CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

===

- Introduction

- Historical Antecedents of Cognitive Consistency
  Theories

- Consistency Theories

- Major Concepts

- Scheme of Chapterization

===

I INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Advancement in science and technology has brought far reaching consequences in various spheres of life. At one pole, there is tremendous increase in knowledge which brings even heavenly bodies nearer. At the other pole human being is becoming less sensitive, and going away from the fellow beings. Ironically, one can understand complexities of computers but fails to understand other human beings.

The most alarming and challenging problem for psychologists, psychiatrists, counselors or social workers, is increasing number of cases of maladjustment : due to failure of inter-personal relationships. Alienation, like cancer is a widespread modern disease, which cuts off men from the surrounding world.

Complaints and dissatisfaction with others are found in both formal and informal social relationships. In formal relationships, people complain against authorities, leaders and vice versa. And if overridden with prejudices and affected by propaganda complains extends itself between different groups like rich and poor, hindu and muslim, minority and majority.

As far as informal social relationships are concerned the case of misunderstanding is more severely affected. As a result there is dissatisfaction between husband and wife, parents and children, teacher and students or between friends. Lack of love, understanding and trust between intimates makes each other more and more suspicious, zealous or cunning. In many cases emotional shocks from intimates leads to nervous breakdown, which ultimately can be named as different psychological disorder.

Data from therapist or counselor undoubtedly suggests that any mental disorders has in root, germs of faqulty perception of fellow being. Faulty perception of other person are mainly because one is not open enough to accommodate other as he is, but wants to perceive from his own viewpoint. If other person, does not suit to his frame of reference, it is not that frame of reference needs modification, but that other person is imbalanced. This wrong attitude on the part of the perceiver may be one of the main causes of wrong perception of other fellow being.

The human behavior with its unique verbal and non-verbal language, is the source of communication between two persons. One person comes to know about the other person through his behavior. Other person reveals his intentions, opinions, beliefs etc. through behavior.

Sometimes, he reveals wrong clues to the perceiver. The perceiver also does not take all clues for granted.

Appraising, understanding and judging others, underlies all human intercourse. One tries to understand the other person from direct and indirect information or clues one gets about the other person. Direct clues are the clues which one collects through direct encounter with the other person. Indirect clues are provided by other persons to the perceiver. On the basis of whatever information one has about the other person (direct or indirect) one tries to judge and understand the other person. The whole process of person perception, where one tries to perceive the other person and finally come to some conclusion, is a very interesting and challenging area for researchers. Scholars from different disciplines have tried to answer the process from different viewpoints. In the present work an attempt has been made to answer it from consistency theories viewpoint.

The whole process of person perception can be arbitrarily divided into three parts : receiving the information, synthesizing and analyzing it and finally decision making. The information which travels from perceived person to perceiver and passes through various

stages may be modified or distorted at any juncture.

First of all, the most important and vital process in perceiving other person is to perceive or receive the information. Perceived person constantly reveals many informations and clues (representing his inner state). All clues cannot be received by the perceiver. There can be three possibilities. First, some potentially vital information may not be received at all. It may be totally overlooked. Second, the information received may be partly distorted: a case of distroted perception. Third, the information be received as it is without any distortion or modifications. In any case, while receiving the information personal and environmental factors play an extremely vital role.

The second stage is of synthesis. Information received by the body through various sense organs reaches to the brain, inbetween many bio-chemical changes occur. These changes also might have profound influence in the whole process. Ultimately, information registers itself in the brain, where it interacts with already available data (past experience in the form of memory). The interaction - synthesis and analysis (thinking, problem solving etc.) done by the brain is second most important juncture. Here past data plays a very important role.

Still scientists are not very clear about the functioning of the human brain and what exactly happens inside the brain. It is yet a very vague area.

The third phase is decision making. After the synthesis and analysis, some decision is taken. The decision which perceiver takes is very important, as it is going to be a base for future interaction. If the wrong decision is taken, there can be wrong reactions. If the perceiver takes wrong decision about the perceived person he will lay the basis for maladjustment with the other person. Gradual growth of such wrong reactions may lead in future to severe emotional shock. In order to reduce mental disorders one has to find out ways to reduce misunderstanding between intimates. For it, first of all one should know different sources of errors in the perception; and second on the basis of errors found, there should be planned effort to improve person perception by training the perceiver.

Informations about perceived person can be varied, reflecting different aspects of his life, his nature, his achievements and so on. These informations can be positive or negative. To take one example: Mr.A, is very intelligent, cunning and a successful political leader. Here three informations are given about Mr.A. Two are positive and one

negative. If perceiver perceives Mr.A., like this he will not be very much surprised to see his positive and negative characteristics together. It may not disturb him more.

There are certain informations which seems to be contradictory. Contradiction need not be logical it can be psychological. If one person comes to know that Mr.S., is a great scientist and he beats his wife. What can be his reaction ? Will it differ from the information about Mr.P. who is said to be a drunkard and who beats his wife. Mr.S. seems more complicated, inconsistent than Mr.P. Moreover Mr.S. may create more concern. The perceiver will be more bothered about Mr.S., in comparison to Mr.P. If one drunkard beats his wife, it is not unusual but if one scientist does like that it is surprising. Logically both things appear equal (·husband beating wife) but psychologically one is more bothersome and inconsistent than other. Perhaps it becomes easy to tolerate the drunkards behaviour but difficult to tolerate the scientist.

Similarly, it becomes easy to tolerate the information that Mr.Y. is a philantropist, and he has donated recently big amount of money for the school building. But difficult to tolerate the information that Mr.Z, most miserly person of the town, donating a big amount of money for the school building. Though both persons are donating money for the same

purpose. Mr.Y seems to be more consistent than Mr.Z. The information that Mr.Z, denotes money for school does not match with the information that he is a miser. There will be no difficulty in understanding Mr.Y, but it will be difficulty to understand Mr.Z from the given informations. Confronted with such inconsistent persons, how one reacts becomes an interesting issue. One may conclude that Mr.Z is really a miser, and donating money is just a show to fool the public. Or one can say, that it seems that Mr.Z, has changed, now he is no more miser. Or one can say that Mr.Z, is miser as far as certain issues are concerned (which he does not give importance) and not always. These are some possible different reactions to Mr.Z's inconsistent behavior. Based on such reasonings or conclusions, the perceiver will react in future with Mr.Z.

If the informations or cognitions about the other person does not fit easily, it may generate the feeling in the perceiver that the perceived person is not consistent. Any information one gets about the perceived person reflecting his belief, behavior, opinion, characteristic, past life, present life, private life or public life... anything related to the perceived person can be said cognition or knowledge. If two or more cognitions does not fit with each other (logically or psychologically) it becomes a case of cognitive

inconsistency.Cognitive inconsistencies are not necessarily
negative or bad characteristics. But it is a feeling on
the part of the perceiver that some cognitions do not
follow each other, they do not go together.

To take some more example. One person cannot believe
in democracy and dictatorship simultaneously. If he believes,
he seems to be confused or inconsistent.

Similarly, if one believes that women should be
given equal opportunity in all spheres of life, but does
not allow his wife to take any sort of active part in
decision-making, is a case of inconsistency. Because what
he believes and what he does, do not fit easily.

To elaborate the case of drunkard cited earlier. If
Mr.P, a drunkard who always abuses and beats his wife, one
day in a gay mood asks his wife to come for an evening walk
and presents her a gold ring, how Mrs. P. will react to it ?
She will be surprised, a bit bothered, as she had never
expected such behavior from Mr. P.

Generally, when one person (perceiver) perceives some
inconsistency in others (perceived person) behavior he
becomes concern or bothered about it. Next, he tries to
understand that inconsistent behavior, and ultimately comes
to some conclusion. In conclusion, either he accepts that the

perceived person is really an inconsistent or he feels
that he is not an inconsistent. If he feels that he is not
inconsistent he puts forward some reasonings. These
reasonings can be termed as modes of inconsistency
reduction.

To take an example: If somebody says that Mahatma
Gandhiji favoured violence. It is an inconsistent information
about Gandhiji (advocate of non-violence). Person can
plainly deny the information that Gandhiji favoured violence.
The denial (mode) of cognition that Gandhiji favoured
violence, reduces the inconsistency, and perceiver's image
or impression about Gandhiji as advocate of non-violence
remains intact.

To take one more example. Mr.A believes that he is very
intelligent and he fails in examination. He cannot deny
the fact that he failed in the examination. Moreover he
does not want to accept that he is not intelligent. So, he
can put forward some reasonings which is socially acceptable
and which proves that he is still intelligent. He can
rationalize, that at the time of examination, he was severely
ill, and could not prepare for examination properly.

All inconsistencies may not be qualitatively and/or
quantitatively equal. Some inconsistencies may be more intense

than others. Tolerance for inconsistency may depend upon the type of inconsistency and its relevance to person (situation) and person's own nature (personality). In case if he fails to tolerate important inconsistency, it may lead to some emotional shock.

In the present study, an attempt was made to study the reactions of perceiver when he perceives some inconsistencies in perceived person. Perceived person's seemingly inconsistent behavior was presented through written descriptions.

Perceiving an inconsistent person involves two major issues : person perception, and inconsistency. The issue of person perception have been discussed in detail in second chapter with the intention that most of the studies related to present work have methodological parenthood in theories other than consistencies.

Issue related to inconsistency has been given first priority and discussed in detail in the first chapter. The concepts of consistency - inconsistency have raised many controversies. There are many methodological and conceptual diversions. It was thought worthwhile to divide the issue under three stages. (1) Informal development of concept of consistency in disciplines other than consistency,

(2) Its formal starting point and various methodological diversifications - major six theories. And as the present work is not confined with any of the specific diversions, but is related to major concepts used by those theories in (3) third stage it was thought desirous to critically evaluate certain major concepts and the problems faced by them, and also the way they were treated or tested in present work.

Historical Antecedents of Cognitive Consistency Theories

The concepts of consistency and inconsistency are neither novel nor unique to psychology. As Zajonc (1960) had indicated, the concepts have appeared in almost all sciences at one time or another, it has long past but short history (McGuire 1966b, Newcomb 1968a).

Most of assumptions, concepts and methods of the contemporary cognitive consistency theories seem to have been influenced by philosophy, physics, biology, sociology, psychoanalysis, and psychology in general. Increasing explorations in the various areas within psychology such as personality, motivation, perception, sociometry, clinical psychology, gestalt psychology, and developmental psychology, contributed considerably towards a clearer understanding of the problem.

Medieval Age :

In a way, it can be said that the idea of consistency had been descended from the medieval notion of logical man or the notions of rational man (McGuire 1966b), and economic man (Newcomb, 1968a). These notions were popular as guiding postulate for explaining human behavior in the early days of the dismal science. Yet these notions were themselves ambiguously used. Rational man was used to refer sometimes to reality orientation, sometimes to internal logical consistency. The latter is closer to the current meaning of cognitive consistency. Currently the term 'Consistency' is based more on 'Psycho-logic' (Abelson and Rosenberg, 1958) rather than on logic. In other words, current theories of consistency do not rest upon the assumption that man is a rational animal, rather they suggest that man is a rationalizing animal (Aronson, 1968), he attempts to appear rational, both to others and to himself.

Charles Peirce :

In an 1877 volume of Popular Science Monthly, Charles Sanders Peirce wrote an essay on the 'fixation of belief', which was important not only as milestone in the history of philosophy, but also in a clearly traceable way to the

subsequent psychological thought of William James, John
Dewey, Edward Tolman, and Leon Festinger. Peirce argued
that men are motivated to attain states of belief and to
avoid states of doubt. Doubt was considered to be an
uncomfortable state, an irritant, from which men sought
relief. When a man is in a state of belief, the cognitive
basis for habit exists, since given the proper circumstances
he will know how to act. But when a man is in a state of
doubt the basis for action does not exist. For Peirce, the
sole object of individual inquiry was the settlement of
doubtful opinions to attain belief and thus to restore a
comfortable state of mind. This core idea has been represented
in one form or the other in the most important competing
theories of contemporary social psychology.

Physics :

Behavioral scientists in order to make their own
studies more scientific looking, adopted (sometimes blindly)
different conceptual models from the natural sciences -
specifically from Physics. The profound effect of Physics can
be seen in the concept of 'intelligence'. Influenced by
classical Newtonian physics, it was believed that man was a
fixed and closed system characterized by fixed intelligence,
orderly development, and fixed though interminable potential.
As a result teachers had assumed that the I.Q. was fixed

entity in young children. Currently, influenced by the
modern physics (Einstenian), development has been considered
as open-ended, and intelligence as modificable. Almost in
the same way, the influence of the classical and modern
physics can be observed in the conceptual development of
consistency theories, specifically with the concepts of
'inconsistency tolerance', and 'inconsistency reduction.'

Classical Physics :

The influence of the thermodynamics would be more clear with
brief reference to the assumptions of thermodynamics. The Law of
Thermodynamics assumed that all systems were endowed with inherent
organizational tendencies which flow toward the establishment
of stabilized relations of part and toward maintenance of
equilibrium or state of synchrony between them. Incursion from
external sources of malfunctioning of some internal part upsets
the balanced relationship and by so doing generates state of
increased 'tension' and 'energy' which results in activity aimed
at 'restoration' of equilibrium, a state of 'harmony' and
'balance' that might not be identical to the relationships and
tension level existing prior to the disruptive displacement from
the steady state.

The above assumptions of thermodynamics were basic to
the following three lines of thought, which in turn influenced

psychology in general and consistency theories in specific.

1. The homeostasis, principle developed in biology
   and later on borrowed by psychology.

2. The psychoanalysis, advanced by Sigmund Freud.

3. The field theory of Gestalt Psychology.

(These three lines of thinking have been dealt in detail
  elsewhere in present chapter).

Modern Physics :

The classical phase of physics ended with the conceptual
modifications started with Einstein and others. The work of
von Bertalanffy (1938, 1941, 1950) and other German
scientists like Dehlinger and Wertz (1942) and Bavinck (1944)
introduced new dimension of thinking more popularly known
as concept of 'Open-system'. The new line of thinking (open-
system) eventually had influenced different concepts and
assumptions (based on thermodynamics) as applied in physics,
biology and later on in psychology, for example, new
concepts like 'steady state' (von Bertalanffy, 1950),
equifinality (von Bertalanffy 1950 ; Prigogine, 1947),
'anamorphosis' (von Bertalanffy, 1929 ; Woltereck (1940)
etc. were introduced in physics and biology. Prigogine and
Wiame, (1946) stated that classical thermodynamics, was an admirable

but fragmentary doctrine. The fragmentary characteristics
resulted from the fact that it was applicable only to
states of equilibrium in closed systems. It was necessary,
therefore, to establish a broader theory comprising states
of non-equilibrium as well as those of equilibrium.
Similarly it seems that now it is high time to develop a
theory which encompasses or embraces seemingly controversial
concepts of 'consistency' and 'exploration'.

Sumner :

Perhaps the first behavioral scientist in this
century to use the concept of consistency was the
sociologist Sumner (1906). He stressed on a 'strain toward
consistency' among the cultural folkways.

Homeostasis :

The term homeostasis was coined by Walter Cannon
(1932) to describe the steady states attained at any
particular moment by the physiological process at work in
living organisms. The idea of 'equilibrium' was presented
by Claude Bernard (1859) in physiology, and on its basis
the motivation principle in psychology utilizing the name
of 'homeostasis', had been developed.

It was the psychobiologist C.P.Richter who extended
Cannon's experimental approach to the study of behavioral
effects of physiological homeostasis. Richter (1942, 1943)
showed that when the physiological regulators were
surgically eliminated the animals themselves made an
effort to maintain a constant environment or homeostasis.

Fletcher (1938, 1942) is credited to bring homeostasis
principle in psychology. Later on many writers have used
the concept of homeostasis in one form or the other to
describe the organization of the personality (Menninger,
1954; Aldrich, 1955; Stagner, 1954, and Emerson 1954). The
influence of homeostasis principle in the earlier stages
of Cognitive Consistency was much more.

Psychoanalysis :

Freudian Psychoanalysis with their subsystems of
id, ego and super ego was mainly concerned with ways in
which the various defense mechanisms operate through
unconscious means to protect the ego system from the forces
disposing towards the tension state of anxiety. The
striking similarity between various defense mechanisms
and the modes of inconsistency reduction can be
seen through the works of : Festinger and Bramel (1962),

Deutch and Solomon (1959), Gerard (1961), Jones et al.
(1962), Aronson (1960). Defense mechanisms like
rationalization, defensive projection, denial etc. have
been explained through consistency theories. Psycho-
analytic theories had difficulties in operationalizing
concepts so that they could be used fruitfully in
experimental programs (Pepitone 1966). Consistency theories
are in advantage as they are able to explain major events
without the concepts like unconscious, super ego etc.

Gestalt Psychology :

In a very broad sense, the gestalt psychologists,
Max Wertheimer (1912), Wolfgang Kohler (1940), Koffka
(1925) and field theorist, Kurt Lewin (1935) contributed
a lot in the development of consistency theories. In this
connection the principle of good figure - pragnanz, was
of prime importance. Wertheimer (1912) applied it to
visual perception. Kohler (1940) related this observation
to a similar tendency found in physical systems which
rules the process in the physiological brain field.
Koffka (1925) applied the same thought model to behavior.
He used the term 'closure' for the distinguish and state,'
a closed figure being a better figure than an open one.
Kohler (1938) introduced a new concept 'standard state',

state towards the processes in the organism are directed.
Lewin (1935 ; 1951) more experimentally inclined and
influenced by the avowed goals of operationalism,
concentrated on the effects of disequilibrium and psychic
tensions produced through such situational manipulations
as interruption of tasks, blocking of goals, and failure
in attainment of levels of aspiration. The impact of
gestalt thinking, specially, Lewin's field theory, was
very much evident in such work as Heider's treatment of
'balance' (1946 ; 1958), in Newcomb's treatment of
'symmetry' (1953 ; 1961), in Festinger's treatment of
'dissonance' (1957) as well as in other theories related
with cognitive consistency.

Developmental Psychology :

Somewhat related to the cognitive consistency approach
was work done by developmental psychologists. There was
early work of Piaget (1932) and the later work of Kohlberg
(1963) on the ontogenesis of the resolution of moral conflicts.
Under the direction of Brunswik (1959) some work had been
done related to the modes of resolution of incongruity in
children to those found in adults under 'microgenetic'
conditions and to those found in earlier periods of culture
history. Heinz Werner (1937, 1956, 1961) found that, an

organism operating at a primitive level of functioning
achieved 'consistency' in a qualitatively different
manner than an organism operating at a more advanced
level of functioning. Bernard Kaplan and Crockett (1968)
proposed developmental analysis of modes of resolution,
which brings developmental and social psychology more
nearer.

Conflicting Theory :

Psychological conflict is said to be the major
source to influence the concept of consistency. In 1935
Lewin, with reference to human behavior distinguished
three kinds of conflict. In 1944, using laboratory animals
as subjects, Miller made the same distinctions by applying
the terms approach - approach, avoidance - avoidance, and
approach - avoidance conflict. Brown (1965) showed that
different types of conflicts could be 'mapped' in terms
of a 'balance model'. For example, approach-avoidance
state of conflict could be compared with a state in which a
positive bond between objects of unlike sign - a condition
of imbalance.

Personality Theory :

In the 'Authoritarian Personality', (Adorno et. al. 1950)
concept of tolerance of ambiguity was discussed. The

similarity of this notion to that of tolerance of
inconsistency seems apparent, though there were very
few supporting studies (Newcomb, 1961). By that time,
problems of the structure of personality were beginning
to impringe upon those of cognitive structuring.

Lecky :

In 1945, Lecky published a small book, in which he
attempted to explain thought and behavior in terms of
single principle. The single principle being, the tendency
of the individual to be self-consistent. He suggested that
this single principle might substitute for the many
principles of human behavior that had been developed for
dealing with diverse areas of cognition and behavior. He
attempted to show how learning could be explained as well
as by a consistency principle as by conditioning. The
process of forgetting was also explained by consistency
principle as inconsistent elements drop out of memory.

It was a brief historical review of some of the
important informal antecedent viewpoints (in different
disciplines) which in turn have influenced considerably
to the some of the basic concepts of the consistency
theories - to be dealt in present study.

Consistency Theories

During 1950's at least half a dozen theories of consistency appeared more or less independently in the psychological literature. They were proposed under various names, such as balance, congruity, symmetry, dissonance. But all had in common the notion that the person behaves in a way that maximizes the internal consistency of his cognitive system ; and that groups behave in ways that maximizes the internal consistency of their interpersonal relations. Fritz Heider (1944, 1946, 1958) gets the credit to propose the first cognitive consistency theory.

In next few pages, in very brief, the different consistency theories have been reviewed. Some of the major developments within theory and suggestions for further reading have been proposed.

A Theory of Balance (Heider) :

The theory of balance was proposed by Heider (1946, 1958) and later on developed and modified by Cartwright and Harary (1956), Newcomb (1953, 1959, 1968b).

Heider was the first systematic formulator of the principles of experiencing 'seperate entities' together in terms of balance. He proposed that the concept of balanced

state designates a situation in which the perceived units
(entities experienced as belonging together) and the
experienced sentiments (attitudes) co-exist without stress.
Heider theorized two types of relations between people or
between people and events : sentiment relations and unit
relations. A sentiment relation was an attitudinal relation
that implied liking, admiring, approving, loving and so
forth. One person may approve of another person or of an
event. Unit relations resulted in a perceived unity of the
persons or persons and events. Examples of unit relations
were similarity, proximity, causality, ownership. One person
may be similar to another or may own a certain object.
Heider used certain symbols to express his formulations : p
for person, O for other person and X for an event, idea or
thing. Heider's formal statements of the conditions of
balance included diad and triad.

A diad (p and o) was considered balanced if, either
both the sentimental relations and unit relation were positive
or both were negative. Diad was imbalanced, if one relation
was positive and other negative.

A triad (p, o and x) was considered balanced when all
the relationship between p, o and x, were positive, or when
two of the relations were negative and one was positive.

Imbalance occured when two of the relations were positive and one was negative. The case of three negative relations was somewhat ambiguous.

Heider considered that imbalance results in tensions which forces a change toward balance. This change could take place in any number of forms. Balance could be restored by changing either of the sentiment relations, by changing unit relations or finally a kind of resolution but not balance can be obtained through differentiation, if such a change was not possible the state of imbalance would produce tension.

Cartwright and Harary (1956) extended Heider's theory in terms of mathematical theory of linear graphs. Expressed in algebraic terms, two or three entities, was considered balanced if the product of the sign was positive and not balanced if the product of the sign was negative.

Newcomb (1953, 1968b) extended balance theory with some changes to the problem of interpersonal communication, examined its motivational basis and elaborated it in terms of role theory in his A - B - X model. Newcomb pointed out that some persons had learned to live with psychological imbalance or that he was simply not susceptible to forces toward balance.

For review : Heider, 1946, 1958 ; Cartwright and
Harary, 1956, Newcomb, 1968b; Lott and Lott 1965 ; Insko,
1967 ; Zajonc, 1968 ; and Edward Jones and Keith Davis,
1965, Feather, 1967.

A Theory of Dissonance :

The theory of cognitive dissonance was proposed by
Leon Festinger (1957) and since then greatly elaborated
by Brehm and Cohen, Aronson and many others. It generated
more experimentation and more hostility than any
other one approach (McGuire, 1966b). The core notion
of the theory was extremely simple : Dissonance is a
negative drive state which occurs whenever an individual
simultaneously holds two cognitions (ideas, beliefs,
opinions) which were psychologically inconsistent. According
to Festinger cognitive elements were 'knowledge' about
various objects, facts, circumstances, behaviors etc. The
term knowledge include beliefs, opinions and attitudes.
Two cognitive elements may have irrelevant or relevant
notions between them. Relevant relations were of two
types, dissonant and consonant. According to Festinger
(1957), 'two elements are in a dissonant relations if,
considering these two alone, the obverse of one element
would follow from the other.' Consonant relations implied

*Festinger, L., A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford
Calif. Stanford University Press, 1957, p. 13.

that one cognitive element does follow from another.
The occurence of dissonance was presumed to be unpleasant,
individuals strive to reduce it by adding 'consonant'
cognitions or by changing one or both cognitions to make
them fit together.

The researches had been as diverse as they were
plentiful. Its range extended from maze running in
rats (Lawrence and Festinger, 1962), to the development
of values in children (Aronson and Carlsmith, 1963), from
the hunger of college sophomores (Brehm, Back and Bogdonoff,
1964), to the proselytizing behavior of religious zealots
(Festinger, Rieckan and Schachter, 1956).

For review, Festinger, 1957 ; Brehm and Cohen, 1962 ;
Aronson, 1966, 1968 ; Insko, 1967 ; and Zajonc, 1968.

A Theory of Congruity :

Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955) ; Osgood et al. (1957) ;
Osgood (1960), had developed a theory of consistency, dealing
with changes in attitudes as a result of incongruity between
the source of a communication and its content.

Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955) asserted that attitudes
tended toward maximum simplicity. According to them when
two attitude objects of differing evaluation were linked

with an assertion there was a tendency for the evaluation of each object to shift toward a point of equilibrium or congruity. Assertions were considered of two types, associative (i.e. A is B, A likes B etc.) and dissociative (i.e. A is not B, A dislikes B, etc.)

Attitudes toward object and source were typically measured on the semantic differential scale (Osgood et al. 1957), which reflected both the intensity and direction of the attitudes. Given the existence of incongruity, the theory hypothesized that the individual would attempt to change his attitudes in the direction of increased incongruity. Theory also assumed that the more extremely polarized attitude would show the greater resistance to congruity pressures.

In initial stage, congruity principle had focused more on attitude change model, later on, it also dealt with the model for semantic combination from their individual components. Issue of latter development was whether the judgment of the combinations could be predicted from knowledge of the judgments of the component parts. The later model was a kind of modification of attitude change model i.e. while the attitude change model usually involved the modification of both cognitive elements to resolve an apparent incongruity, in semantic model, the resolution

involved the formation of a single composite score. This
was accommodated by translating the notion of a differential
susceptibility to change as a function of degree of intensity
of the attitude into the corresponding notion of differential
contribution of more or less intensely polarized elements
to the composite judgment.

For Review : Osgood (1960);Tannenbaum(1967,1968a), and Insko(1967).

A Theory of Balance (Abelson) :
———————————————————————

In 1958, Abelson and Rosenberg, jointly proposed a
paper on Psycho-logic. Later on both adopted different lines
of thinking.

In the original system of Abelson and Rosenberg (1958),
attitudinal cognitive structures were assumed to consist
of sets of cognitive elements A, B, C .... , each ordered
pair of elements being connected in a sentence by a perceived
relation (r) , which could be classified as either
positive (p), negative (n), ambivalent (a), or
null (o). A set of psycho-logic rules was also given.

Later on criticisms were raised against psycho-logic,
that classification of relations merely into two broad
categories (positive and negative) was quantitatively
crude (McGuire 1966b, Kiesler, Collins, and Miller 1968),
a more telling criticism of psycho-logic was that it gave
too little scope to the possibilities of human thought, it

was too rigid and too monolithic.

The original 'psycho-logic' model, allowed changes of evaluations or of perceived relations as the only modes of imbalance resolution. In 1959, Abelson proposed four modes of inconsistency resolution : denial, bolstering, differentiation and transcendence. Later on in 1963, he added rationalization as a mode of inconsistency resolution. (The present study was based on Abelson's classification of modes of resolution).

Gradually, Abelson's interest shifted towards more sophisticated methodology : computer simulation of social behavior. Abelson (1968a) believed that the basic principles by which human beings manipulate the symbols they cognize were few in number and structurally simple.

For review : Abelson (1959; 1963, 1967 , 1968a, 1968b), Abelson and Rosenberg (1958) ; Abelson and Carroll, J.D. (1965); and Insko (1967).

A Theory of Affective-Cognitive Consistency :

The model of intraattitudinal affective - cognitive consistency theory was proposed and developed by Rosenberg (1953, 1956, 1960a, b and c, 1968). The basis for the theory was the relationship of consistency between a comparatively stable affective or evaluative orientation toward some object

and the person's beliefs about how that object was related
to other objects of affective significance.

The fundamental principle was simple. The attitude
change process was due to a sort of homeostatic process in
which the production of affective - cognitive inconsistency
arouses further symbolic activity leading toward restoration
of inner consistency.

Following propositions were proposed :

" 1. When the affective and cognitive components of an
attitude are mutually consistent, the attitude is
in a stable state.

2. When these components are mutually inconsistent,
to a degree that exceeds the individual's
'tolerance limit' for such inconsistency, the
attitude is in an unstable state.

3. In such an unstable state the attitude will undergo
reorganizing activity... three possible outcomes
is achieved... (a) rejection of the communication...
that engendered the original inconsistency...
(b) 'fragmentation' of the attitude... (c) accommoda-
tion to the original inconsistency producing
change..." (Rosenberg 1960c)[*].

The threshold of intolerance for inconsistency was
conceived in a way as a function of general personality
attributes, situational factors, and attributes of the
attitude itself.

---

[*] Rosenberg, M.J. A Structural Theory of Attitude Dynamics.
Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 322.

Rosenberg in his recent article, 'Hedonism, inauthenticity and other goads' (1968.), gave detailed descriptions and modifications of his original theory. He concludes that affective-cognitive inconsistency was often tolerable and that it does not motivate consistency-restoring activity unless or until it becomes intolerable.

For review : Rosenberg, 1953, 1956, 1968 ; and Insko, 1967.

A Logical - Affective Consistency Theory :

The theory was proposed and developed by William J. McGuire. He started with the assumption that the conceptual system at any moment was highly interconnected and in a state of internal harmony that might be called 'consistency'. He also believed that there was a strong tendency to conserve both the connectedness and the internal consistency of the conceptual system. He further believed that the receipt of any new and especially discrepant information would produce considerable conceptual activity, involving a great deal of internal readjustment, until the information was absorbed into the system with the least loss in internal consistency and the greatest gain in connectedness. Unlike others, McGuire in his approach, took the need for consistency granted and used it to map the cognitive system.

McGuire attempted to define consistency among propositions (logical) included in the individual's belief system and to handle quantitatively the gradations asserted to each proposition. Logical consistency theory was based on two postulates : (1) there was a tendency for an individual's beliefs or expectations to be related in a manner required by the rules of formal logic and (2) there was a tendency for an individual's beliefs to be consistent with the desires or wishes (wishful thinking).

McGuire's major emphasis was on persuasive communication, socratic method of producing opinion change and importance of temporal factors. Later on McGuire (1968.) changed his extreme stand regarding structure of human thought. He realised the importance of primitive modes of thinking to formal logic.

For review : McGuire (1960a ; 1960b ; 1960c ; 1964 ; 1966a ; 1966b ; 1968) ; Dillehay, Insko and Smith, 1966 ; and Insko, 1967.

It was in brief review of all the major theories of consistency. The present work dealing with perception of an inconsistent person does not confine itself to any particular theory or methodology. It deals with some of the basic concepts common to all the theories ; inconsistency tolerance, modes of inconsistency reduction and botheration.

of inconsistency. Almost all theories believed that
inconsistency leads to botheration., all inconsistencies
are not equally tolerable, and person confronted with
inconsistency may try to reduce it. Taking for granted that
there will be some reactions to inconsistency, present
study attempted to study the influence of personality and
situational determinants on cognitive consistency-
inconsistency, more specifically in perception of inconsistent
behavior of other person.

Major Concepts :

In this section some of the major concepts related to
inconsistency have been dealt in detail. They have been
presented under different heads : inconsistency and
motivation, inconsistency and psychological stress, inconsistency
and tolerance, and inconsistency and modes of resolution.

Inconsistency and Motivation :

Various consistency theoryes formulations included the
implicit assumption of a basic tendency of the human organism
to maintain a state of consistency or equilibrium within
his cognitive system. Consistency was classified among other
basic drive states regulating human behavior. It was regarded
as a 'unitary motivational state.' Some theoretical developments
(later on) within and outside of consistency theories gave

diametrically opposite views. Outside the theories, work
of Berlyne (1968) and Maddi (1968) emphasized the need
for variety instead of consistency - that confronted with
an inconsistent situation person will try to explore it
with curiosity rather than going back to previous stage.
Within the consistency theories serious doubts regarding
the nature of consistency drive were raised up.
Specifically, Berkowitz (1968a) thought it very much
inappropriate to accommodate conventional physiological
drive states (like hunger and thirst) and to extend it
to cognitive processes. Similarly, Tannenbaum (1968b)
while commenting upon the motivational nature of inconsistency
agreed with others in rejecting unitary-drive reduction
nature of inconsistency, specifically, that inconsistency
is an aversive state and generates activity for its own
resolution. Tannenbaum, considered 'unitary-drive reduction',
model as too gross and unrefined basis upon which one can
build an adequate theory. Rejection of an inconsistency
drive does not mean the rejection of a consistency position.
The need for consistency was there, but the 'homeostatic'
model was not suitable to encounter in all cases.

What happens when inconsistencies are being introduced ?
All agreeing viewpoint was that there was something special
and distinctive about consistency - at least these was a
limit to tolerate inconsistency. It was a state to be avoided

(if not necessarily of a unitary drive reduction model).

Inconsistency leads to what ? It was the question where differences of opinion have been found. Back (1968) differentiated between need reductions and cognitive motivations, and saw the cognitive motivation in terms of a built-in-mechanism to achieve and maintain equilibrium. He advocated cognitive analogue to physiological homeostasis. For Kelman and Baron (1968b) 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. Differing from Back's point of view, Kelman and Baron considered impact of inconsistency as signaling rather than of reducing capacity. Schachter (1964), Singer (1968) and Pepitone (1968) supported, Kelman and Baron's (1968b), opinion that 'signal-and-search' model may fit better. The 'signal-and-search' model views man as essentially an information-processing animal. In engaging in information seeking activities, the individual may be faced with an inconsistent phenomena. Awareness of apparent discrepancy (should) elicit the kind of searching and support seeking behavior. Tannenbaum (1968b) suggested that 'homeostatic model,'

may be operative under different circumstances. Neither being an all-or-none explanation. According to him, 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.

One of the objectives formulated for the present study was to observe whether 'homesstatic' model was appropriate to the study or 'signal-and-search model. If homeostatic model would be operating then perceiver, confronted with inconsistent situation will face tension (botheration) and would try to reduce the inconsistency level almost semiautomatically. If 'signal and search' model would be operating confronted with inconsistent signal person may or may not try to reduce the inconsistency, and if he tries he may be able to resolve it or he may not.

Inconsistency and Psychological Stress :

In 1950s when several cognitive consistency models were introduced, a common feature of the various consistency theories formulations was the assumption that a state of 'psychological stress' was associated with the condition of inconsistency.

Different theorists referred the stressful aspect of inconsistency differently. Heider referred it as 'feeling of discomfort' (1958, p.160), Osgood as 'stressful' (1960, p.345), Festinger called it as 'psychological discomfort' (1957, p.2.), Hovland and Rosenberg preferred to call it as 'the special tension' (1960, p.224) while Zajonc spoke as 'painful' or at least 'psychologically uncomfortable' (1960, p.282). Though the concept of stress was mentioned by most of theorists, it received surprisingly little direct attention in research to date.

Berkowitz, (1968b) and Brock (1968) started doubting the need to postulate 'stress state'. While commenting on 'stress state', Tannenbaum (1968c) proposed three possible combinations between inconsistency (I), stress (S) and inconsistency reduction (R). First, stress as a 'mediator', ' I —→ S —→ R). The onset of the inconsistency directly evokes psychological discomfort which, being a 'naturally' aversive state, in turn, elicit appropriate stress-reducing activity. In second model stress was mentioned as a 'by-product', (I —→ R and I —→ S). It suggested that inconsistency itself generates the power for its own resolution and that the accompanying stress is a side effect. The third model dealt with stress as a 'consequence', (I —→ R —→ S). Stress was referred due to

activity elicited by the inconsistency. The activity
appropriate to reduce the inconsistency induces psychological
discomfort. A major difference between three models rests
in the sequence of events and hence in temporal relation
between I, R and S.

A wide variety of measures of stress, anxiety or
nervousness have been used. McNully and Walters (1962),
used a verbal anxiety measure. In a study designed to
determine, among other things, whether subjects in an
imbalanced condition will feel more tense or nervous' than
those in balanced conditions, Sampson and Insko (1964)
asked Ss to indicate on a seven-point Semantic Differential
Scale about what they felt. Price, Harburg, and Newcomb
(1966) asked Ss to indicate how they felt by placing a check
along a line 90 mm long and extending from 'uneasy' to
'pleasant'. Apart from verbal methods to assess stress,
many of physiological measures have been used to measure
stress (Malmo, 1958 ; Lazarus, et.al, 1962).

In present study subjects were asked how much bothered
(concern) they were about inconsistent person. They had
to react on eleven point scale ranging from 0 to 10. No other
physiological measurements were applied to measure the degree
of botheration.

Inconsistency and Tolerance :

One of the basic issue in consistency theories was
tolerance for inconsistency. It was stated by almost all
theorists that inconsistency cannot be tolerated easily.
Degree of tolerance may depend upon the type of the
inconsistent situation and upon the perceiver's personality.
All situations need not be equally inconsistent, so it may
require different degrees of tolerance. Similarly same
inconsistent situation may be reacted differently by
different individuals. Several writers suggested that certain
personality and situational factors may influence the
individual's tolerance for cognitive inconsistency
(Adorno et. al. 1950; Steiner, 1954 ; Festinger, 1957 ;
Bieri, 1961; Rosen, 1961 ; Rosenberg and Hovland, 1960 ;
Cohen, 1960 ; McGuire, 1966b; Glass 1968; Miller and
Rokeach, 1968).

Authoritarian (Adorno et.al. 1950) and Dogmatic (Rokeach,
1960) persons find it more difficult to tolerate and to
withstand cognitive inconsistency. Rokeach (1960) suggested
that close belief systems were characterised by a relatively
high rejection of disbelief systems, by isolation of parts
within and between belief and disbelief systems, and by
relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system
as indicative of simplistic thinkigg. By contrast, low
dogmatic individuals were able to tolerate more cognitive

inconsistency, because of their greater ability to think complexly and in an integrated fashion.

Steiner (1954) found that high ethnocentrics tolerate less disharmony between their value systems and their perceptual assumptions.

In one of the studies dealing with dogmatism and tolerance for trait inconsistency (Foulkes, and Foulkes, 1965) observed that high dogmatic subjects found it more difficult than low dogmatic subjects to tolerate the inconsistency created by conflicting information. All the three studies reviewed indicates that authoritarian and dogmatic persons possess low threshold of tolerance for inconsistency. Low threshold of dogmatic and authoritarian persons does not mean that they change their attitudes quickly, on the contrary they were found quite resistant to change (Rosenberg, 1968).

Rosenberg (1968) reported that affective-cognitive inconsistency was often tolerable and that it did not motivate consistency-restoring activity unless or until it became intolerable.

Hedonic inconsistencies were more tolerable than antihedonic, and inconsistent cognitions of general import were more tolerable than those of personal import (Rosenberg, 1965).

Miller and Rokeach (1968) commented that the concept of tolerance of inconsistency was ambiguous for them. They could not find much specification about the concept, whether it was a process involving differences in threshold or it was rather differences in modes of resolving inconsistency.

In present study tolerance was measured by directly asking the subject to rate his own degree of tolerance. Whether he can easily tolerate such inconsistent person or not on eleven point scale ranging from 0 to 10 number. With the assumption that different persons will show different degree of tolerance to inconsistency. In present study, the concept of tolerance was used more as a threshold value of tolerance, rather as a differences in modes of resolutions.

Inconsistency and Modes of Resolution :

When confronted with an inconsistent situation (with two or more inconsistent cognitions) one of the plausible reactions is to think out or to reason out why it is like that. Sometimes one cannot feel the gap between two or more discrete informations and feels or accepts the situation as an inconsistent. While sometimes the reasonings they have put forward are such that the potential to reduce the level of inconsistency between cognitions. The 'reasons'

having potential to reduce the inconsistency level have
been variously classified by different writers within
and outside of consistency theories as 'modes of
inconsistency reduction.'

Three major classifications on modes of inconsistency
reduction were forwarded by Abelson (1959, 1963)
consistency theorist ; Kaplan and Crockett (1968)
developmentalist ; and Kelman and Baron (1968a)
functionalist.

Abelson (1959) presented paper on intrapersonal
conflict resolution. On the basis of purely theoretical
considerations, Abelson delineated four 'mechanisms' for
resolving belief dilemmas : denial, bolstering,
differentiation and transcendence. Later on (1963) he added
to it rationalization. The classification presented by
Abelson was chosen for the present work. Details about
different modes have been discussed under the head
dependent variable in chapter III.

Kaplan and Crockett (1968) felt that the work done
by Gollin (1954, 1958) and Abelson (1959, 1963) were not
truly developmental. Beyond the recognition of qualitative
difference in mode of resolution, the developmentalists
were interested to order the various modes of resolution in

a rational sequence, the more primitive modes reflecting a lesser differentiation and hierarchic integration than the more advanced modes. In reply to it Kaplan and Crockett (1968) proposed three level developmental model, consisting of primitive, intermediate and advanced modes. Primitive modes were further classified as, simple aggregation, simple univalence and rejection of task. Intermediate modes into univalance through linguistic interpretation, resolution through grossly differentiated sources, resolution via pseudo-explanatory personality trait and resolution via contextual variability. Advanced modes were not further classified.

Kelman and Baron (1968a) taking functional viewpoint classified different modes in terms of two - dichotomics (a) the nature of process - whether it is primarily one of avoiding or one of actively confronting it, and (b) the nature of outcome achieved, whether the inconsistency is handled in way that leads to its reduction or in a way that leads to its maintenance.

Under inconsistency reduction, Kelman and Baron proposed, denial, distortion, rationalization and derogation of source, if the process be primarily of avoiding of inconsistency ; and change in attitude, change in action, change in standard and influence attempt, if the process be primarily of confrontation

of inconsistency. For inconsistency maintenance, writers proposed compartmentalization, institutionalized insulation and compensatory situation in case of avoidance ; and bolstering, differentiation and transcendence in case of confrontation of inconsistency.

In present study different modes of inconsistency reduction (Abelson 1959, 1963) were studied as one of the reactions to inconsistent situation. It was believed that confronted with inconsistency, person may not necessarily reduce the inconsistency. First of all he may even fail to notice the inconsistency. If noticed, he may accept it or may feel that the person has changed. In some cases he may use different modes of inconsistency reduction as the reasoning. Modes of inconsistency reduction were treated as one of the reactions to inconsistency.

Scheme of Chapterization

The reporting of the present work has been divided into six chapters.

The first chapter is devoted to general introduction of the problem, brief historical sketch of the concepts, consistency and inconsistency outside and within different theories of consistency, and some major concepts relevant to present studies have been dealt in detail.

In the second chapter a review has been made of the related literature. Attempt has been made to note the trends, to identify

the gaps and thereby to select the problem.

The third chapter deals with the statement of the problem, enumeration of objectives and hypotheses, specification of the variables chosen, plan and design of the problem, detail of the tools used, description of the sample, data collection, scoring procedure and statistical techniques to be used.

In the fourth chapter, statistical analysis and interpretation of the results have been presented.

The fifth chapter deals with the discussion of the results and states the limitation of the work.

In the sixth chapter the summary of the work, obtained results and some suggestions for further research have been given.