CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

- Inconsistency Felt - Botheration - Tolerance
- Relationship Between Inconsistency - Botheration - Tolerance
  Inconsistency and Botheration
  Inconsistency and Tolerance
  Botheration and Tolerance
- Change in the Degree of Inconsistency Felt
- Third Person and Relative
  - Botheration
    Tolerance
- Modes Used - Modes Not Used - Integration
- Homeostasis or Signal - and Search
- Limitations of the Study

V DISCUSSION

In first chapter it was made clear that the present study thrives to focus on the way perceiver perceives inconsistent person. In third chapter of methodology it was further specified that the perceiver person was to be considered on his sex and personality basis, while inconsistent person or perceived person on the basis of three situations.

In total, 48 boys and 48 girls were selected on the basis of their responses on Harvey's 'This I Believe Test.' The TIB test was used to differentiate four types of belief systems - designated in the present study as system I, II, III and IV. As described in third chapter respondents of system I and II are more concrete thinkers while the respondents of system III and IV are more abstract thinkers. The subjects of system I has fairly undifferentiated and poorly integrated cognitive structure. He shows greater dependency on external authority. The subjects of system II shows negativism and anti-rule, anti-authority orientation. The cognitive structure is somewhat more differentiated than system I's subject. The modes of functioning of the system III'ss subject is characterized by a desire to be liked and to maintain relationships that fosters mutual dependency. Conceptual organization is more differentiated

and better integrated. System IV, the most abstract of the four systems as characterized by high task orientation, information seeking, independence without negativism, internal standards of conduct and relativism in thought and action. The conceptual structure is more highly differentiated and integrated than the other systems. He is less likely than individuals from other systems to generalize impression based on incomplete information.

Three different situations were representing three inconsistent persons. In situation I, seemingly inconsistent behavior of Mr. A between his private and public life was shown. In situation II, Mr. X's past private and present private life were highlighted. While in situation III, past public and present public life of Mr. P were main issues.

The subjects or the perceiver persons were supposed to show their reactions towards three situations or three inconsistent persons. The reactions of the perceiver were collected in two sessions as shown under procedure, chapter III. The collected data were scored, tabulated and organized for further statistical treatments. The results of statistical analysis with interpretation has been given in chapter IV. In present chapter obtained results have been discussed in light of prevalent theories of consistency and person perception.

Inconsistency Felt - Botheration - Tolerance

Confronted with other person's inconsistent behavior, a perceiver perceives the situation, notices the level of inconsistency, feels bothered about the others' inconsistency and may or may not tolerate others' inconsistency. As mentioned in first chapter while discussing major concepts, it was stated that there may be personality and situational differences in reactions to inconsistency. First objective of the present work was, ' to study sex, personality and situational differences in reaction to inconsistency, in terms of, degree of inconsistency felt, degree of botheration and degree of tolerance,' As shown in data sheet, Appendix 3 there were five numerical scales. The subjects had rated their feelings regarding described inconsistent persons twice, which were analysed and the results have been presented in first 24 tables as given in chapter IV. The tables show means, analysis of covariance, mean differences for main effects and interaction effects for five dependent variables. Here, the results have been discussed sex, personality and situationwise.

Sexwise : Girls in comparison to boys perceived more degree of inconsistency as in Table 4.3 more specifically, girls of system II and IV as in Table 4.4. There was no sex difference as far as botheration(Table 4.10)and tolerance(Table 4.13)for third person's inconsistency were concerned. Girls in comparison to boys felt more bothered about inconsistent relative, as in Table 4.17. The girls showed less

tolerance towards inconsistent relative Table 4.22,more specifically the girls of system III and IV as in Table 4.24. In other words, there was no sex difference as far as botheration and tolerance were concerned if the inconsistent person was unknown other ; the moment the inconsistent person became relative,the level of botheration increased and the level of tolerance decreased for the girls.

There are very few researches availabbe dealing with sex difference on one hand and botheration and tolerance on other hand. Rosenberg (1965) gave hedonic - antihedonic and personal - general items to both male and female. In hedonic - antihedonic dimension, mean botheration of females were found to be more.While in personal - general dimension, females were found to be more bothered for personal items and male for general items. The results were not significant, but are cited here to show the trend.Comparing the results of Rosenberg and of the present work it can be seen that generally women are more bothered about personal things (object or person).

Steiner (1960) studied sex differences in dissonance tolerance. He found out that females were more inclined to tolerate dissonance. Contrary to this, the results of present work reveal that girls have shown, in general less tolerance for inconsistent person, more specifically, if he was a relative as in Table 4.22. Moreover, the results presented in Table 4.45

and 4.46 give somewhat contradictory results. In a kind of liking scale (Table No.4.45), girls have shown more willingness for closer reactions with inconsistent persons. The results of Table No. 4.46, reveal that only 37 percent of girls showed their willingness in tolerating inconsistent person while 53 percent boys showed that they could tolerate inconsistent person.

Generally, it is believed that Indian women are more submissive and they tolerate many social injustices. The scoring of TIB test also revealed the same trend. In chapter III, under the scoring of the TIB test, it has been shown that it was difficult to assign system II for girls as hardly there was any girl who had openly shown rebelious nature - characteristics of system II. But the results reveal that girls were less tolerant.

To put all the results together, it seems that girls of system I and II (more concrete thinkers) have reacted differently than the girls of system III and IV (more abstract thinkers). More concrete girls in comparison to more abstract girls perceived less degree of inconsistency (as in Table 4.5) ; and showed more tolerance for inconsistent relative (as in Table 4.23). In other words, the girls who were more open minded and independent thinkers have shown their less tolerance towards inconsistent relative. While the girls, who were more concrete thinkers, perceived less inconsistency ; were

comparatively less bothered, and more tolerant, and in a way preferred inconsistent persons as a near relative.

Systemwise : The analysis of covariance was not significant for two variables, 'degree of inconsistency felt' as in Table 4.2 and 'degree of tolerance for relative's inconsistency' as in Table 4.21. While it was significant for remaining variables : degree of botheration for both third person (Table 4.9) and relative (Table 4.16) and for degree of tolerance for third person as in Table 4.12.

The results of main effect reveal that :

1. Subjects of system I perceived less degree of inconsistency than the subjects of system III. (Table 4.3)
2. More abstract subjects were more bothered about the inconsistent person (both third person and relative. (Tables 4.10 and 4.18).
3. Subjects of system II were least tolerant for third person's inconsistency. (Table 4.13)

Harvey and Ware (1967) found that the concrete subjects to a significant greater extent than the abstract individuals perceived inconsistencies between other person's past and present behavior. In present work there were three situations. Comparing the results with Harvey and Ware's study it seems that as far as F-value is concerned there was no significant difference (as in Table 4.2). While results of main effects are contradictory. Contrary to Harvey's finding in present work more abstract thinkers (system III) perceived more inconsistency in comparison to more concrete thinkers (System I) as in Table 4.3.

Interaction sex and personality as given in Table 4.4 and 4.5 reveals that there was no significant difference between boys in perceiving inconsistency. But girls of system I and II perceived less degree of inconsistency in comparison to the girls of system III and IV (as in Table 4.5 and Figure 4.2). Boys of system III and IV perceived significantly less degree of inconsistency than the girls of system III and IV (as in Table 4.4 and Figure 4.1). In other words, the results of present work were contrary to Harvey's result only as far as girls were concerned. In Harvey's study interaction sex and systems were not studied separately, so it cannot be said conclusively that the results were really contradictory. On the whole it can be said that there was no significant difference systemwise as far as perception of inconsistency was concerned.

The subjects of system II were found to be least tolerant to third person's inconsistency (Table 4.13). The results seem to be in tune with the characteristics of system II subjects, as described by Harvey's studies. The subjects of system II were described as in a psychological void, rebelling against structure and authority on one hand and rendered fearful and anxious by the absence of authority guidelines on the other hand (Harvey, Reich and Wyer, 1968). May be due to rebelious type nature and concrete thinking the subjects of system II were less tolerant to the inconsistency.

In sum, it can be said that :

1. Girls of system III and IV, in comparison to boys of system III and IV and girls of system I and IV percei ved more inconsistency.
2. More abstract subjects, (system III and IV) were comparatively more bothered than the more concrete subjects (System I and II).
3. The subjects of system II were least tolerant for inconsistent third person.

Situationwise : The situations in the present study were descriptions of inconsistent persons. On the whole, there were three inconsistent situations. It was assumed that 'situation private x public will yield more degree of inconsistency in comparison to other two situations,' as Hypothesis I. No hypotheses were developed for botheration and tolerance.

F-value was significant for factor situation of variable 'degree of inconsistency felt' as in Table 4.2. For main effects, situation I and II were perceived significantly more inconsistent than the situation III as given in Table 4.3. Interaction sex and situation were significant as given in Table 4.7. Table 4.7 reveals that, boys perceived situation I as significantly more inconsistent than the situation II and III ; while girls perceived situation III as least inconsistent in comparison to the situations I and II.

The interaction effect, as shown in Table 4.7, reveals that the hypothesis I, that 'situation I will yield more degree

of inconsistency in comparison to situation II and III,' was true for boys. While for girls it revealed almost same trend, but for girls situation I and II were equally inconsistent. In a way girls perceived situation II as more inconsistent.

The hypothesis was based on the assumption that inconsistency between past and present will be regarded as a kind of change or maturity, due to some experience. While if one person believes something and does something else, means in present only, he is behaving differently. The results given in Table No. 4.35, reveals that respectively for situation II and III, there were 176, and 150 responses of 'inconsistency due to change' while for situation I, for 170 times 'inconsistency was accepted as personality traits' out of 243 responses. Most of respondents reacted to situation II and III as a change in person. What does the inconsistency due to change mean ? Does it mean that person is not inconsistent ? Similar type of questions were asked to the respondents. There was a difference of opinion. For some, change in behavior meant no inconsistency, while for others, it meant that inspite of change inconsistency was there.

The reason for considering situation II (past private and present private) as more inconsistent in comparison to situation III (past public and present public) seems to be that discrepancy between private means discrepancy between

beliefs, and discrepancy between beliefs is a sign of confusion, wavering mind, immature thoughts etc. In other words, it means that person is not consistent in his thinking. While for past public and present public, discrepancy is between behavior of past and present. Sometimes it is regarded as essential quality also. The thinking done or said in public may not be regarded as mere inconsistent because person might be doing it deliberately. Inconsistency in speaking or doing something in public may not be looked as serious as the inconsistency between ideas or beliefs.

F-values were not significant for remaining variables. Only interaction personality and situation was significant for variable, 'degree of botheration for relative's inconsistency.

In sum, it can be said that the boys perceived situation I as more inconsistent in comparison to remaining two situations; while girls perceived situation I and II as more inconsistent then the situation III.

Relationship Between Inconsistency - Botheration - Tolerance

Three dependent variables, degree of inconsistency felt, botheration and tolerance are reactions to inconsistency. In the present work these reactions have been treated about other person's inconsistent behavior. Other inconsistent person, was further varied according to his type of inconsistent behavior and his relation with the perceiver. There were three types of inconsistencies, depicted through situation I, II and III and

there were two types of relations with perceiver : unknown and-other and near relative.

Perceiver persons may vary in their reactions to inconsistency of other person, in terms of, noticing inconsistency in perceived person's behavior; feeling bothered about him ; and in being able to tolerate his inconsistent behavior. Here an attempt was made, 'to study relationship between degree of inconsistency felt, degree of botheration and degree of tolerance for both third person's inconsistency and relative's inconsistency', as Objective No.2. The results have been given in Table 4.25, 4.26 and 4.27.

Inconsistency and Botheration : It was expected that 'There will be a positive relationship between degree of inconsistency felt and degree of botheration' as hypothesis No.2. In other words, higher the degree of inconsistency perceived higher would be botheration for perceived person. Overall correlation was significant, but partial correlation was significant only at post ratings level. Post ratings correlation for third person was .190 and for relative ✗ was .302. The results specify two trends :

1. In comparison to pre ratings at post ratings correlation was significantly higher. In other words, more and more one ponders over inconsistent person, his botheration becomes affected according to the intensity of inconsistency of other person.

2. The positive relation between the intensity of inconsistency and level of botheration becomes more clearer and higher for relative rather than for third person.

The above results support the assumption that higher the intensity of inconsistency in other person higher would be the degree of botheration in perceiver. The trend was more clear for both relative and post ratings.

Inconsistency and Tolerance : All inconsistent situations need not be tolerable. Tolerance may vary from situation to situation and from individual to individual. An attempt was made to know the relationship between tolerance and level of inconsistency. In other words, if level or degree of inconsistency is more, does it mean that tolerance required will be more or less. An assumption was made that, 'there will be a negative relationship between degree of inconsistency felt and degree of tolerance' (Hypothesis No.3). This assumption was based on simple common sense that the higher the level of inconsistency in other person lesser would be tolerance in perceiver.

The results obtained in Table No. 4.26, supports the argument. All the overall correlations and partial correlations were negatively significant. It means, that the threshold of tolerance varied according to magnitude of inconsistency.

Negative correlations in post ratings though significant were low in comparison to pre ratings. The only difference between pre and post ratings was that in the pre ratings,

subject behaved instantly, without thinking much, while in the post ratings they rated the situation after much thinking. It can be said that lower correlation at post ratings suggest a trend that apart from level of inconsistency there could be some other factors which affect the tolerance. First reaction (pre ratings) was more a kind of impulsive reaction which might have affected more to tolerance limit while the second reaction was not more impulsive. There can be some other factors, which might have affected the level of tolerance at post ratings, but here nothing much can be said conclusively as there was no provision to measure internal processes more subtly in the present study.

Botheration and Tolerance : An attempt was also made to study the relationship, if any, between the level of botheration and the level of tolerance. Hypothesis No.4, formulated for the purpose assumed that, ' there will be a negative relationship between degree of botheration and degree of tolerance.' The logic behind the formulation was simple and based on common sense argument. If one is more inconsistent, his inconsistency may be more bothersome and less tolerable for perceiver. In other words, if one is more bothered about others inconsistency he will find it difficult to tolerate others' inconsistent behavior. The very fact that he is more bothered leads to assumption that he may be more involved, more concerned or more affected and which in turn may lead to

less tolerance.

The results presented in Table No.4.27, support the assumption. All correlations and partial correlations were negatively related. Overall correlation was not significant for third person's inconsistent behavior at post ratings, the remaining overall correlations were significant. The hypothesis, that botheration and tolerance were negatively related was proved.

Overall correlation between botheration and tolerance at post rating for third person was -0.068 and for relative it was -.171. The results indicate that negative relation in both cases were low. In comparison to third person for relative, the trend to negative relation was bit more clear. Higher the botheration for relative's inconsistency lower would be the tolerance limit. For third person's inconsistency, negative correlation was there, but the correlation was almost zero. From the results it seem that 'negative relation between botheration and tolerance' was more true with inconsistent relative rather than inconsistent third person. ~~He has nothing to loose much while tolerating him.~~

In sum, it can be said that inconsistency and botheration were positively related while inconsistency and tolerance; and botheration and tolerance were negatively related.

Change in the Degree of Inconsistency Felt

In present study pre post test paradigm was used more specifically to study the pattern of change in the inconsistency felt. It was simply believed that in pre rating perceiver will react according to his first reactions without

thinking much. Then he was supposed to write impressions about the described person. It was also believed that the exercise to write impressions would give him ample opportunity to apply different modes of inconsistency reduction, and ultimately he may be able to reduce the level of inconsistency. No hypotheses or assumptions were formulated for this objective, mainly because there were many other possibilities about the intervening behavior and the experimenter thought to keep the issue open for any interpretation according to the results without going much in ~~thes~~ search of causal relationship. It was also thought that impression writing exercise, may make certain peripheral issues central and vice versa, the subject may or may not be able to apply certain modes successfully, factors like his own mood, intention, values etc. also were thought to be playing an important part.

The results given in Table No. 4.28, reveal that there was no significant difference between two ratings for degree of inconsistency felt. While the results given in Table No. 4.29 lead to conclusion that in both cases where 'modes were applied' and where 'modes were not applied', in post ratings perception of degree of inconsistency increased. In other words, after impressions were written, the level of

perceived inconsistency increased.

Out of total 288 observations, in 152 observations, subjects had applied modes of inconsistency reduction and in remaining 136 observations had not applied a single mode of reduction. Inspection of Table No. 4.29, further reveals that, those who had 'used modes' in pre ratings, had perceived 5.65 mean degree of inconsistency, while those who had ' not used' had perceived 5.97 mean degree of inconsistency. In comparison to those who had not used any mode those who had used mode had perceived 0.32 less than degree of inconsistency. At post ratings the difference was of 0.21 mean degree. No statistic was applied to see whether the results were significant or not. But following hunches could be put forward,

1. Those X who had used modes, from the beginning had perceived less degree of inconsistency, may be because they had applied modes at the first sight only. In other words, the later exercise a special opportunity to apply modes, served merely as an expression media of what was already thought or applied during pre ratings. [illegible].
2. For those who had applied modes, in later ratings, there was an increase in perception of inconsistency. May be because, certain overlooked factors might have become more prominent, and came to surface, due to pondering over the matter.
3. Some of the modes of inconsistency reduction may not have the capacity to reduce the level of inconsistency. It might have served just as 'inconsistency maintenance mode. (Kelman and Baron, 1968a).

4. If perceiver, perceives that other person has 5 degree of conflicting behaviors (inconsistencies), and somehow is able to resolve three degree conflicting inconsistencies. For remaining two degrees however, hard he tries if he cannot reduce, he may feel that on the whole perceived person is more inconsistent (5 + 2 = 7) instead of (5 - 3 = 2). In other words, here the important issue, becomes unresolved inconsistencies. Because, perceiver could not reduce the inconsistency level, he may feel that the other person is really more inconsistent than he had thought earlier. It seems that reason falls in one of the hot areas whether impressions are averaged out or added, as discussed in review of related studies without raising much controversy, experimenter wants to suggest, that as far as this work is concerned, it seems that impression might have 'averaged' out, or at least, not 'added out'. As no special techniques were applied, and moreover, no statistical significance level was studied, experimenter wants to leave the issue for further study in future, with the hunch, that impressions might not be 'added out' in such circumstances as given in the study.

5. There was a tendency in the perceiver to accept other person as inconsistent instead of trying to reduce his inconsistency. The results given in Table No.4.32 and 4.36 reveal the same. The subjects had used 248 modes of inconsistency reduction (Table 4.36) and 682 reductions to accept inconsistency (Table 4.32). It becomes easy to accept the discrepancy of others' behavior as a sign of hipocracy, show, or inconsistency rather than attempting to find out some meaning or truing to reduce the level of inconsistency.

In sum, it can be said that there was no significant difference between pre and post ratings for degree of inconsistency felt.

Third Person and Relative

Does the perceiver person differ in their reactions to the inconsistency of unknown other in comparison to relative's inconsistency. More specifically, what bothers more to the perceiver, unknown third person's infonsistency or relative's inconsistency ? Who can be tolerated easily, unknown inconsistent person or inconsistent relative ? Objective No.4 was, to compare reactions to inconsistent behavior of third person and relative, in terms of, botheration and tolerance.'

Botheration : It was expected that, ' more degree of botheration, will be felt for relative's inconsistency than third person's inconsistency', as hypothesis No. 5. The assumption behind this was simple, if inconsistent person is relative, his inconsistent behavior can directly effect perceiver, but if, he is unknown other it may not affect that much. The ego involvement may be less with unknown other person in comparison to relative.

The results given in Table No. 4.30, reveal that overall and levelwise all t-values were significant at pre ratings. While at post ratings, for boys and the subjects of system III, t - values were not significant, for remaining levels and overall, t-values were significant. The obtained result supports the assumption that inconsistent relative was significantly more bothersome. The nonsignificant results for boys and subjects of system III, seems to be due to their specific way to react to the situation.

1. For boys, mean value of botheration for third person was 4.62 and for relative 4.97. The difference was negligible. The reason might be that boys are more carefree and happy go lucky. They were just slightly bothered about inconsistency.
2. Subjects of the system III felt 5.14 and 5.46 mean degree of botheration respectively for third person and relative. It shows their over concern and social nature as they were more bothered for both types of inconsistent person.

On the whole it can be said that inconsistent relatives are more bothersome. Rosenberg (1965), gave personal - general and hedonic - antihedonic items to the subjects He found that general items arose less botheration at inconsistency than personal items. The psychological meaning of this findings may be that we are bothered by inconsistencies both in cognitions affecting our own welfare (relative or personal items) and also in others that do not affect our welfare (third person or general items); and specifically, the former type of encounter with inconsistency is more upsetting.

Tolerance : It was expected that ' there will be no difference in degree of tolerance required for third person's and relative's inconsistent behavior' as in hypothesis No.6. The results given in Table No. 4.31, reveal that only one t-value of the boys at pre rating was significant. All other t-values, were not significant. It supports the assumption that 'there will be no difference in degree of tolerance required for third person's and relative's inconsistent behavior.'

The post test inquiry revealed that those who said they can tolerate inconsistent relative gave the reason that they have to tolerate in case inconsistent persons are close relative, as there is no way out. For third person they said

as they don't know them much, nor do they have any encounter with them, they can tolerate him easily. Somewhat similar idea was put forward by Rosenberg (1968), when he said that affective cognitive inconsistency is often tolerable and that it does not motivate consistency - restoring activity unless or until it becomes intolerable.

In sum, it can be said that, if third person and relative both are equally inconsistent, the inconsistent relative will generate significantly more tension or botheration in comparison to third person ; but both third person and relative will be tolerated equally.

Modes Used - Modes Not Used - Integration : When one person perceives other person's inconsistent behavior and tries to form impressions about him, he may use different types of reactions. These reactions were brought broadly under 'modes used' and 'modes not used'. In present work different reactions as under 'modes used' and 'modes not used' and their level of integration were studied, under objective 5, 6 and 7. Objective No. 5 was ' to study sex, personality and situational differences in reaction to inconsistency, in terms of, inconsistency not felt, acceptance of inconsistency and inconsistency due to change.' Objective No. 6 was, ' to study the pattern of inconsistency reduction modes, in terms of, sex, personality and

situational differences.' Objective No. 7 was, ' to study the level of integration of seemingly inconsistent information.' The results have been given in Table No. 4.32 to 4.40. As objective 5, 6 and 7 are somewhat related, they have been discussed together. In first few paragraphs general discussion has been given, followed by levelwise discussion.

Consistency or Inconsistency : Reactions under 'modes not used' were, inconsistency not felt, acceptance of inconsistency without reasoning, acceptance of inconsistency with reasoning, acceptance of inconsistency as personality traits and inconsistency due to change. While reactions under 'modes used' were, denial, rationalization, bolstering differentiation and transcendence. Total reactions of 'modes not used' types were 682, as in Table 4.32; and of 'modes used', 248, as in Table 4.36. More frequent use of 'modes not used' type of reactions show that there were comparatively more attempts to accept the unknown other person as an inconsistent instead of trying to reduce the level of inconsistency by applying proper modes. Generally, when perceiver perceives other person's behavior (specifically inconsistent), he tries to find out ar reason out why other person behaves like that. In his attempt to find out reason, he may be mostly stucked up with the words like, 'hypocrate', 'showy', 'he has changed' etc. And perceiver feels that he

has found the reason that why other person behaves inconsistently, simply because he is hypocrate, or because he is showy ... and so on. It seems, that over use of such words - meaning acceptance of inconsistency in others' behaviour, in fact, blocks further inquiry. The perceiver, instead of trying out some ways to integrate inconsistent or discrete informations by bridging it, simply accepts that other person is inconsistent. Pepitone and Hayden (1955) while attempting to test conflict resolution tendencies, found that only a minority of the subjects were able to reconcile the two sets of information in their impressions, most of the respondents either ignored one set of information, or if both sets of information were retained, provided no satisfactory means of relating and unifying the two themes. Similarly, Dinnerstein (1951) reported that impressions were not always unified, completed and rounded. These findings are more related to the way the inconsistent informations are being integrated, but here it is suffice to say, that people in general, try to accept that other person is an inconsistent instead of trying to perceive him as more consistent.

Pattern of Modes : Five modes of inconsistency reduction were studied in present work : denial, rationalization, bolstering, differentiation and transcendence. Out of total

248 modes used, denial was used highest, 95 times ; followed in descending order, rationalization, 76 ; transcendence, 46 ; differentiation, 35 ; and bolstering was used 6 times. The general pattern, from highest to lowest, was denial, rationalization, transcendence, differentiation and bolstering. Abelson (1959) in his theoretical paper on belief dilemma, expected a hierarchy of resolution attempts in following order, denial, bolstering, denial, differentiation and transcendence. It was based on principle of relative ease in using modes. Denial was thought by Abelson as most easy and transcendence most difficult. There are many accounts of differences between the obtained results and the hierarchy proposed by Abelson. First, in 1959 work, Abelson had not introduced the mode of rationalization; (2) Bolstering as such becomes easy when one knows the inconsistent person, so that he can bring forth good points, but if inconsistent person is unknown one, it becomes difficult to enumerate good points, (3) apart from it, the mode transcendence, was also used more frequently than other easy modes, the fact that users of mode transcendence mostly were respondents of system IV, as given in Table 4.38, reveals that for abstract respondents of system IV it was comparatively easier to apply the mode transcendence, and that's why they applied it more frequently. Denial was used most as predicted

by Abelson. Different from the Abelson's pattern, the general pattern of modes of inconsistency reduction in present work was: denial, rationalization, transcendence, differentiation and bolstering.

All modes of inconsistency reduction were used by the respondents, but their pattern differed. The details of the pattern of modes levelwise will be discussed later on.

Integration : Based on Kaplan and Crocketts (1968) proposal, three levels of integration were arbitrarily classified : juxtaposition, related together and integrated. The levels of integration were further quantified in 1 to 10 numbers. Higher number or scores represented integrated information and lower scores juxtaposition, the details have been given under dependent variable 'integration', in chapter III.

Characteristic ways of doing things determine whether an organism is developmentally more 'primitive' or 'advanced' irrespective of when these modes of operation are brought into play (Werner, 1937, Werner and Kaplan, 1956 ; Kaplan, 1964, 1966 and 1967, Mair, 1962.) Here stress was not given on particular mode but the way the modes were used. According to viewpoint as suggested by Kaplan and Crockett (1968), in present work an attempt was made to order the various modes

of reduction in a rational sequence, the more primitive modes reflecting a lesser differentiation and hierarchic integration (like juxtaposition) than the more advanced modes (like integrated). In other words, the mode denial can be used in a primitive way or in advanced way. The way the informations were integrated determined whether the person was working at lower level or at higher level of integration. So, this developmental way of analysis which stresses 'characteristic ways of doing things', made the interpretation of 'modes used' and 'modes not used' more meaningful. Results undef modes used and not used showed what were different reactions to inconsistency while results under integration showed at what level this modes or reactions were functioning. The results of mean difference of integration have been given in Table No. 4.40.

Some of the general observations made by the experimenter while conducting and analyzing the reactions to inconsistency are worth discussing. Ten items were given in each situation, in sets of five, to the respondents. The respondents after reading it were supposed to write the impressions. The most striking fact was that the respondents reacted on one or two items at a time, and very few tried to integrate more or all the items in their reactions, as given in Table 4.46 and 4.47. Second thing, there was a

tendency, in the respondents to generalize from one or two items. Third thing, the respondents used extensively 'frame of reference'. To give an example,

For situation I - private x public, there was one item, says 'that he is extra - ordinary intelligent', to it respondent reacted, that he is not intelligent because intelligent persons do not say like that. Instead of trying to relate one item with other items, generally, respondent reacted by comparing particular item with 'stereotypes' or frame of reference'. In other words the perceiver instead of considering other person as an unique person, and comparing and integrating his traits, compared his traits with 'stereotypes' or 'frame of reference' (which was at times, very rigid), and generalized from one or two items.

This observation leads to conclusion, that in person perception, perceiver needs training of how to perceive other person as an unique entity, how to integrate his each trait (instead of comparing it with 'stereotypes' or 'rigid frame of reference'). The training may help in reducing errors in person perception.

Sexwise : There was no significant difference between boys and girls for their reaction for modes not used, as in

Table 4.33 ; modes used, as in Table 4.37 ; and the level of integration, as in Table 4.40.

Though the results were not significant certain trends were dominant. For example, girls accepted inconsistency in other person more frequently ; while boys preferred reason 'inconsistency due to change' more frequently than the expected frequencies of X^2 - test, as given in Table 4.33 ; boys used the mode transcendence more frequently, as given in Table 4.37 ; boys had integrated the inconsistent informations at comparatively higher level, as given in Table 4.40. Gollin (1958) found that females more frequently in comparison to males formed integrated impressions from discrepant informations. While in present study, no sex difference was obtained as far as integration of discrepant informations were concerned, but the obtained trend in contrast to Gollin's results was that boys integrated it at higher level in comparison to girls. Boys in present work, used the mode 'transcendence' and reaction 'inconsistency due to change' more frequently, while girls had accepted inconsistency more frequently, by using trait like hypocrate, showy, silly, inconsistent etc. The results do not tally with Gollin's (1958) study. The difference in findings may be attributed to cultural differences.

As far as pattern of modes of inconsistency reductions was concerned, both boys and girls used the sane general pattern

denial most used, followed by rationalization, transcendence, differentiation and bolstering.

Personalitywise : The reactions to inconsistency, personalitywise, for modes not used have been given in Table 4.34 ; for modes used, in Table 4.38; and for integration in Table 4.40. All the results were significant.

The subjects of system IV - highly abstract thinkers, integrated the inconsistent information at higher level, as in Table 4.40 ; gave more number of reactions, as in Table 4.34 and 4.38 ; gave more responses of 'acceptance as personality traits' and 'inconsistency due to change', as in Table 4.34; and used mode 'transcendence' more frequently, as in Table 4.38 ; in comparison to the subjects of other systems. The results seem to be in tune with Harvey, Hunt and Schroder (1961) and subsequent series of studies by Harvey and his colleagues, where they expected subjects of system IV working at abstract level, able to integrate information in better way, use of better explanations, use of higher modes. The detailed characteristics of subjects of system IV has been given under independent variable 'Belief System', in chapter III.

The significant difference found in integration, as in Table 4.40, shows that more abstract subjects, system III and IV, have characteristically more advanced ways of doing

things, in comparison to the more concrete subjects (system I and II). The subjects of system I and II, showed more primitive ways of doing things, by giving poor, half explained and incomplete explanations. The results are in tune with Harvey and Ware (1967) study, where they reported that more concrete subjects gave few explanations of the inconsistencies, gave poorly integrated accounts of the inconsistency, expressed in mere reiteration of the conflicting characteristics.

As far as pattern of modes of inconsistency reduction were concerned, subjects of system IV used mode denial and transcendence more frequently; while the subjects of system I, II and III relied more on denial and rationalization, as in Table 4.38. The more use of mode transcendence by the subjects of system IV shows the capacity of most abstract subjects to integrate inconsistent things in more advanced way.

Situationwise : The results of modes not used have been presented in Table 4.35 ; modes used, in Table 4.39; and of integration in Table 4.40. The X^2 - value was significant for 'modes not used', while results of 'modes used' and 'integration' were not significant.

Situationwise means of integration were not significantly different, as in Table 4.40. In other words, all the three situations were integrated at same level. The reactions to the inconsistency, in form of 'modes used' and 'modes not used', were

integrated at equal level irrespective of type of the inconsistent situation.

x^2 - value of 'modes used' was not significant for variable situation, as given in Table 4.39. The non significant results indicate that different modes were used in equal proportion for all the three situations. Pattern of modes of inconsistency reduction remained same, as general trend, denial and rationalization more used followed by transcendence differentiation and bolstering.

Though the pattern remained same and there was no significant difference for the 'modes used', number of modes used per situation was drastically different. For situation I in total, 121 modes were used ; while for situation II, 48; and for situation III, 79 ; as given in Table 4.39. The less number of modes used for situation II and III, was mainly due to more use of reaction 'inconsistency due to change' for these situations, as given in Table 4.35. The results in Table 4.35 shows that situation II and III, in all had 326 reactions of 'inconsistency due to change' out of total 328. The situations II and III, had specific nature, both depicted inconsistency between past and present. So, it had more reactions as 'inconsistency due to change'. And as there were more reactions of 'inconsistency due to change' there was less need of utilizing other modes of inconsistency reduction.

Moreover, the exclusive use of 'inconsistency due to change', for situation II and III, lead to significant X^2 difference for 'modes not used', as given in Table 4.35. It can be seen that for situation II and III, there were more reactions of 'inconsistency due to change' while for situation I, more number of reaction of 'acceptance of inconsistency', were given.

In sum, it can be said, that though all the three situations were equally integrated and had the same pattern of modes used, there was difference for 'modes not used'. The reaction 'inconsistency due to change' was given exclusively for situation II and III, and 'acceptance of inconsistency' more frequently for situation I.

Homeostasis or Signal-and-Search

In the first introductory chapter while referring to historical development of concepts of consistency and inconsistency it was traced out that the concepts were influenced by thermodynamics, biology and gestalt psychology. In the beginning phase of consistency theories, under the influence of homeostatic nature of consistency, early theorist had developed a unitary-drive-reduction model. According to that model, presence of inconsistency gives rise to a state of tension (in much the same way as do another drive states like hunger and thirst). The existence of this psychological tension

(botheration) motivates the person to eliminate inconsistency, thereby restoring what may be called a state of 'dynamic equilibrium' (Lewin, 1935). These theories were attacked from many sides, for assuming 'a naive hydraulic conception' of behavior (Weiss, 1964; Anderson and Fishbein, 1964; Fishbein and Hunter, 1964; Berkowitz, 1968a ; Back, 1968; Kelman and Baron, 1968b ; Maddi, 1968; Berlyne, 1968). A new model : signal and-search was proposed by Kelman and Baron (1968b). According to this model reduction of inconsistency was not an important end in itself. They believed that individual was stimulated to explore the basis of the inconsistency and its consequences. The end result may or may not include an attempt to resolve the inconsistency itself. They considered impact of inconsistency as signaling rather than reducing capacity. The signal-and-search model views man as essentially an information - processing animal. Objective No. 8 of the present work was, 'to observe which model is more applicable out of the two models, namely homeostatic and signal-and-search. No hypothesis was developed.

The objective was not measured directly. The data gathered were to be interpreted along with the observations made during the practical sessions. In Table 4.41, some of the data from the previous tables have been presented in rearranged form.

It was observed that most of the perceivers could observe some kind of inconsistency in the perceived person. The observed

inconsistency in other person did not bother to all the respondents. There were some respondents who said that they were not at all bothered about the inconsistent person though they had perceived inconsistency.

It was observed, that those who perceived inconsistency in other person, and also were bothered about his inconsistency said that they could tolerate him easily.

In total 248 time modes were used to reduce the level of inconsistency and 682 time, it was either accepted or felt as inconsistency due to change (Table 4.41). In their reactions to inconsistency, most of the time respondents accepted it as inconsistent instead of reducing the level of inconsistency in order to make it more consistent.

Even those who had used modes, had perceived almost equal degree of inconsistency. Those who had used modes perceived 5.65 in pre test and 5.96 mean degree of inconsistency in posttest. Those who had not used, perceived 5.97 in pre test and 6.17 mean degree of inconsistency in post test. This shows that even the application of modes, had not brought the level of inconsistency lower.

The just cited observations and results can be summarized as :

- Those who perceived inconsistency in other, were not necessarily bothered about his inconsistency.
- Some of the respondents who had shown their botheration about others inconsistency said that they can tolerate him.
- Most of the respondents more frequently accepted that the other person was inconsistent rather than to try to reduce his level of inconsistency.
- Even those who used modes had perceived same level of inconsistency, and in some cases inconsistency instead of being reduced increased.

All such results favoured signal-and-search model. Tannenbaum (1968b), believed that both models might be operative under different circumstances. He suggested that information paradigm was most suited where the input was of a factual or of a perceptual nature, or where the cognitive implications were involved. And when inconsistencies involve purely affective relations, the mechanism may be more along semi-automatic homeostatic lines. It can be said that according to Tannenbaum's speculation in present work where inconsistency was more of a cognitive nature, reaction to inconsistency was in accordance to signal-and-search model.

Limitations of the Study

To study perception of an inconsistent person, laboratory method was used in present work. Inconsistent person was depicted through two sets of five sentences. Three different

types of inconsistent situations were manipulated. This method helped in studying inconsistencies in very specific manner in a restricted controlled environment. As a result it inherited all the limitations of laboratory methods, like reduction of complex human behavior, absence of person to be perceived, reduction in interaction between perceiver and perceived person, laboratory set up might have brought certain changes in respondents like, his behavior to please experimenter, pre sets in mind, motivational level and so on.

It seems that the lack of live and real encounter might have affected results but the gross trend of reactions might not have been damaged severely. Some of the obtained results can be safely used as broad guidelines for future research or understanding of person perception.
