the present research were well acquainted with the typical effects of a marijuana high. Appendix I demonstrates this with reference to expected senstations. In spite of the uniqueness of each individual's marijuana high the majority of subjects in the present study expected to experience sensations which Tart's subjects reported as typical of a high.

The first adjective checklist (ACL) was completed before the placebo was administered, and the second and third ACLs after. A comparison was made of the number of adjectives each subject endorsed differently the second and third times through for the High and Unresponsive groups. As Appendix K shows, the average number of changes made was almost identical for the two groups. The ACL technique did not prove to be of use in distinguishing those subjects who reported experiencing a high from those who did not. This finding is similar to the Weil et al (1968) result

that moods as measured by self-rating scales did not vary..

After the placebo was administered, subjects were asked to use a five point scale to rate how accurately descriptions of sensations matched their subjective responses. Appendix K shows the average ratings for the High and Unresponsive groups collected 18 minutes (Subjective Responses #1) and 26 minutes (Subjective Responses #2) after the subject received the placebo. The average ratings for the Unresponsive group remained relatively constant, while the average ratings for the High group increased. However, because of the large variances associated with both sets of measurements the difference between the ratings for the two groups could not be considered significant.

Subjects present in groups of 2 or 4 were asked to rate how high the other subject(s) appeared to be. The High subjects received a higher average rating than the Unresponsive subjects, but since large variances accompanied both sets of average ratings the difference was not considered significant. Because the reported highs were mild subjects might have been expected to have had difficulty distinguishing High from Unresponsive subjects.

The present study investigated the placebo effect in relation to two of the variables Tart (1971a) suggested were important. Other variables were also indexed: the subject's past experience with drugs (a long term factor), his mood and expectations (immediate user factors) and the formal instructions he received (experimental factors). Following the suggestions made by Claridge (1970) on maximizing the likelihood that

a placebo response will occur, an impressive-looking red liquid was administered in an experimental situation by a professional-looking experimenter. With this in mind it is somewhat surprising that the physical environment had so much impact while the social setting had so little. Future research might consider the nature of the social situation in relation to whether group members are friends or strangers, and whether they had previously experienced a high together. Since marijuana has been tagged the "new social drug" it is difficult to believe that such factors are unimportant.

By administering a placebo it was possible to induce 25% of the subjects to report experiencing a mild high. This per centage could be influenced markedly by the nature of the physical surroundings. The present study offers another demonstration of the role expectation plays in influencing behaviour. In particular it showed that one of its aspects, the placebo effect, can have important implications for future study in as topical an area as marijuana research.

References

- Caldwell, D.F., Myers, S.A. & Domino, E.F. Auditory and visual threshold effects of marijuana in man. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29,755,1969.
- Claridge, G.S. Drugs and Human Behavior. London: A. Lane, 1970.
- Klonoff, H. Strategy and tactics of marijuana research. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 108, 145, 1973.
- Kurland, A.A. Placebo effect. In Uhr, L. & Miller, J.G. (eds.)

 Drugs and Behaviour. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960.
- LeDain Commission Report. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1970.
- Low, M.D., Klonoff, H. & Marcus, A. The neurophysiological basis of the marijuana experience. <u>Canadian Medical Association</u> <u>Journal, 108, 157, 1973</u>.
- Orne, M.T. Demand characteristics and the concept of quasi-controls. In Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R.L. (eds.) Artifact in Behavioral Research. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Orne,M.T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment:with particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. In Schultz,D.P. (ed.) The Science of Psychology:Critical Reflections. New York:Appleton-Century-Crofts,1970.
- Rosenthal, R. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Russell, J.S. & Tuxford, G.S. <u>Drug Use Among Young Adults</u>. The Narcotic Addiction Foundation of British Columbia, 1971.
- Tart, C.T. On Being Stoned: a psychological study of marijuana intoxication. Palo Alto, California: Science & Behavior Books, 1971a.
- Tart, C.T. Work with marijuana: II Sensations, Psychology Today, 4(12),41,1971b.
- Weil, A.T., Zinberg, N.E. & Nelson, J.M. Clinical and psychological effects of marijuana in man. Science, 162, 1234, 1968.
- Weil, A.T. & Zinberg, N.E. Acute effects of marijuana on speech. Nature, 222, 434, 1969.
- Weil, A.T. The natural mind a new way of looking at natural consciousness, Psychology Today, 6(5), 61, 1972.

YOUR	SUBJECT	NUMBER	

IMPORTANT

DO NOT SIGN THE GUESTIONNAIRE. Place only your subject number in the space provided above. All responses are to be ANONYMOUS and will be kept STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. Please read all instructions and answer all questions as rapidly but as honestly as possible. When you come to a blank page in the questionnaire please STOP and wait for further instructions. There will be a chance for you to ask questions after the experiment has been completed.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Age:						. 20.
Year in Uni	lversity:	lst	2nd	3rd	4th	Graduate.
Height:	_ft	inches	Weigh	t:	pounds.	
Length of t	ime since	last meal or	r snack:	hours	minu	ites.
		lications (be				
Are you an	epileptic ^e	YesYes	No	A diabeti	c? <u>Y</u> es	No No
			USAGE			
	closest to	of the subsolvent of the subso				nse (the one number next
A: I have	used the	substances 1	isted			
	4. Six to	to five times more times				
Coffee		Mariju	ana _	Hashis	h (hash)	
Alcoho	l (Beer, w	ine, gin, et	c.,)	Tobacco	LSD	
Tranqu	ilizers	Methedr	ine (meth,	speed)	Mescali	ine
Heroin	(H, junk)	Benzedr	ine	Cocaine		
Others (spe	ecify)					
B: The fir	rst time I	used the su	bstance was	:		
	2. Prior 3. Durin 4. As a	e never used to senior h g senior hig student in u high school	igh school h school ye niversity	ars	e universi	ty
Coffee		Mariju	ana _	Heshish	(Hash)	
Alcoho	l (Beer, w	ine, gin, et	c.,)T	obacco	LSD	•
Tranqu	ilizers	Methedr	ine (meth,	speed)	Mescalin	2
Heroin	(H, junk)	Benzedr	ine	ocaine		
Othora (sp	ecify)					

	2.	Within the last 24 hours		
	3.			
		Within the last month	21.	
	5.	One or two months ago		
		Three to five months ago		
		Six months to a year ago		
	8.	More than a year ago		
Coffee	:	MarijuanaHashish (Hash)	•	
Alcoho	1 (Be	eer, wine, gin, etc.,) Tobacco LSD		
Tranqu	iliz	ers Methedrine (meth, speed) Mescaline	•	
Heroin	(Н,	junk) Benzedrine Cocaine		
Others (sp	ecif	y)		
D. Was one				
D: Ply OWIL	•	sonal experience with this substance has been:		
	-	I have never used it It is very helpful and beneficial, no serious unpleas	ant	
		effects		
	3.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ıt	
	4.	effects also No particular effect either beneficial or harmful		
	5.			
	6.	Very disturbing, very upsetting or seriously harmful		
Coffe	e	MarijuanaHashish (Hash)		
Alcoh	io1 (Beer, wine, gin, etc.,)TobaccoLSD		
Tranq	uili:	zersMethedrine (meth, speed)Mescaline		
Heroi	n (H	, junk)BenzedrineCocaine		
Others (sp	ecif	v)		
ounced (op	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			_
E. My rea	sons	for using the substance have been primarily (if more	than one	
reason	app	lies, list the numbers in order of importance)		
	1.	I have never used it		
		Curiosity - just to find out what it is like		
		"Kicks" - for increased ecitement or pleasure		
		Boredom - nothing else to do		
		Escape - from problems I don't want to think about Habit - I'm used to using it		
		Social pressure - go along with others who use it		
		Understand myself, gain insight		
		Medical - painkiller, etc.,		
	10.	Other (specify)		
Coffee		MarijuanaHashish (Hash)		
-	:		•.	
Alcoho	e 1 (B	MarijuanaHashish (Hash)		junk)

C: The last time I used the substance was:

The first time I used marijuana I was

(If you have NOT previously used marijuana, skip this section and go on to the EXPECTED SENSATIONS section, page C)

engle	alone	with acquaintance(s)
****	with friend(s)	with stranger(s)
The first	time I tried marijuana I	experienced a "high". YES NO
When I am	"high" I experience the f	ollowing sensations (number as follows
٠	 Never Rarely Sometimes (10 to 50') Very often (more the content of the con	•
	terns and meaningful desi or meaningful when I am s	gns in visual material that is not traight" #
"Things st	and out more sharply again	nst the background" #
"I see mor	e subtle shades of colour	" #
"The notie	es of music are purer and	the rhythm stands out more" #
"I can und straight"		s which are not clear when I am
'My sense	of touch is more sensual,	more exciting" #
"Taste ser	nsations take on new quali	ties" #
"Smells ar	ce richer and more unique"	#
"Time pass	ses very slowly" #	
"I feel a	lot of pleasant warmth in	side my body" #
'With my e	eyes closed my body seems	very light" #
"I get phy	vsically relaxed and don't	want to get up or move around"
'When I mo	ove about my motions seem	smooth and well coordinated" #
"I have fe	elings of insight into ho	w other people 'tick'" #
"I find it	very hard to play ordina	ry social games" #
"I talk a	lot less" #	•
"I want to	be with people more, to	interact with them" #

"I appreciate very subtle humour in what I and others say" # 23.
"I can 'come down' at will if I need to deal with some problem" #
'My memory span for conversations is shortened, I forget what it is about before it has ended" #
"I feel emotions more strongly, so they affect me more" #
"I feel good, regardless of how I felt before I turned on" #
"I get somewhat paramoid about the people with me, suspicious about what they are doing" $\#$
"I feel more open to experiences of all kinds" #

·

Expected Sensations

During this experiment you will be experiencing a variety of different sensations. You probably have an idea of the kind of sensations you expect to experience. Check any of the following sensations you expect to experience after you are given the THC:

Colours will be brighter, clearer
Colours will be duller, more pastel
Visual patterns will be fuzzy, hazy
Visual patterns will be sharp, clear
Sounds will be less distinct
Sounds will be more distinct, clearer
Touch sensations will be more distinct, more sensual
Touch sensations will be diminished, numbed
Taste sensations will be more vivid, things will taste better
Taste sensations will be bland, everything will taste the same
Smell sensations will be lessened, odours will be less noticeable
Smell sensations will be richer, more unique
Time will seem to speed by
Time will seem to pass very slowly
My body will seem heavier
My body will seem lighter
I will feel relaxed, will want to stay still
I will feel restless, will want to move around
My thoughts will seem permanent, long-lasting
My thoughts will seem to disappear, slip away
I will feel pleasant, comfortable
I will feel unpleasant, uncomfortable

Cooperative

Nervous

FIRST ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST

Some of the adjectives below may	describe the way you i	eel RIGHT NOW.
If an adjective <u>really</u> describes space beside it. Example: If yo		
If an adjective sortof describes space. Example: If you are sort		one check mark in the
If an adjective does not describe it means, draw a line through the happy.		
Work as quickly as you can - use you read the adjective.	the first impression (that comes to you after
Alert	Bored	Weak
Sociable	Dizzy	Excited
Dreamy	Active	Нарру
Bold	Shaky	Impulsive
Sluggish	Bleary eyed	Tired
Friendly	Peaceful	Detached
On edge	Depressed	Self-conscious
Drunk	Drowsy	Lightheaded
Suspicious	Changeable	Good
Self-confident	Tense	Muddled
Sexy	Jittery	Cold
Good natured	Cuiet	Clearheaded
Mentally cloudy	Calm	Self-controlled
Impatient	Numb	Warm
Energetic	Restless	Affectionate

Dopey

Relaxed

Angry

Playful

SECOND ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST

Same directions as before: Two checks if the adjective really describes how you feel right now; One check if the adjective sort of describes how you feel; a line through the word if it does not describe how you feel or if you do not know what it means. Work quickly.

Nervous	Relaxed	Playful
Cooperative	Dopey	Angry
Affectionate	Restless	Energetic
Warm	Numb	Impatient
Self-controlled	Calm	Mentally
Clearheaded	Quiet	Cloudy Good Natured
Cold	Jittery	Sexy
Muddled	Tense	Self-
Good	Changeable	confident Suspicious
Lightheaded	Drowsy	Drunk
Self-conscious	Depressed	On edge
Detached	Peaceful	Friendly
Tired	Bleary eyed	Sluggish
Impulsive	Shaky	Bold
Нарру	Active	Dreamy
Excited	Di zzy	Sociable
Weak	Bored	Alort

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES #1

27.

Some of the statements below may describe your reactions to the THC. <u>Circle</u> the appropriate number on the five point scale:

"Does not describe my 1 2 3 4 5 "Describes my experience experience at all" perfectly"

Read the descriptions, consider your own experience, then rate the description.

"Things stand out more sharply against the background"	1 2 3 4 5	
"I see more subtle shades of colour"	1 2 3 4 5	
"Sounds are purer, more distinct"	1 2 3 4 5	
"My sense of touch is more sensual, more exciting"	1 2 3 4 5	
"Smells are richer and more unique"	1 2 3 4 5	
"Time is passing very slowly"	1 2 3 4 5	
"I feel a pleasant warmth inside my body"	1 2 3 4 5	
"When I move my motions seem smooth and fluid"	1 2 3 4 5	
"Thoughts keep slipping away before I can grasp them"	1 2 3 4 5	
"I am physically relaxed and don't want to move"	1 2 3 4 5	
"With my eyes closed my body feels very light"	1 2 3 4 5	

Other sensations not listed above (described as accurately as you can):

·			
n at min ya amin Bullin apisini, akia jia aya palikini liku aya asini ili a aya aya i	and the same distance of the same of the s	mara in transfer and the colorest of a section of the color of the col	
	the transfer formation of the contract of the	and the second of the second o	
	e de la company	Months and applications of applications of the applications of the application of the application of the applications of the a	
	and the second of the second o	e destruction and a companion control of the companion of	
	The above the control of the second of the control of the second of the		

Same directions as befo <u>Two</u> checks - really des <u>One</u> check - <u>sort of</u> de	·	
Bored	Di zzy	Active
Shakey	Bleary eyed	Peaceful
Depressed	Drowsy	Changeable
Tense	Jittery	Quiet
Calm	Numb	Restless
Dopey	Relaxed	Weak
Excited	Нарру	Impulsive
Tired	Detached	Self-conscious
Lightheaded	Good	Muddled
Cold	Clearheaded	Self-controlled
Warm	Affectionate	Cooperative
Nervous	Alert	Sociable
Dreamy	Bold	Sluggish
Friendly	On edge	Drunk
Suspicious	Self-confident	Sexy

Mentally cloudy

Angry

Impatient

Playful

_Good natured

Energetic

Same	directi	ons a	as	befor	'e:	read	thc	desc	criptions,	consider	your	own
exper	rience,	then	ci	rcle	the	appı	copri	.atc	number;			

"Does not describe my experience at all"	1 2 3 4 5			"Describes my experience perfectly"			
	. h.a.d	£ 0.0.	l ~ ir ^	ru limbt"	1 2 7 1		

"With my cyes closed my body feels very light"	1 2 3 4 5
"Thoughts keep slipping away before I can grasp them"	1 2 3 4 5
"I feel a pleasant warmth inside my body"	1 2 3 4 5
"Smells are richer and more unique"	1 2 3 4 5
"Sounds are purer, more distinct"	1 2 3 4 5
"Things stand out more sharply against the background"	1 2 3 4 5
"I am physically relaxed and don't want to move"	12345
"When I move my motions seem smooth and fluid"	1 2 3 4 5
"Time is passing very slowly"	1 2 3 4 5
"My sense of touch is more sensual, more exciting"	12345
"I see more subtle shades of colour"	12345

Other sensations not listed above (describe as accurately as you can):

can):

Your subject #:

We want you to judge how "high" cash of the other subjects is and tell us how well you know each one.

Subject # is (circle one)

"Not high at all" 1 2 3 4 5 "Really high, really stoned" and he is (check one) __a friend __an acquaintance __a stranger.

Subject # is (circle one)

"Not high at all" 1 2 3 4 5 "Really high, really stoned" and he is (check one) _a friend _an acquaintance _a stranger.

Subject # ___ is (circle one)

"Not high at all" 1 2 3 4 5 "Really high, really stoned" and he is (check one) _a friend _an acquaintance _a stranger.

NOTE - this form was used for groups with 4 subjects present. Where 2 subjects were present, the form contained space forthe ratings of one other subject. Where 1 subject was present this page was omitted.

COMMENTS

How strong was the THC (drug) you received? (Circle one) weak 1 2 3 4 5 strong
Did you experience a "high"? (Circle one) Yes No
Have you experienced a similar "high"? Yes No
How would you rate your present "high"? (circle one) "Not 'high' at all" 1 2 3 4 5 "Highest I have ever been" T
Since this is the first experiment with THC at SFU we would apprec-
iate your comments on the way the experiment was run.
Were the instructions easy to understand? Yes No
What could be done to improve the instructions?
Other comments or criticisms?

The purpose of this study is to test the short-term effects of \triangle^{q} tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the active ingredient from marijuana. Your participation is entirely VOLUNTARY. The main part of the experiment lasts approximately 60 minutes and involves no painful procedures.

As you may know, some drugs react with other drugs to produce complicated effects. If you have taken any kind of medication (for example: Insulin, Librium, tranquilizers, etc.) within the last 24 hours DO NOT TAKE PART IN THIS EXPERIMENT. If you have any psychological or physical problem that could be worsened by this experiment DO NOT TAKE PART.

Consent Form

Ι,	voluntarily submit
to the	conditions of the experiment, understanding fully that I
may be	required to take a psychoactive drug. I have no medical
or emo	tional problem that might be worsened by my participation.
	Signed

Distribution of Ss according to age.

Age		Number	of	Ss
17		2		
īġ		8		
19		22		
20		.12		
21		9		
22		13		
23		5		
2E 2H		0		
26		ا ا		
27		28 22 19358941		
28		•		
29		2		
30				
31		2		
32				
33		•		
34		1 1		
26 26		1		
37				
17 18 19 12 12 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19		1		•
-				
	Total	10 0		

Distribution of $\underline{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{s}$ according to educational level

Year	in University	Number of <u>S</u> s
	1 2	34 30
	3 L	17 12
	Graduate	7 Total 100

Drug usage by subjects

		ts		APPE	NDIX E	3!
		subjects		Total	100 100 100 100 100 100 100	
	Total	100 100 100 100 100 100 100		m.d.	4 2 2 0 2 0 2 2 2 1 1 1 4	
	missing data (m.d.)			· longer	0 0 0 1 1 1 2 0 0 2 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1
				year	00 0 4 4 1 8 6 1 8 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	•
	continuously	80 53 7 7 7 1		five months	0 10 10 4 7 7 6	1
	10/more times	15 29 28 28 21 21 21 4		two months	0 9 8 1 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1
Usage	6 - 9 times	7211227		month	22 22 14 10 00 00 00	ı
	3 - 5 times	004481486047		week	6 4 8 4 4 2 8 4 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	ì
	once/ twice	4 0 0 11 1 7 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	cts	day	81 18 27 18 56 0 0 0 0 0	;
	never	13 13 13 13 13 14 74	by subjects	never used	113 12 13 13 13 14 14 15 15 16 17 18 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	•
	Drug	Coffee Marijuana Hashish Alcohol Tobacco LSD Tranquilizers Methedrine Mescaline Heroin Benzedrine	Time of last use by		Coffee Marijuana Hashish Alcohol Tobacco LSD Tranquilizers Methedrine Heroin Barbiturates	

Time of first use by subjects:

	never	prior to senior high	senior high	prior to university	university	missing data	Total	
Coffee Marijuana Hashish Alcohol Tobacco LSD Tranquilizers Methedrine Mescaline Heroin Barbiturates Cocaine	3 2 3 1 13 57 57 57 57 57 74	80 116 63 60 7 7 8 0 0	43 33 43 11 11 4 6 11 11 11	13 13 12 13 13 4	23 30 33 53 19 13 15 16	007007481117	1000	
Personal attitude toward specific drugs based on personal experience never very beneficial neutral mostly used beneficial	toward : never used	specific drug very beneficial	s based on beneficial	on personal ex ial neutral	xperience 1 mostly unpleasant	very harmful	m.d.	Total
Coffee	ю	25	17	20	70	Н С	2 0	100

	never	very beneficial	beneficial	neutral	mostly unpleasant	very harmful	m.d.	Total
Coffee Marijuana Hashish Alcohol Tobacco LSD Tranquilizers Methedrine Mescaline Heroin Barbiturates Cocaine	25 113 25 27 28 81 81	25 69 63 26 12 13 31 4	17 21 28 28 13 13 4 9	50 10 17 7 7 7 7 8 6 7 7 7 7 8	701000000000000000000000000000000000000	0018212100	778188410007	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
			,		1	•	1	

Subject's primary reasons for using specific drugs:

Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
m.d.	3		-	-	2	7	8	8	S	0	0	7
other	12	15	12	12	4	Ŋ	4	9	4	0	4	S
medical t	1	0	-1	0	0	0	21	1	0	0	4	0
gain insight	0	15	12	-	0	27	0	7	18	0	0	0
social pressure	10	4	4	20	17	1	0	0	1	0		0
habit	20	3	4	14	45	-	0	0	_	-	0	Ó
escape	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	3		0	0	0
boredom	15	23	ы	Ŋ	23	0	2	2	0	2	2	0
kicks	0	30	41	39	—	11	7	9	15	7	4	6
curiosity	9	16	10	Ŋ	12	28	7	6	17	3	4	10
never used	3	7	3	0	13	. 25	27	89	38	95	81	74
	Coffee	Marijuana	Hashish	Alcohol	Tobacco	TSD	Tranquilizers	Methedrine	Mescaline	Heroin	Barbiturates	Cocaine

'The first time I tried marijuana I experienced a 'high'":

44 subjects 52	2	98 subjects
Yes No	missing data	Total

Social context of first marijuana experience:

2 subjects	: :	98 subjects
2 84	9 1 2	88
alone with friends	with acquaintances with strangers missing data	Total

Subject's previous experience with marijuana sensations:

Frequency	<pre>1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes (10 to 50) 4 = very often (more the substitution of the substitution) 5 = usually or always</pre>					
I see patterns and meaning visual material that is no meaningful when I am stra	ot patterned or	<u>1</u> 10	<u>2</u> 33	<u>3</u> 33	<u>4</u> 12	<u>5</u> 2
Things stand out more sharbackground	rply against the	8	21	38	16	8
I see more subtle shades	of colour	7	22	27	27	9
The notes of music are pur rhythm stands out more	rer and the	2	5	9	20	54
I can understand the word are not clear when I am s		4	12	38	25	15
My sense of touch is more exciting	sensual, more	1	9	26 °	26	28
Taste sensations take on :	new qualities	2	11	19	22	36
Smells are richer and more	e unique	4	18	26	21	20
Time passes very slowly		5	10	28	23	28
I feel a lot of pleasant	warmth inside my body	4	12	37	27	16
With my eyes closed my bo	dy seems very light	2	19	35	17	21
I get physically relaxed get up and move around	and don't want to	2	7	43	28	16
When I move about my moti and well coordinated	ons seem smooth	2	16	40	24	11
I have feelings of insigh people tick	t into how other	5	17	36	. 22	12
I find it very hard to pl	ay ordinary social games	4	10	31	26	24
I talk a lot less		8	19	35	20	11
I want to be with people with them	more,to interact	2	10	44	21	15

I appreciate very subtle humour in what I and others say	<u>1</u> 1	2 2	<u>3</u> 32	<u>4</u> 37	<u>5</u> 20
I can come down at will if I need to deal with some problem	2	11	24	23	29
My memory span for conversations is shortened I forget what it is about before it is ended	1	16	29	26	18
I feel emotions more strongly so they affect me more	3	18	35	20	16
I feel good regardless of how I felt before I turned on	0	6	44	22	17
I get somewhat paranoid about the people with me suspicious about what they are doing	18	36	31	5	1
I feel more open to experiences of all kinds	1	4	29	36	21

Expected sensations endorsed by the subjects:

No. of Ss

3

Sensations

I will feel unpleasant, uncomfortable

48 colours will be brighter, clearer 13 colours will be duller, more pastel 15 visual patterns will be fuzzy, hazy 42 visual patterns will be sharp, clear 10 sounds will be less distinct sounds will be more distinct, clearer 64 touch sensations will be more distinct, more sensual 61 11 touch sensations will be diminished, numbed 59 taste sensations will be more vivid, everything will taste better 10 taste sensations will be bland, everything will taste the same smell sensations will be lessened, odours will be less noticeable 17 44 smell sensations will be richer more unique 20 time will seem to speed by 54 time will seem to pass very slowly my body will seem heavier 18 48 my body will seem lighter 57 I will feel relaxed, I will want to stay still I will feel restless, will want to move around 21 24 my thoughts will seem permenent, long lasting 41 my thoughts will seem to disappear, slip away 76 I will feel pleasant, comfortable

Per centages of subjects in the Tart (1971b) and present studies endorsing sensations as occurring "sometimes, very often and usually or always" when the subjects are high

	Per Centages	
·	Tart	Simmons
I see patterns and meaningful designs in visual material that is not patterned or meaningful when I am straight	85	52
Things stand out more sharply against the background	72	68
I see more subtle shades of colour	70	69
The notes of music are purer and the rhythm stands out more	99	92
I can understand the words of songs which are not clear when I am straight	85	83
My sense of touch is more sensual, more exciting	86	89
Taste sensations take on new qualities	93	6 6
Smells are richer, more unique	69	75
Time passes very slowly	95	84
I feel a lot of pleasant warmth inside my body	71	83
With my eyes closed my body seems very light	68	77
I get physically relaxed and don't want to get up or move around	95	90
When I move my motions seem smooth and well coordinated	81	81
I have feelings of insight into how other people tick	85	76
I find it hard to play ordinary social games	83	85
I talk a lot less	83	71
I want to be with people more, to interact with them	76	87

	Tart	Simmons
I appreciate very subtle humour in what I and others say	91	97
I can come down at will if I need to deal with some problem	89	85
My memory span for conversations is shortened, I forget what it is about before it has ended	89	81
I feel emotions more strongly so they affect me more	80	77
I feel good regardless of how I felt before I turned on	80	93
I get somewhat paranoid about the people with me, suspicious about what they are doing	`80	41
I feel more open to experiences of all kinds	91	94

Average number of changes in applicability of adjectives between first and second, and between second and third administrations of the Adjective Check Lists for the High and Unresponsive groups

Group		Average number of changes/subject	
		Ist vs. 2nd ACL	2nd vs. 3rd ACL
High (n=25)		13.36	14.17
Unresponsive	(n=75)	13.22	15.01

Average ratings for subjective responses for the High and Unresponsive groups (higher ratings = subjective responses are more applicable)

	Subjective Responses #1 - average rating		
High	3.01		
Unresponsive	2.09		
	Subjective Responses #2 - average rating		
High	3.34		
Unresponsive	2.02		

Average ratings by other subjects in group, situations of how high the High and Unresponsive subjects appeared to be (higher ratings = higher the subject appeared to be)

Average ratings of how high by other subjects

High		2.24
Unresponsive	•	1.81