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ABSTRACT
THE SOCIAL BASIS OF SELF-DIFFUSION:
A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION

by
Stanley J. Morse

An important and frequently overlooked structural characteristic of the self-concept is the degree to which individuals perceive inconsistencies within it (self-diffusion). It was hypothesized that the number and magnitude of such perceived inconsistencies should increase with (1) the degree of conflict perceived between the evaluations of "significant others" (Mead, 1934) and (2) the degree to which conflicting roles are performed and internalized. A scale was devised to measure self-diffusion. On it, 209 students in an introductory psychology class at Duke University described themselves in 10 different ways on a matrix on which all traits intersected each other. At each intersection, they rated the degree of perceived inconsistency on a 4-point scale.

Self-diffusion was positively correlated with the degree to which significant others were perceived to disagree with each other. Hypothesis (2) could not be tested separately since role and evaluation occur simultaneously. However, self-diffusion was negatively correlated with socio-economic level. Catholics had higher mean diffusion scores than other religious groups and males were more diffuse than females. The relationship between self-diffusion and residential mobility (an index of exposure to role and evaluation conflicts) was inconclusive.

High and low self-diffusion subjects describe themselves differently. High diffusion subjects appear to be more other-directed.
The amount of contact with parents may be an intervening variable between role and evaluation conflict and self-diffusion.
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THE SOCIAL BASIS OF SELF-DIFFUSION

A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

It is almost a truism that individuals try to appear to be what they think they are; that, for instance, a policeman who conceives of himself as "tough" will act "tough." Psychologists have consequently attempted to catalog all the characteristics which an individual ascribes to himself (his self-concept) and have tried to predict situation-specific behavior on the basis of this information (cf. Wylie, 1961). They have correlated components within the self-concept with everything from socio-economic level to sexual behavior. These investigators, for example, have discovered that individuals who see themselves as "intelligent" do well in school, while those who see themselves as academically inferior to their peers do not do as well.

Recent evidence from two sources indicates that the self-concept is more than a collection of independent, detailed cognitions about the self and that, in considering it within this narrow context, these psychologists may have overlooked one of its most crucial features—the relationship between these cognitions.

The "Identity Crisis"

Numerous social theorists and psychoanalysts (cf. Stein, Vidich and White, 1960; Weiss, 1961) have described the current age as one characterized by "alienation and the search for identity" (Weiss, 1961, title). One threat running through all these writings and confirmed
by the observations of such authors as Kafka (1956), Hesse (1963) and Camus (1946) is the idea that individuals cannot see themselves as coherent "wholes." Twentieth century individuals have more official documents, I.B.M. numbers and pieces of "sign equipment" (Goffman, 1959) which they can use to identify themselves than they have ever had before. Yet, the question "Who am I?" is becoming increasingly more perplexing to them. In more operational terms, these individuals may have very definite self-concepts, but the traits which they ascribe to themselves and which distinguish them from others in their own mind are not subjectively consistent or consonant with each other. According to these critics, it is precisely this structural-organizational aspect of the self-concept which is a crucial determinant of behavior. Erikson (1960), for instance, calls lack of a "persistent sameness within oneself" (1960, p. 38) "diffusion" and describes its consequences:

Many a late adolescent, if faced with continuing diffusion, would rather be nobody or somebody bad, or indeed dead—and this totally and by free choice—than be not-quite somebody (1960, p. 62).

Cognitive Structure

All cognitions, whether about the self, about interpersonal relationships or about politics, form a constantly-interacting system which must be described in terms of structural relationships (Abelson and Rosenberg, 1958; Zajonc, 1954) in order to accurately predict individual behavior. Writers on cognitive structure claim that it is
not enough, for instance, to know that an individual is anti-Communist. We must also discover if he knows anything specific about Communism, what his attitude is toward federal intervention in the economy and whether or not he ever fought in a war in which this country was involved, amongst other things. Only when we can delineate all relevant cognitions and can determine how they interact with each other can we then predict this individual's behavior in a specific situation concerning, for instance, removing books by Karl Marx from the local, public library. Many relationships can exist between two cognitions—opposition, complementarity, etc.—but one of the most important and one which intersects the observations of the theorists discussed above is the degree of "fit" or "harmony".

Festinger (1957), Lecky (1945) and Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955), although they use different terms, suggest that individuals strive for "cognitive structures" in which all elements are congruent, consistent or consonant, i.e. "belong together or fit together" (Festinger, 1964, p. 512), experientially, culturally or logically. By experimentally creating the perception of dissonance between cognitive elements (such as old and new information about the same topic) they have successfully predicted behavior which attempted to eliminate dissonance through perceptual distortion, the discarding of the old information or avoidance of the entire problem, to name a few "defense mechanisms."
Problem

Despite the obvious indications that they have overlooked something, psychologists have failed to empirically investigate the highly crucial, structural aspects of the self-concept discussed above. The objectives of this preliminary, exploratory paper are, therefore, to:

1. develop an empirical measure of the degree of perceived inconsistency or dissonance within the self-concept and
2. indicate some of the factors which may contribute to such dissonant perceptions.

THEORY

Self-Diffusion

We can use Erikson's (1945) term "diffusion" to describe varying states of perceived disharmony or dissonance within the self-concept. According to him, an individual who performs many conflicting roles which he then internalizes is "diffuse" because no one role which he performs is "me" to the individual. When the actor looks at all of these roles together, he can see no coherent, integrated pattern. By role, in this case, Erikson means any pattern of behavior which we would consider simply a recurrent "personality trait" (e.g., being shy or sensitive). Within this framework, we can say that individuals vary along a continuum of diffusion, with complete "self-diffusion" at one end and complete "self-unity" at the other. Most individuals,
of course, have self-concepts lying somewhere between these two "ideal type" extremes. Operationally, we can define self-diffusion as the presence of perceived inconsistencies within the self-concept and self-unity as their absence. Individuals can then be placed along this continuum according to the number and magnitude of "non-fitting" relationships which they perceive within their self-concepts. Our problem, then, is "What are some of the social conditions related to self-diffusion?"

Inconsistencies within the self-concept may be judged by logical or moral standards. For instance, an individual may be shy and friendly (logical inconsistency). On the other hand, he may be a Good Catholic and practice birth control (which he may perceive as moral inconsistency). There may be other criteria as well for judging inconsistencies, but since we are only concerned here with a subjective impression of inconsistency, this is irrelevant.

Festinger states our focus very well when he writes:

We are concerned with psychological implication and not necessarily logical implication. The psychological implication which one cognition can have for another cognition can arise from a variety of circumstances. There can be psychological implications because of experience and what one has learned...

There can also be psychological implication because of cultural mores and definition...The synonyms which the dictionary gives for the word dissonant are harsh, jarring, grating, unmelodious, inharmonious, inconsistent, contradictory, disagreeing, incongruous, discrepant...In general, one might say that a dissonant relation exists between two things which occur together,
if in some way, they do not belong together or fit together (1964, p. 512).

Limiting Factors in Studying Self-Diffusion

An individual's self-concept is the product of long and complex developmental processes which have been excellently summarized by Shibutani (1961) and will not be repeated here. In this paper, we will try to outline and subject to empirical verification two major sources of self-diffusion, but by no means the only factors contribution to this phenomenon. This exploratory study will have to be restricted in several other ways as well. We have a wide variety of self-components, some of which are highly specific and variable, while others underlie our behavior in a wide variety of situations. For example, an individual's conception of his ability to produce good finger paintings will only take on importance at a finger painting party. In addition, such a trait may easily be modified through lessons or practice. We are concerned here with more basic personality traits such as an individual's conception of his intelligence, the way in which he interacts with others along several dimensions and his confidence in himself. Such conceptions undoubtedly also vary from situation to situation. For instance, a male may perceive himself as a "lady killer" and act accordingly, but his conception may radically, if only temporarily, change after being rebuffed by a female acquaintance. However, unlike the finger painting case, this individual will usually rate himself similarly and
consistently on this dimension and may consider this self-rating in situations which may have nothing to do with women (Engel, 1959; Rogers and Dymond, 1954). We are therefore concerned with self-diffusion within those sections of the self-concept which remain relatively stable, which are relevant in a wide variety of different situations and which are, consequently, important determinants of cross-situational regularities in behavior. These qualifications become even more important when it is realized that the individual's self-diffusion is a structural quality which may not depend upon which particular elements are central to his self-concept, or which come to the fore in a particular situation. For instance, the individual may usually think of himself in situation-less terms. When he is dreaming or watching television, his self-concept may simply consist of the perception of either self-diffusion or self-unity with no particular personality traits considered.

The problem of how either a unified or diffuse self-concept arises is the problem of how the self-concept itself develops. Two elements seem critical—(1) the way in which one is evaluated by others and (2) the roles one plays. Evidence, however, is scarce and inconclusive (Wylie, 1961).

Others' Evaluations as a Source of the Self-Concept.

The principle theoretical statements on the social basis of the self-concept are set-forth by Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934). Both stress the importance of how others evaluate the individual in
determining how he evaluates himself, but what is actually critical, of course, is not the evaluations themselves but the way in which they are perceived. To Cooley (1902), the self begins with an instinctive feeling of possession over parts of the body and physical objects within the environment. This feeling then undergoes progressive differentiation as we compare ourselves and our possessions with others and share their judgements of these objects. In summary, this "looking glass self" is based upon:

the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgement of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification (Cooley, 1902, p. 184).

Mead (1934) dispensed with Cooley's instinctual, appropriative feeling and located the entire basis of the self-concept in social interaction. He felt that the individual acquires a self-concept only when he begins to look upon himself as an external object. He can do this only by:

taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience and behavior in which both he and they are involved (Mead, 1934, p. 138).

Several empirical studies lend support to these two views which place the individual's self-evaluation in the hands of those who are evaluating him. However, their interpretation is unclear. When we
evaluate a particular role which we are performing and when our audience also evaluates it, we are both judging exactly the same behavior. Is our conception of it based, then, upon our own evaluation or upon that transmitted to us by others, as these studies imply? A significant correlation between the two could easily be found since the same, culturally-defined criteria may be used for evaluation both by the actor and his audience. Never-the-less, Videbeck (1960), Gergen (1964) and Backman, Secord and Pierce (1963) have caused a change in the individual's self-evaluation by experimentally manipulating the evaluations made of him by others. However, these investigations provide no data on how long the produced changes in the self-concept lasted. Others (Helper, 1955; Manis, 1955; and Miyamoto and Dornbusch, 1956) also have lent support to this theory by demonstrating statistically significant correlations between the evaluations which an individual makes of himself and those made of him by others, but they have failed to show any causal direction in these correlations.

Role Playing as a Source of the Self-Concept

More recent investigations indicate that cognitive elements may enter the self-concept through the performance of roles of which they are a part. For instance, when Gertrude Lawrence, in "The King and I" whistled "a happy tune," she came to perceive herself as fitting the part she was playing and the trait "unafraid" became a part of her self-concept. If we can consider attitudes about political
questions analogous to attitudes about the self, studies of attitude change lend support to this position. Crawford and Gergen (in press), for instance, found that role playing could cause elementary school pupils who were fond of pets to adopt and retain attitudes about pets directly contrary to those which they held initially. Less dramatic results were also obtained by Janis and King (1954, 1956), Carlson (1956), Culbertson (1957), Harvey and Beverly (1961) and Scott (1959). The most direct support for the role playing thesis is provided by Gergen and Gibbs (unpublished). They demonstrated that role playing, in the absence of any evaluations at all, will affect the self-concept and that changes produced in this way are relatively long-lasting.

The two processes discussed above (evaluations by others and role-playing) undoubtedly each contribute to the formation of the self-concept and are analytically separate mechanisms. However, roles are seldom performed without being evaluated and evaluations are seldom given in the absence of roles. Consequently, these two processes are found concurrently in a natural setting and interact with each other.

Conflicting Evaluations as a Source of Self-Diffusion

If an individual believes he is being evaluated differently by several significant others (persons whose opinions he values and whose evaluations he internalizes into his self-concept) on the same characteristic or believes others are attributing characteristics to him which somehow conflict with each other, and internalizes these
evaluations, he will perceive inconsistencies within his self-concept. It should be noted, of course, that all evaluations are not internalized. For example, evaluations by a teacher who is considered poor are likely to be ignored, while conflicting evaluations by highly regarded teachers may be considered important and internalized. However, we are only concerned with the self-concept, which consists only of these internalized evaluations.

The situation of evaluative conflict is a common one. Individuals are evaluated by a wide variety of disparate audiences daily. For example, a member of a juvenile gang will try to appear to be a good thief and be evaluated as suitably dishonest by his peers. On the other hand, his highly religious mother (who may be as important a significant other as his comrades) may perceive him as a good, honest, religious youngster and evaluate him in this way. Consequently, when the individual thinks of himself outside of these two highly specific contexts, he will find within his self-concept the dissonant evaluations "dishonest" and "good" and self-diffusion will result.

Helper (1955) provides tentative, although indirect, support for this hypothesis. He found a positive correlation between the temporal stability in the ideal self-concepts of 50 high school students and the amount of discrepancy between the ideal conceptions of the students held by their parents. The larger the degree of evaluative conflict between mother and father, and presumably perceived by the students, the less clear and constant a picture these students had of their ideal selves.
The Performance of Conflicting Roles as a Source of Self-Diffusion

If individuals play roles which meet standards which they perceive as conflicting with each other or play roles which themselves conflict with each other and if they internalize these conflicting roles or standards, they will see inconsistencies within their self-concepts. We are continuously playing different roles and presenting ourselves in different ways (Katz, 1942; Jourard and Laskow, 1958; Goffman, 1959; Gergen, 1964; and Gergen and Wishnov, 1964). For instance, a university professor may feel he should project the image of a reserved scholar in the classroom and act accordingly. At home, however, he may be a docile husband and father dominated by his wife and children. If he were playing the same role continuously (either husband or teacher), he could step back from this role and say to himself, "I am a person with this characteristic, this characteristic and this characteristic, all which fit very well together." If, on the other hand, the individual is constantly performing different roles and, obviously, meeting different role expectations, he will be displaying characteristics which will be inconsistent with each other, and perceived as such, but consistent, again, with the roles to which they are assigned. Consequently, when he steps back from these divergent roles, all he can say is, "I am a person with this characteristic (which is associated with one role) and this other one (which is associated with another role) and these characteristics don't quite go together harmoniously."
HYPOTHESES

In summary, we can say that when proliferation of roles and conflicting evaluations is maximized, we have a self-concept with dissonant elements, a diffuse self-concept. When evaluations and roles are similar, we have a consonant or unified self-concept. If, once again, we can consider political attitudes similar to cognitions about the self, Winthrop (1946) provides some support for this argument, although he was not able to disentangle the playing of conflicting roles with the perception of conflicting evaluations. He constructed two attitude inventories of 50 statements each, the items on one being Aristotelian opposites of the statements on the other. These were administered to 709 college students two weeks apart. There was a significant drop in attitude consistency between the freshman, sophomore and junior years—years in which the individual is being exposed to new evaluations, is playing new roles and is living in a new environment.

Mead (1934) and Cooley (1902) pictured the self-concept as a highly unified entity because they based it upon "a unity and structure of the social process" which led to "unity and structure of the complete self" (Mead, 1934, p. 144). This condition, as we have shown, does not exist today, if, indeed, it ever did exist. In their descriptions of social interaction, Mead and Cooley picture the individual as playing a small number of roles before a small number of like-minded evaluators. However, as we have demonstrated,
the self-concept must arise within individuals who are, in the words of Becker and Strauss:

members of structures that change, riders on escalators that carry them up, along and down, to unexpected places and to novel experiences (1956, p. 263).

We can now advance the following hypotheses, based upon the discussion above:

(1) The more conflicting evaluations which an individual receives, the more self-diffusion there will be within his self-concept.

(2) The more conflicting roles which an individual performs, the more self-diffusion there will be within his self-concept.
CHAPTER II
METHOD

SCALES

Self-Diffusion Scale

Self-diffusion was measured by first having the respondent list ten elements within his self-concept and, then, having him rate the degree of inconsistency which he perceived between these elements. These two processes will be discussed separately since each evolved independently and presents distinct problems of validity and reliability. For a copy of the entire scale, see Appendix A.

SELF-DESCRIPTIONS: As indicated above, the self-concept contains many personality traits which are relevant only to highly-specific situations. These are peripheral to what Allport (1955) calls the "proprium" or central, behavior-determining, core of the self-concept. For example, being an American may only become relevant when amongst foreigners, while being a Ford-owner may only become significant at a stock car rally. Likewise, central elements within the self-concept also vary from situation to situation, although they generally remain relatively stable. Thus, a student may feel "stupid" immediately after failing an examination, but may perceive himself as "brilliant" after receiving an "A" on another
test. However, in most situations, he will probably see himself as "moderately intelligent" and his over-all self-concept will contain this more nebulous term. To validly measure self-diffusion, therefore, we must first obtain an adequate sample of the central, relatively stable traits within the individual's self-concept. We decided that 10 personality traits would provide an adequate sample because pre-tests indicated that individuals can easily and quickly supply this number of adjectives. Requests for a larger number may strain their ingenuity and force invalid, random responses. Consequently, subjects were asked to describe themselves in 10 different ways and record these descriptions on a 10 by 10 matrix (see Figure 1, page 18).

Pre-Test Forms: This device was first pre-tested on 35 female students at Leslie College, a women's college in Cambridge, Massachusetts. These subjects were paid volunteers in a "persuasibility" study. They were asked to describe themselves in any 10 ways they wished. No limits to the terms they could use were indicated. It was made clear to them, furthermore, that this questionnaire would remain completely anonymous, that it was not connected with the study in which they were participating, that attempting to create a good impression would serve no purpose and that the experimenter was in no way associated with the Leslie College administration or faculty.

When these data were analyzed, two problems immediately became apparent. Many individuals described themselves according to physical characteristics (e.g. "pretty"), interests (e.g. "like to play golf") and group identification (e.g. "member of Surfers' Club").
Figure 1

In order to measure self-diffusion, all subjects were presented with a matrix such as this one:

```
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
```
We felt that these descriptions were not personality traits central to the individual's self-concept. Other subjects misunderstood the instructions and did not complete the form. Consequently, a revised version was administered to 26 male and female students in an introductory social psychology course at Harvard Summer School. This group was asked to describe themselves in any way they wished. They were explicitly cautioned, however, not to list physical characteristics, preferences or group memberships.

Analysis of these forms indicated that the subjects had listed central personality traits this time. However, further analysis led us to suspect that our sample still was not balanced since few negative descriptions appeared and since subjects are prone to attempt to create a good impression for the experimenter in such situations. We were not sure, however, whether this indicated a biased sample which might influence our results or whether it was a fair representation. Two final forms were therefore constructed.

**Form A:** On Form A, respondents were given very specific instructions, but could use any ten descriptions they wished:

People think of themselves in many different ways. Please try to describe yourself in ten different ways on the ten lines to the left below (the lines numbered from 1 to 10). You can use any adjectives or phrases which you think would best characterize you, but try to concentrate on your personality. In other words, don't list adjectives like "handsome" or "blue-eyed" or phrases like "like to play golf" or "good dancer."

These directions appeared above the grid which is reproduced on page 18.
Form B: Form B was constructed to (1) obtain what we felt to possibly be more balanced self-descriptions (ones containing both positive and negative items), (2) to see how a positivity-bias, if it existed, would affect the self-diffusion scores and (3) to make it possible to easily compare the self-descriptions of subjects with different levels of self-diffusion. Subjects who received this form were told:

People think of themselves in many different ways. Below are two lists of ways in which someone might characterize himself. Please select the five adjectives from each list which best describe you. Then, write these ten descriptions on the ten numbered lines to the left on the next page (the lines numbered from 1 to 10).

These directions appeared above the following two lists of personality traits and on the page preceding the grid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List I</th>
<th>List II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>Impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td>Worrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Self-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Quick-tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Easily influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Gullible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Envious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In compiling the above lists, we did not want to force subjects to describe themselves in language they would not ordinarily use (e.g. "diffident" instead of "shy") or to list adjectives which they would not select if completely free to use any terms they wished. The subjects in both pre-test groups, although they differed markedly in socio-economic background, religion and academic achievement and ability, listed essentially the same personality traits in describing themselves (once peripheral items were eliminated). Since our experimental group also consisted of college students, we assumed that the traits selected by the pre-test subjects would provide an adequate universe from which they too would select their 10 descriptions. Consequently, the two lists above were obtained by first recording all the traits which the Harvard and Leslie students listed. This initial compilation was reduced to 86 items by combining like terms and eliminating redundant ones. Fifteen students at Antioch College (Yellow Springs, Ohio), the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Cambridge, Massachusetts) and Brandeis University (Waltham, Massachusetts) then sorted these items into desirable and undesirable categories. These judges were told:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List I (cont.)</th>
<th>List II (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>Often feel misunderstood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Disorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Guilt-ridden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>Self-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above: Neat, Sensitive, Tolerant, Idealistic, Adventurous, Intelligent, and Happy are from List I (cont.), while Often feel misunderstood, Disorganized, Guilt-ridden, Stubborn, Self-centered, and Noisy are from List II (cont.).
Put those traits which you think
would be favorable for someone—
not necessarily you—to have in one
pile and those which you think
would be unfavorable for someone
to have in the other. If you can't
make up your mind about a trait, put
it in the undecided pile.

This procedure yielded 23 traits which all judges rated favorable
and 21 which all rated unfavorable. Form B was constructed by shortening
these lists through the elimination of polar opposites and the
combining of similar items. List I contains 18 favorable traits
printed in random sequence and List II contains 17 unfavorable traits
in random order.

**SELF-DIFFUSION:** Subjects were asked to re-copy the ten
descriptions of themselves which they had listed at the side of the
matrix (Figure 1, page 18) in the same order across its bottom. Thus,
each of the 10 personality traits intersected every other trait.
At each intersection, the degree of perceived dissonance could be
reported.

**Pre-Test Forms:** Both pre-test groups were asked to rank the
relationship between each pair of traits as either (1) consistent,
(2) inconsistent or (3) neither consistent nor inconsistent OR
unrelated, by placing an appropriate number in each intersection box:

1 = consistent
2 = neither consistent nor inconsistent or unrelated
3 = inconsistent

This system appeared to have several defects: (1) This narrow
scale range produced an unnecessarily truncated distribution which
made it almost impossible to obtain statistically significant correlations. (2) The inconsistency scores assigned to pairs of traits could not be interpreted unambiguously. Equal total scores could be obtained if the subject ranked half the pairs "3" and the other half "1" or if he ranked all of them "2." Likewise, it is not clear whether or not the relationships between two traits which are unrelated is synonymous with the relationship between two traits which are neither consistent nor inconsistent, as the instructions imply. Indeed, in the language of sign-graph theory, which could be employed to precisely describe such relationships, a line between two points indicates the presence of a relationship, while a particular type of line indicates either a positive or negative relationship. On the other hand, no relationship at all is indicated by the absence of any connecting line between two points and constitutes an entirely different situation (cf. Morrissette, 1958). (3) Finally, using the terms consistent and inconsistent in the instructions may have caused respondents to judge the relationship between traits solely or mainly on logical grounds. We were interested, however, in the description of non-fitting relationships judged according to any subjective criteria subjects wished to use.

Experimental Forms: A new, experimental form was devised on which the scale was widened, on which the no relationship category was eliminated and on which only one side of the compatibility-incompatibility continuum was used. Furthermore, a wide variety of terms was used to indicate the presence of non-fitting or dissonant relationships so as not to suggest the specific criteria to be used.
in making these judgements (e.g. "disharmony" or "inconsistent").

Subjects who completed either Form A or Form B were given the following written instructions:

The purpose of this section is to assess approximately how much you feel these various aspects of yourself (those listed by the respondent on the matrix) to be related. Clearly not all aspects of anyone's personality are perfectly consistent with each other. We have many different traits and capacities and they are never all in perfect harmony with each other. Please try to compare each of the ten descriptions with each other, and use the square where each meets one of the others to give an indication of how incompatible you feel the two descriptions to be. In each square write one of the following numbers depending on the type of relationship between the traits:

0 if you feel the two traits are generally compatible; that is, you find that they don't contradict each other but tend to go hand in hand or cohere. For example, you might give a 0 if you were comparing the trait "honest" with "generally trustworthy."

1 if you feel the two traits are slightly incompatible.

2 if you feel the two traits are moderately incompatible.

3 if you feel the two traits or descriptions are very incompatible; that is, you find that they conflict or tend to contradict each other. For example, you might give a 3 if you were comparing the trait of "a person who always finishes a job" with "irresponsible."
Once this was done, the 45 intersection scores were summed to provide a measure of self-diffusion based upon this 10-item cross-section of the self-concept. The maximum possible self-diffusion score, therefore, was 135 and the minimum possible score was 0. In measuring self-diffusion in this way, one must ask "How honest were the respondents?" Subjects might have tried to describe themselves largely in favorable and highly consistent terms. However, the fact that most pre-test subjects used the same descriptive terms suggests that most were being honest. If they were not honest in their responses (and did try to hide unfavorable items and inconsistencies), any inconsistencies which they listed would undoubtedly be extreme ones which could not be distorted either through selective perception or dishonest reporting. Results obtained with such a dishonest, truncated distribution, however, would be even more significant than results obtained with a wider range of responses since it would be more difficult to attain statistically significant correlations in the former case.

A test-re-test reliability coefficient of .75 (p < .01) was obtained for 12 Leslie subjects over a three week interval, indicating the relative constancy of the diffusion score and reliability of the scale. The predictive validity of this scale was ascertained by testing the hypotheses employed in this study on the 76 pre-test subjects. In most instances, these hypotheses were supported by the data.
Evaluation Conflict Scale

Subjects were presented with 13 personality traits which we felt were controversial, i.e., on which the respondent and significant others might not agree:

- Stubborn
- Sympathetic
- Confused
- Studious
- Insecure
- Considerate
- Impulsive
- Responsible
- Immature
- Independent
- Self-centered
- Neat
- Tolerant

Each trait was followed by five columns, each containing the numbers 0 through 3 in a row and headed: Myself, Father, Mother, High School Friends and College Friends. The subjects were told:

Below is a series of adjectives which someone might use to describe himself or someone else. Indicate for each whether you would apply it to yourself and whether or not your mother, father, high school and college friends would apply it to you.

In column 1, rate the degree to which you think the trait is characteristic of you by circling the appropriate number:

- 0 = not characteristic at all
- 1 = slightly characteristic
- 2 = somewhat characteristic
- 3 = very characteristic

In column 2, circle the degree to which your father would think the trait is characteristic of you.
Similar instructions were given for the subject's mother, high school friends and college friends. These directions were printed above the traits and numbers in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Myself</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>H.S. Friends</th>
<th>College Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stubborn</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a copy of the entire scale, see Appendix B.

The degree of disagreement between the evaluations of any two significant others was calculated by computing the differences between the evaluations of these two individuals for each of the 13 traits and summing these differences. Thus, if the subject's father rated him "1" on stubborn and his mother rated him "3" on this same trait, he would receive a difference score of 2 for this trait and this score would be added to the 12 other difference scores. Under this system, parent-peer discrepancy scores could be obtained by averaging the evaluations of mother and father and both groups of friends and calculating the differences between these two averages. However, we calculated only the differences between all evaluations of the subject's mother and high school friends and added these scores. This was done because of its simplicity and, more importantly, because analysis demonstrated that there was little disagreement between mothers and fathers, on the one hand, and both groups of friends on the other. The minimum possible discrepancy score between any two evaluators or between self-evaluations and the evaluations of any single other person on the scale was 0 and the maximum possible score was 39.

The discrepancy between all four significant others was computed by adding the total difference scores between father and mother,
mother and high school friends and high school and college friends.
The maximum possible score here was 97 and the minimum possible
score was 0.

The discrepancies between self-evaluations and the evaluations
of significant others was computed in a like manner. For example, if
the subject rated himself as "0" on the trait confused, but his
college friends rated him "3" on this same trait, he would receive a
discrepancy score of 3 on this particular item, and so forth.

The discrepancy score between self-evaluations and the evaluations
of the "generalized other" (Mead, 1934), which is, in effect, the
mean of all self-other discrepancies, was computed by adding the
four self-other discrepancy scores: self-mother, self-father, self-
high school friends and self-college friends. This total was then
divided by four to obtain the mean self-other discrepancy score or the
self-generalized other discrepancy score. The maximum possible score
here was 39 and the minimum possible score was 0.

Any dishonesty or perceptual distortion of this scale will tend
to truncate the range of discrepancy scores and make it more difficult
to obtain statistically significant results. Consequently, any
significant results obtained will be more impressive since they will
be based on a narrow range of extreme cases.

This scale measures the perception of discrepancies between the-
evaluations of significant others, rather than the actual evaluations.
However, an individual responds to his perception of reality rather
than to reality itself and it is this perception which will determine
his behavior and self-concept. For instance, if an individual
believes that his girl friend perceives him as non-aggressive, he will
react to her on this basis although she may really see him as aggressive and domineering. Consequently, it is irrelevant whether or not this scale is recording actual or perceived evaluation conflicts.

Biographical Questionnaire

It was necessary to design all measures used in this study so they could be easily completed during a 20 minute testing session. Consequently, only very imprecise biographical information was obtained. We used this information to roughly measure role and evaluation conflict, under the assumption that students who differed from those with whom they were currently interacting or whose home environment differed from that of their neighbors would experience evaluation conflict. We also assumed that students who moved frequently either residentially or socially were being required to perform conflicting roles and were being evaluated according to conflicting standards by divergent groups of people. This question is discussed more fully in the next chapter. At any rate, mobility data were obtained by asking the subjects to indicate the number of cities or towns inhabited prior to college and the number of houses occupied by them in the city of longest residence. Subjects were also asked to list their father's occupation, their sex and religion and the amount of contact they had with their parents each month. Most of the questions on this form were closed-ended to permit rapid analysis and equivalency of responses. Fathers' occupations were transformed into socioeconomic level scores based both on the 1950 U.S. Census analysis of income and educational levels and on prestige ratings obtained in a
1947 nation-wide survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (Reiss, 1961). A complete copy of the biographical questionnaire can be found in Appendix G. Questions which do not pertain to this study but which are printed on this form were used in other studies in which this form was used.

The biographical questions were pre-tested and refined by first administering them to the 76 Leslie and Harvard students in the pre-test groups.

SUBJECTS

The subjects in this study were 129 male and 80 female undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at Duke University, in Durham, North Carolina. This general education course meets the social science requirement at Duke and its students therefore represent a wide cross-section of the undergraduate student body, particularly in the sophomore year. Students in this course receive credit for voluntary participation in psychological research and all participated in this study. This represents 6 freshmen, 157 sophomores, 37 juniors, 7 seniors and 2 graduate or special students with a wide range of major fields and interests. About half of these students are from the southeast, while most others are from the northeast or middle west, with a few foreign students. Most are Protestants. Four students were 17 years of age or less, 30 were 18,
124 were 19, 42 were 20, 8 were 21 and one was 22.

PROCEDURE

The questionnaire was administered early in the fall semester of the 1964-65 academic year, during a regularly-scheduled testing session during which the students completed a battery of psychological tests and sociological questionnaires. They were assured by the examiner that all responses would remain completely anonymous and would be used solely for research purposes. The form containing the three scales was titled "American Universities Self Report Inventory" and was administered to all subjects in the sample. However, the group was first divided randomly into two approximately equal halves, so that the Inventory completed by 106 students contained self-diffusion Form A, while the remaining students completed Form B. A further random sample of 40 students, half of whom completed Form A and half of whom completed Form B, also filled-out the Evaluation Conflict Scale. While they completed this form, the other students in the experimental group took a variety of psychological tests unrelated to the present study. All subjects first completed the biographical questionnaire, then the self-diffusion scale and, finally, the evaluation conflict scale or other psychological test.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

This study is a largely exploratory one as noted in Chapter I. Its aim is simply to identify some of the factors contributing to self-diffusion. The data analyses which will be discussed here will be very preliminary and the discussion of them highly speculative. A more thorough discussion of the sources of self-diffusion will have to await the computation of analyses of variance on the data reported herein and a new study which will more adequately delineate and measure the independent variables tending to produce self-diffusion.

Before discussing the results of this study, it will be helpful to examine the question of whether self-diffusion is based upon the internalization of conflicting evaluations or role performances, as suggested, or whether the same traits are just perceived differently.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF HIGH AND LOW DIFFUSION SUBJECTS

Form B, which was completed by 100 subjects, provides information on the question posed above since the personality traits selected by both groups of subjects (those with high diffusion and those with low diffusion) were recorded on it and can be easily compared with
Table 1

Number of High and Low Self-Diffusion Subjects Selecting Each Trait
(Form B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Number of HD Ss Selecting</th>
<th>Number of LD Ss Selecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List I (Positive Items):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List II (Negative Items):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrier</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Conscious</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick-Tempered</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Influenced</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envious</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often Feel Misunderstood</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt-Ridden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Centered</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Traits Selected More Frequently\(^1\)
by High and Low Diffusion Subjects
(\textit{Form B; N = 100})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Diffusion Selections</th>
<th>Low Diffusion Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Disorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td>Self-Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Conscious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily Influenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often Feel Misunderstood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)If the difference in the number of subjects in each diffusion group (median split) selecting a particular trait was five or more, the trait was assigned to that group (e.g. if 25 high diffusion and 20 low diffusion subjects selected trait \(X\), it was assigned to the "High Diffusion Selections" list).
Subjects were first split into high and low diffusion groups at the median on the self-diffusion scale. Then, the number of subjects in each of these two groups selecting each particular personality trait on List I (positive traits) and List II (negative traits) was summed. As can be seen on Table 1 (page 33), traits from both List I and List II were not selected in equal numbers by high and low diffusion subjects. This indicates, among other things, that high and low diffusion individuals do not have self-concepts containing the same traits which they just evaluate differently as to level of inconsistency. On the contrary, it is conceivable that the same societal norms may be used to judge dissonance by all subjects. If this is true, individuals with the same self-components should have exactly the same self-diffusion scores.

Table 2 (page 34) suggests more clearly the way in which the self-concepts of high and low diffusion subjects differ as far as content, rather than structure, is concerned. On it are listed those traits selected by 5 more subjects in one of the diffusion groups than in the other. For example, if trait X were selected by 25 High and 20 Low diffusion subjects, it would be assigned to the high diffusion column. As would be expected, high diffusion subjects appear to be more concerned with how others evaluate them than are the low diffusion subjects. This may indicate that they have many more significant others whose opinions they value and whose evaluations they internalize. Consequently, they are more prone toward self-diffusion because of the large number of evaluation sources within their environment. The self-concepts of low diffusion subjects seem more self-centered. As expected, then, high diffusion subjects describe themselves as
optimistic, sincere, friendly, practical, impatient, worrier, self-conscious, easily-influenced, envious and often feel misunderstood. This cluster of traits closely approximates Reisman's (1950) description of the other-directed individual. On the other hand, low diffusion subjects are moody, disorganized, stubborn and self-centered—all traits which indicate that these persons have restricted interaction with others and pay little attention to them. Surprisingly enough, the trait "intelligent" appeared more frequently on the low self-diffusion list. It may of course be that those who perceive of themselves as intelligent do so precisely because they ignore others' opinions of them. However, this may also indicate that these subjects are perceived as intelligent by significant others because they can make up their own minds about academic and other questions and are, perhaps, more interested in solitary, academic pursuits than they are in group interaction. Another possibility is that playing the role which when internalized registers as "intelligent" means being scholarly and solitary.

Evaluate Criteria

From the above discussion, we can conclude that different items are contained in high and low diffusion self-concepts and that general standards may be used by all to judge inconsistency. However, we do not know what these general standards are. Table 3, on the following page, provides some clues to the standard(s) by which dissonance within the self-concept is judged. The mean inconsistency score for each of
Table 3

Mean Inter-Item Diffusion Scores Within and Between Trait Lists
(Form B; N = 99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait List</th>
<th>Mean Inter-Item Diffusion Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (Positive Items)</td>
<td>.39 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (Negative Items)</td>
<td>.62 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-List</td>
<td>1.13 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** T-test between means for List I and List II = 6.6, p < .005.

*** T-test between means for Inter-List and List II = 4.17, p < .001.
the intersections at which two positive (List I) traits crossed can be compared with the mean scores for all negative (List II) item intersections. Positive items are seen as significantly ($p < .005$) less inconsistent with each other than negative items. On the other hand, as expected, the highest inconsistency exists between positive and negative items ($p < .001$), indicating that the positive-negative or favorable-unfavorable continuum is an important standard by which inconsistency is evaluated.

EVALUATION CONFLICTS

Since the results obtained by subjects who received both Form A and Form B did not differ significantly from each other and since both samples were randomly matched, we shall discuss both forms as one, in most instances.

It was hypothesized in Chapter I that individuals who perceive more conflict in the evaluations which they receive from significant others will also perceive more conflict, or inconsistency, within their self-concepts. A direct test of this hypothesis is provided by correlating the individual's self-diffusion score with the total conflict which he perceives between the evaluations of him provided by four significant others—his mother, his father, high school friends and his college friends. This relationship was found to be $.52$ ($p < .03$) supporting the hypothesis. However, when we examine
Table 4

Correlations Between Total Diffusion Score and Perceived Conflict Between Evaluations of Pairs of Significant Others (Both Forms; N = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair of Evaluators</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>p &gt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and High School Friends</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Index of Parent-Peer Conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and College Friends</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>p &gt; .10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. All significance tests are two-tailed.
each pair of conflicting evaluations separately, another pattern emerges (Table 4, page 39). The only evaluation conflict which is significantly correlated with self-diffusion at the .05 level or better is that between the subject's parents and peers (.34). An analysis demonstrates that this results from their being little perceived disagreement between the evaluations of mother and father, on the one hand, and both groups of friends, on the other. This is discussed more fully in Chapter II. Another possible explanation of this phenomenon, which is not born out by the data, is that advanced by child psychologists who claim that the parent-peer conflict may be more significant than any other one, regardless of the level of agreement between significant others (Mussen, Conger and Kagan, 1963).

Self-Other Conflicts

The self is a source of its own evaluations which can be contrasted with the perceived evaluations of significant others (on which it was originally based). Individuals, for instance, often evaluate themselves or their work when they are completely alone. Furthermore, if we find evaluation conflicts between self-evaluations and the evaluations of other significant others, we should expect this to be an even greater source of self-diffusion than that between the others' evaluations themselves. After all, the self is perhaps the most "significant" significant other to the individual who is being evaluated (whether by himself or by someone else). These predictions are born out by examining the correlations between the
Table 1
Correlations\(^1\) Between Two Measures of Diffusion and Perceived Conflict Between Self-Evaluations and Perceived Evaluations of Four "Significant Others" and "Generalized Other" (Both Forms; \(N = 40\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Others&quot;</th>
<th>Total Diffusion Score</th>
<th>Number of Trait Pairs Ranked &quot;3&quot; or &quot;2&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>(0.16 (p &gt; 0.10))</td>
<td>(0.37 (p &lt; 0.02))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>(0.30 (p &lt; 0.10))</td>
<td>(0.39 (p &lt; 0.01))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Friends</td>
<td>(0.20 (p &gt; 0.10))</td>
<td>(0.22 (p &gt; 0.10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Friends</td>
<td>(0.20 (p &gt; 0.10))</td>
<td>(0.24 (p &gt; 0.10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Generalized Other&quot;</td>
<td>(0.32 (p &lt; 0.05))</td>
<td>(0.43 (p &lt; 0.01))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. All Significance tests are two-tailed.
individual's self-diffusion score and the discrepancy which he perceives between his own evaluations and the evaluations of significant others. Although, as Table 5 on the preceding page indicates, most correlations between self-diffusion and self-other evaluation discrepancies are not statistically significant, all trends are in the predicted direction. What is more important, however, is the fact that the correlation between self-diffusion and the self-generalized other discrepancy is \( r = 0.32 \) (\( p < 0.05 \)). The self-concept is evaluated by a wide variety of different people who, when taken together, form the "generalized other" (Mead, 1934). Consequently, this correlation and this source of evaluation should be more important than any single component evaluation within it.

To better illuminate the trends found by correlating the total diffusion score with self-other discrepancies, we can re-calculate the amount of diffusion by considering only extreme perceptions—the number of trait pairs ranked "3" and "2" or considered to have the highest degree of inconsistency with each other. When this is done, as Table 5 shows, self-mother, self-father and self-generalized other discrepancies all are correlated significantly with self-diffusion. It is interesting to note that friends seem to be a less significant source of self-evaluations than parents. This corroborates psychoanalytic and other theory which finds the basis for most individual behavior and personality in parent-child interactions. However, this phenomenon may also be explained by suggesting that friends are perceived as agreeing with the self either because they actually do agree or because they are such an important source of self-evaluations that perceptual distortions create the impression of
agreement. It may also be easier to distort the views of friends as opposed to parents because individuals may have more contact with and therefore more actual knowledge of the opinions of their parents. In any case, such actual or perceived agreement would eliminate self-friends discrepancies as sources of self-diffusion.

ROLE AND EVALUATION CONFLICTS

As outlined in Chapters I and II, role conflicts and conflicts in evaluations of others are found concurrently in a natural setting. For this reason, we cannot separately test hypotheses 1 and 2 with our remaining data on present and past behavior patterns of our subjects.

Mobility

The more different cities in which an individual lives and the more houses which he occupies within one city, the more likely he is to be exposed to conflicting evaluations and to the performance of conflicting roles.

When correlation coefficients comparing self-diffusion and mobility are compared, interesting results are obtained (Table 6, on the next page). For Form A and Form B combined, the number of houses in which one has lived in the city of longest residence is positively
Table 6

Correlations\(^1\) Between Total Diffusion Score and Two Indices of Residential Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Index</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>p &gt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Houses Occupied</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>p &gt; .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cities Inhabited</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>p &gt; .10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. All Significance tests are two-tailed.
correlated with self-diffusion (p < .05) supporting our hypotheses. Contradictory results are found when comparing inter-city mobility with self-diffusion. In fact, when we examine Form B alone, the opposite relationship is found (p < .05). Several possible explanations can be advanced to account for this. According to the University of Michigan's study of the Detroit area and its inhabitants, persons who move from house to house usually do so because they are downwardly social mobile, while inter-city moves are a function of upward social mobility (Swanson, 1964). Individuals who move from one city to another usually do so to advance their occupational position by securing a new and better-paying job. They have therefore most likely "arrived" at their new status position. They are not what we would call "in transit." On the other hand, people who switch houses frequently within the same city are most likely forced to do so because of increases in family size without concomitant increases in income or because of cuts in pay which lower per capita income and impair the ability to perform certain roles. These facts may cause a lowering of socio-economic level and force the performance of unwanted and inhospitable roles in an environment whose evaluations will be based upon criteria which are new to the individual being evaluated. The upwardly mobile individuals, on the other hand, will be able to perform roles to which they have aspired (and which they were probably performing before, anyway) and to be evaluated by the reference group whose evaluations have consistently been considered, whether members of this group were present in-person or in the individual's mind. Consequently, if this argument is tenable, high inter-city mobility subjects will receive consistent evaluations and perform consistent
### Table 7

Relationship Between Socio-Economic Status of Father and Total Diffusion Score

(Both Forms; N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Socio-Economic Status</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diffusion Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 4.1
\]

\[P < 0.05\] **2

---

1 Median split.

2 Two-tailed test of significance.
consistent roles. High intra-city mobility subjects will do the opposite. These explanations can therefore account for our suggestive but inconclusive results.

One problem which might account for these inconclusive findings is the narrow range of mobility displayed by college students before entering school. We would expect more dramatic support for our hypotheses if a wider sample, composed of individuals within all socio-economic categories, were employed.

Socio-Economic Status

Most students at Duke University come from upper middle class backgrounds. However, within this narrow range we can still examine the question of whether or not we can find negative rank order relationships between socio-economic level and self-diffusion. This will provide a further analysis of some of the questions raised in our discussion of mobility. Students whose fathers have relatively lower socio-economic levels and who find themselves at an upper middle class university are probably confronted with more conflicts in role requirements and evaluations than are students whose fathers are at higher levels. These latter students will find themselves in an environment more similar to the one in which they were raised, while upwardly mobile students who are trying to get ahead in the world of statuses by gaining a college education will be forced to play new roles and receive new evaluations to accomplish this task. These students are in the process of moving upward unlike the parents
discussed in the previous section who had already "arrived" at their new niche. They therefore should have higher self-diffusion scores than upper class students. Table 7, on page 46, indicates that this hypothesis was supported at the .05 level.

Religion

Students who are attending college with those of similar backgrounds or who have been raised amongst those of similar religious convictions should have experienced less role and evaluation conflict at home and should face less at school than those who have not. The religious breakdown and mean self-diffusion scores of the students in our sample by religion are reported in Table 8, on the next page. The percentages within our sample closely reproduce the religious breakdown of the entire Duke student body. As predicted, Catholics, who are in a minority both at Duke and in the South, have significantly higher mean self-diffusion scores than other religious groups (p < .01) while the other groups do not differ significantly from each other. It will be argued, of course, that Jews are also in the minority at Duke and should also experience high self-diffusion for this reason. However, if we examine the geographical origins of those within each religious category (Table 9, page 50) the reasons for this seeming anomaly become clear. Most Jews come from the Northeast where they form a substantial community which permits them to interact exclusively and consistently with each other. Catholics, on the other hand, come largely from the South where they form a small minority which is in daily contact with non-Catholics. Such individuals undoubtedly
Table 3

Mean Total Diffusion Scores for Three Religious Groups
(Both Forms: $ df = 75$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>Mean Diffusion Score</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>$3.7$</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>$4.05$ **</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>$3.62$</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** T-test between means for Protestants and Catholics: $t = 2.4, p < .01$. Differences between non-Catholic means are not statistically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>% from Southeast</th>
<th>% from Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will be evaluated very differently by their own community and by the larger society of which they are a part and they will perceive these differences in evaluation while Jews may not.

Sex

We had expected males, who are proceeding steadily toward a career, to have significantly lower self-diffusion scores than females. Female college students are faced with the perplexing and conflict-arousing problem of whether to proceed toward a career or catch a husband (Bettleheim, 1962). Because of this conflict they usually experience conflicting evaluations and perform conflicting roles. For example, they may be evaluated as brilliant by professors and less intelligent by their boy friends. At the same time, they may be performing the conflicting roles of avid and aggressive student and submissive "females." These conditions should lead to high self-diffusion. However, as Table 10, on the next page, indicates, exactly the opposite relationship between self-diffusion and sex was found. Males have significantly higher \((p < .05)\) self-diffusion than females. This surprising finding can be explained in several ex-post-facto ways. Males must depend upon the favorable evaluations of a variety of others for their career advancement while the careers of most women are based upon favorable evaluation by one person (the husband). Males may therefore have more others than do females whose evaluations they consider significant and whose evaluations they internalize. As we indicated in the beginning of this chapter, high self-diffusion subjects tend to describe themselves in terms which
Table 10
Relationship Between Sex and Total Diffusion Score (Both Forms; N = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diffusion Score</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 4.6 \]
\[ p < .05 \]

1. Median split.
2. Two-tailed test of significance.
closely parallel the other-directed person depicted by Reisman (1950). If the males within our sample, then, are more other-directed than the females, we should expect them to manifest higher self-diffusion. It may be true as we originally thought that females are faced with more actual conflict than males, but they are able to prevent their internalization, and the concomitant production of self-diffusion.

INTERVENING VARIABLE

We saw above that the extent of other-directedness may be an intervening variable between role and evaluative conflicts and self-diffusion. Another factor which may limit the affect of conflicting evaluations and roles on self-diffusion might be the degree of closeness between students and their parents. Presumably, subjects who are closer with their parents probably have fewer sources of significant evaluations than those who are not and therefore must depend more upon their friends for evaluations (a much larger collection of evaluators!). The assumption here is that those who must depend upon several sources for evaluations have a higher probability of receiving evaluations in conflict with each other or with their own self-evaluations. Students who are closer with their parents should therefore manifest less self-diffusion.

All subjects were asked to indicate the frequency with which
Table 11
Relationship Between Amount of Contact with Parents and Total Diffusion Score (Both Forms; N = 199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Communications Per Month with Parents</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>4 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall $X^2 = 4.8$ ($p < .10$)²  
Linear Trend $X^2 = 4.1$ ($p > .10$)  
Residual $X^2 = 0.7$ ($p > .10$)  

¹ Median split.  
² Two-tailed test of significance.
Table 12

Relationship Between Amount of Contact with Parents and Total Diffusion Score
(Both Forms; N = 143)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Communications Per Month with Parents</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>4 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diffusion Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.9 \]

\[ p < .05^2 \]

1 Median split.

2 Two-tailed test of significance.
they contacted their parents by mail, telephone or in-person each month. This should provide a rough indication of how close they are with their parents and how significant a source of their self-evaluations their parents therefore are. Table 11, on page 54, provides tentative support for our hypothesis. Those with the least contact are predominately highly diffuse (16 to 8), while the split within the moderate contact group is 50-50. On the other hand, those subjects who are very close with their parents manifest predominately low self-diffusion (69 to 50). This relationship can be more clearly seen by comparing only high and low contact groups (Table 12, on the preceding page). This chi-square, 4.9, is significant (p < .05).

According to this table, as predicted, high contact subjects have low self-diffusion and low contact subjects have high self-diffusion. Further analysis will have to be undertaken to discover exactly how, if at all, this factor acts as an intervening variable between role and evaluation conflict and self-diffusion.
 CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

The self-concept may be examined as a collection of mutually-interacting cognitions about the self. These cognitions, according to evidence from therapist and scientists studying cognitive structure, are frequently judged according to compatibility, consonance or balance. The degree to which the individual's self-concept is perceived by him to contain personality traits which fit together subjectively (self-unity) or do not (self-diffusion) may be a crucial determinant of his behavior.

Symbolic interactionists suggest that the individual's self-evaluations are internalizations of others' opinions of him. At the same time, role-playing studies indicate that individuals internalize the roles they play. From this, we advanced the hypotheses:

(1) Self-diffusion will be positively correlated with the amount of conflict which the individual perceives between the evaluations of significant others.

(2) Self-diffusion will be positively correlated with the degree to which the individual plays and internalizes conflicting roles.

A scale was devised to measure self-diffusion. On it, subjects place 10 self-descriptions on a 10 by 10 grid so that all traits intersect. At each intersection, the degree of inconsistency which the individual perceives can be recorded on a 4-point scale ranging from no inconsistency (0) to a great deal of inconsistency (3). When summed, these intersection scores provide a measure of self-diffusion.
The degree of perceived evaluation conflict by significant others was obtained by asking the subject how others rate him on several characteristics and how he rates himself on these same traits.

Role and evaluation conflict, beyond this, cannot be separately studied, since role playing and evaluation usually occur simultaneously. However, we can infer the extent of evaluation conflict which the individual receives and the number of conflicting roles he is required to play by discovering how different he is from those in his milieu.

Two-hundred nine male and female students in an introductory psychology course at Duke University served as subjects in this study. Hypothesis 1 was clearly supported. It appears that crucial sources of self-diffusion are the degree of perceived conflict between the evaluations of parents and peers and the discrepancy between self-evaluations and those provided by the "generalized other" (Mead, 1934).

Hypothesis 2 could not be tested separately. Nevertheless, self-diffusion was found to be highest amongst lower socio-economic level college students, amongst males and amongst Catholics. All of these groups, except males, differ significantly from those in their social milieu and are thus exposed to conflicting evaluations and role requirements. Males, on the other hand, may be more other-directed than females and therefore have more significant others whose opinions they consider and internalize and, consequently, have more chance of internalizing conflicting evaluations of themselves.

Mobility, which indicates the possible extent to which an individual is exposed to a wide-range of evaluations and role requirements, was not conclusively linked to self-diffusion.
Individuals with high and low self-diffusion describe themselves in different ways. Low diffusion subjects seem more solitary and self-centered, while high diffusion subjects seem to be very concerned with how they appear to others.

The concept of self-diffusion which was developed in this paper merits serious consideration by both sociologists and psychologists.

Sociologists have consistently stressed the fact that different individuals behave in the same way in similar social situations. Regardless of the individual's personality traits, he will perform the roles assigned to him. Goffman (1959) very effectively applies dramaturgical (theatrical) terms to human interaction. He demonstrates how individuals perform a wide variety of different acts for many different audiences daily. These they perform in the "front," or public, on-stage region and prepare in the "back," secret, back-stage region. According to Goffman, one would get the impression that individuals are just being constantly handed different scripts over which they have no selection. They are being directed in the performance of these more by social norms than by individual predelictions.

Psychologists, for many years, have been worried about what they call "integration." This term has been used to mean anything from adaptability to "mental health." However, one underlying theme in this writing is that the individual who is not "integrated" does not see himself as a whole. As a consequence, he functions neurotically in interpersonal situations (Buhler, 1950; Dorken, 1953; Thorne, 1959).

Self-diffusion might be profitably examined as a concept which will link these seemingly different foci. The individual is, of
course, a product of both social factors and his own particular outlook on the world. For example, within the self-diffusion framework, we might try to study the affects of what Simmel (1955) calls "intersecting social circles" to which the individual belongs. By examining the number of reference groups to which an individual belongs, the extent of agreement or disagreement and the degree of "intersection" between them, we could predict the individual's self-diffusion or "level of integration" (if this term could be clearly operationally defined). This information should then permit us to predict his subsequent behavior.
APPENDIXES
Section X

Sample cards of themselves in many different ways. Please say
is different positions in the different ways on the lines to the left
table (also from numbers 1 to 15). You are not to objects
as. Each time you hear words you are reading, you say to
merit is your personal. In other words, each time objects
in their positions on the table with your mind of the cards or
sentences. As you have noticed, these are descriptions of yourself
on the left. Again, these are terms in the case where you are the
batter. In other words, who care the cards you get on Line 1 at the
left is also on Line 1 on the batter.

Loc. please go on to section XI.
Section IV

The purpose of this section is to assess approximately how much you feel these various aspects of yourself to be related. Clearly not all aspects of anyone's personality are perfectly consistent with each other. We have many different traits and capacities, and they are never all in perfect harmony with each other. Please try to compare each of the ten descriptions with each other, and use the square where each meets one of the others to give an indication of how incompatible you feel the two descriptions to be. In each square write one of the following numbers depending on the type of relationship between the traits:

0 if you feel the two traits are generally compatible; that is, you find that they don't contradict each other but tend to go hand in hand or cohere. For example, you might give a 0 if you were comparing the trait of "honest" with "generally trustworthy."

1 if you feel the two traits are slightly incompatible.

2 if you feel the two traits are moderately incompatible.

3 if you feel the two traits or descriptions are very incompatible; that is, you find that they conflict or tend to contradict each other. For example, you might give a 3 if you were comparing the trait of "a person who always finishes a job" with "irresponsible."

Be sure to put one of those numbers in each box. Please work as rapidly as possible, giving your first reaction in each case.

THANK YOU. NOW, PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT SECTION
APPENDIX A: SELF-DIFFUSION SCALE
(Form B)

PART B

Section I

People think of themselves in many different ways. Below are two lists of ways in which someone might characterize himself. Please select the five adjectives from each list which best describe you. Then, write these ten descriptions on the ten numbered lines to the left on the next page (the lines numbered from 1 to 10). Now, please repeat these ten descriptions in the same order across the bottom. In other words, make sure the word you put on line 1 at the left is also on line 1 at the bottom. Then you have finished, go on to section II.

List I

Optimistic
Studious
Honest
Considerate
Reliable
Kind
Sincere
Friendly
Cautious
Independent
Practical
Neat
Sensitive
Tolerant
Idealistic
Adventurous
Intelligent
Happy

List II

Impatient
Worrier
Self-conscious
Mood
Rebellious
Immature
Quick-tempered
Easily influenced
Lazy
Equivocal
Envious
Often feel misunderstood
Disorganized
Guilt-ridden
Stubborn
Self-centered
Noisy
SECTION II

The purpose of this section is to assess approximately how much you feel these various aspects of yourself to be related. Clearly not all aspects of anyone’s personality are perfectly consistent with each other. We have many different traits and capacities and they are never all in perfect harmony with each other. Please try to compare each of the ten descriptions with each other, and see the square where each meets one of the others to give an indication of how incompatible you feel the two descriptions to be. In each square write one of the following numbers depending on the type of relationship between the traits:

0 if you feel the two traits are generally compatible; that is, you find that they don’t contradict each other but tend to go hand in hand or echo. For example, you might give a 0 if you were comparing the trait of “honest” with “generally trustworthy.”

1 if you feel the two traits are slightly incompatible.

2 if you feel the two traits are moderately incompatible.

3 if you feel the two traits or descriptions are very incompatible; that is, you find that they conflict or tend to contradict each other. For example, you might give a 3 if you were comparing the trait of “a person who always finishes a job” with “irresponsible.”

Be sure to put one of these numbers in each box. Please work as rapidly as possible, giving your first reaction in each case.

THANK YOU. NOW, PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT SECTION
APPENDIX B: EVALUATION CONFLICT SCALE

Below is a series of adjectives which someone might use to describe himself or someone else. Indicate for each whether you would apply it to yourself and whether or not your mother, father, high school and college friends would apply it to you.

In column 1, rate the degree to which you think the trait is characteristic of you by circling the appropriate number:

0 = not characteristic at all
1 = slightly characteristic
2 = somewhat characteristic
3 = very characteristic

In column 2, circle the degree to which your father would think the trait is characteristic of you.

In column 3, circle the degree to which your mother would think the trait is characteristic of you.

In column 4, circle the degree to which your close high school friends would think the trait is characteristic of you.

In column 5, circle the degree to which your close college friends would think the trait is characteristic of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stubborn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sympathetic</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Confused</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Studious</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Insecure</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Considerate</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Impulsive</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Responsible</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Immature</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independent</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>H.S. Friends</td>
<td>College Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-Centered</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nast</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tolerant</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
APPENDIX C: BIOGRAPHICAL INVENTORY

Please answer the following questions about yourself by placing a check mark (✓) next to the one best answer to each question or by filling in the blank. All information will remain strictly confidential. Be sure not to skip any questions. Fill in rapidly as possible.

1. Age:

2. Sex: Male  Female

3. Year in college: Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  Other (please specify)

4. In which city or town have you lived for the longest time since your birth?

In this city or town, approximately how many different houses, apartments, etc., did your family own?

In approximately how many other cities or towns have you lived before coming to college?

5. How many older brothers or sisters do you have?

6. Were either of your parents born outside North America?
   Yes  No
   In which country(ies)?

7. Were any of your grandparents born outside of North America?
   Yes  No
   In which country(ies)?

8. What is your father's occupation?

9. Have you ever lived or travelled outside North America? Yes  No
11. Approximately how much time do you devote to extra-curricular activities during an average week at Duke (if you are above a freshman) or how much time did you spend during an average week in high school (if you are a freshman)?

__________________________ hours

12. How many dates do you have during an average month? (Circle appropriate number):

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 more than

Do you usually date the same person? Yes _____ No _____

13. Do you belong to a fraternity or sorority at Duke or do you plan to join one? Yes _____ No _____

14. While at Duke, how many times during an average month do you or do you think you will write or phone your parents? (Circle appropriate number):

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 more than

15. What is your college average to date (if you are above a freshman) or what was your average during your last two years of high school (if you are a freshman)? (Circle appropriate letter):

A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D

16. Would you say you know more, fewer or about the same number of classmates than most other students at Duke? More _____ Some _____ Fewer _____

17. Have you done any dramatic acting while in high school or college?

Yes _____ No _____

18. Have you ever received any professional counseling or psychiatric aid?

Yes _____ No _____

THANK YOU. NOW, PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT SECTION ..............
AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES SELF REPORT INVENTORY

Please complete every item in this inventory as rapidly and honestly as possible. Make sure not to skip any items and to read all instructions carefully. Thank you.

All information will remain strictly confidential. We are interested in the group as a whole, rather than in any one individual. However, please print your name and section below so that we can keep all information pertaining to you together:

Name (please print): ____________________________
Section: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
APPENDIX E

Means and Standard Deviations for
Selected Variables
(Both Forms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Diffusion Score</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trait Pairs Ranked &quot;3&quot; or &quot;2&quot;</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Houses Occupied</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Additional Cities Inhabited</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's S-E Status</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Prestige</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E-Prestige Discrepancy</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with Home</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Means and Standard Deviations for Selected Variables
(Form A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Diffusion Score</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trait Pairs Ranked &quot;3&quot; or &quot;2&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Houses Occupied</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Additional Cities Inhabited</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's S-E Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>39.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Prestige</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>78.78</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E Prestige Discrepancy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with Home</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Means and Standard Deviations for Selected Variables
(Form B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Diffusion Score</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.64</td>
<td>21.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trait Pairs Ranked &quot;3&quot; or &quot;2&quot;</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Houses Occupied</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Additional Cities Inhabited</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's S-E Status</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.01</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Prestige</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-E-Prestige Discrepancy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications with Home</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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