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Chapter I

THE PROBLEM OF STUDYING SELF AND ROLE BEHAVIOR

Statement of purpose:

It is the purpose of the present study to explore the possibility that self as a process can be behaviorally manifested through the study of role behavior. The present study attempts to survey manifestations of self concepts as a means of arriving at a preliminary statement of the exemplification of self through role behavior. This will be accomplished initially by outlining a set of assumptions basic to self process and then by an analysis of a series of interviews with a designated group of individuals.

Self as a field of study: The problem of studying it scientifically:

Self can be variously defined,\(^1\) but for scientific fruitfulness it must be studied by means of individual behavior from which inferences about the self may be drawn (see Shoben, 1962). Specific behaviors

taken in a social context have been called roles and a considerable
body of role theory and its attendant research has been developed
(Biddle and Thomas, 1966). However, for the psychologist endeavoring
to understand human behavior the difficulty with role theory as it has
been explicated in the literature is that it is sociological rather than
psychological in nature. 2 This leads to the difficulty of relocating the
loci for behavior from a social interaction view in which behavioral
expectation is an end-in-itself to the psychologist's view of behavior
as a valid way of predicting individual behavior by studying performance,
motivation, cognitive development, etc. The psychologist views
behavior as the observable product of many dynamic processes occurring
within the organism. The self process is hereby assumed to be a causal
factor for manifesting roles, and becomes important to the psychologist
as an inferential process underlying human behavior.

Another difficulty in studying self scientifically is that the idea of
self invariably creates for the behavioral scientist a paradox. Too often
researchers are forced to be classified as either "hard", experimentally
oriented scientists who cannot by their scientific approach refer to
inferential processes which they perceive as metaphysical, but base
their scientific guesses on probabilities of occurrences of observables,
or as "soft", introspective humanists who believe the potentials of

2See Appendix A for critical review of Role literature.
organisms are amenable to inferential deductions and base their conclusions on possibilities of occurrences (see Annals of New York Academy of Science (1962) for examples of both these viewpoints). However, when an attempt is made to undertake a comprehensive study of man it becomes impossible and improbable that man can be understood from only one of these approaches.

Significance of problem:

Man does not exist in a vacuum. Man is a social creature, born of man, in a society of man. By the very fact that all organisms exist in environments they (man included) are acting and reacting to the influences of their condition. The process of action-reaction creates an environmental interaction that has been accepted as a basic condition for all living organisms.

Man both initiates stimuli and reacts to stimuli. Many of the internally initiated stimuli and processes of action are inferred; e.g., one such internal process, thinking, is an inference. As man acts-reacts selectively to his environments he can be observed through his behavior and the underlying dynamics or processes that give rise to the manifested behavior can be inferred. Inferences are derivations based upon certain observables which imply, indicate, and determine certain processes as existing.
Naive reference to the human organism as a human being infers a process—one in which the human organism is assumed to be in some developmental continuum or sequence, in which a yet to be state or stage of development is hypothesized. If man is developing, furthering himself by some form of directional existence, then he can be understood with reference to a prior state and to a future condition. Such a continuum infers that man possesses a memory of a past, perceptions of present, and is capable of postulating a future with himself as his locus of reference. But, the only reality man has is the self, which is his least tangible and most amorphous attribute. Self represents a process of viewing outwards and inwards. Both internal and external originating stimuli take on meaning as they are processed, organized, integrated and assessed by the self system. Thus, self is the mediator and mediating process which presents, interprets, relates and redefines the environment as it exists at that moment and as it may be hypothesized or assumed to exist in the past and future with the loci of references as the organism.

Man learns about his own organism and develops ideas and beliefs that give meaning of his being from his experiences with his environment. Many of his self concepts are evaluated through social participations.

From the earliest forms of cognitive integrations and differentiations man constructs views of himself that eventually will
become stabilized and flexible. Some of these cognitive relationships are postulated and interpreted to form the basis of his identities or the ideas of self reference and self meaning.

Since man is born into a social group, he learns to reinterpret and assess his own concepts of self in accordance with his perceptions of others and their reactions to him. As an individual cognitively develops he is able to perceive, interpret, hypothesize and evaluate his social participations with respect to his self conceptualizations. His concepts of self become both more specified and general as to his role flexibility, adaptability and stability.

The problem that becomes discernable is that of understanding the dynamics behind role assumptions and how the study of man is enhanced by studying roles and the development of self. The study of a process is the study of an inference and can only be undertaken if a product is obtainable and behaviorally observable. Self is not an entity—it cannot exist apart from its neurological-physiological substrate: only the organism is an entity. But, man does refer to self (e.g., James, 1890) and cognitively-affectively interprets his interactions in terms of himself. Man's self is always the locus of reference against which he

3 The reader will note that the term identities rather than the more common identity is being used here. The reason for the concept of plural identities rather than that of a single identity appears later in the discussion.
makes comparisons and inferences (Shibutani, 1961). He evaluates not
only others but himself in relation to standards or criteria he has
cognitively developed. It is through the process of building concepts
of self that man can aspire to all possibilities (Maslow, 1943;
Goldstine, 1939). As man elaborates and reorganizes his self concepts
from results of his role participations, he bases his self expectations
on a probability that certain behaviors will be reinforced.

Role has often been defined as expected behavior implicit in the
stimulus situation. Researchers have attempted to study roles as
complex behavior patterns existing in reality situations (see Sarbin,
1968), that is, real life behavior in a situational context.
Psychologists, by studying the process of socialization, percept of
others, interdependence, conformity, sanctions or the framework of
demands and rules, and position or status implications, attempt to
scientifically structure the individual's understanding, motivation and
reaction to his society and self by the type of role behaviors he
manifests.

For those scientists who deny inferential, subjective cognitive
processes, the study of self becomes an enigma, because the process
is the study of cognitive-affective interpretations by the individual of
himself. Through the opportunities of social participation the
individual, within the limitations of his level of development, can
relate to others and project, reflect, and hypothesize identity concepts,
or ideas of reference about himself. The roles a person assumes can afford the vehicle for social behavior.

However, the study of roles does not stem from a simple, undimensional theory. Each researcher uses the biases of his particular discipline to fractionate the study of roles into various perspectives, in which role itself becomes only one concept within role theory. Each study of role is developed with those particular aspects or uniqueness that the researcher has selected to focus upon. His understanding of the concepts of role depends heavily on the background of his scientific discipline. The task that faces any worker with role theory is to be able to integrate the various contributions from the behavioral and social sciences; e.g., from social psychology, sociology, anthropology, political sciences and education. Further, he must discern the commonality within concepts and specific control variables studied by each of the scientific approaches in order to create a theory that has broad acceptability. Problems arise in attempting to define role concepts so that a researcher, whatever his scientific interests, can contribute to role study by stating his findings in terms that are understandable and broadly applicable. The concepts encountered in the study of role must be general, independent, comprehensive and parsimonious. A perusal of the literature in role shows that the four mentioned characteristics have not been met. Many of the studies are neither comprehensive nor general, but idiosyncratic to the perceptions of the worker. Many
researchers have neither used nor defined the independent variables in their design, and the law of parsimony has given way to over-simplification or complexity. As Biddle and Thomas (1966) state:

Reviews of role definitions have indicated a striking diversity of definitions. The idea of role has been used to denote prescription, description, evaluation, and action; it has referred to covert and overt processes, to the behavior of the self and others, to the behavior an individual initiates versus that which is directed to him. Perhaps, the most common definition is that role is the set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be. But this much agreement is at best but an oasis in a desert of diverging opinion. A careful review of the definitions reveals however, that there is one nearly universal common denominator, namely, that the concept pertains to the behaviors of particular persons.

These authors have defined role as a "person-behavior matrix that deals with the interface between persons and behavior." The matrix is comprised of a set of behaviors ordered by a set of behavioral classes. They prefer to keep the usage of the term role to refer to the entire person-behavior matrix, provided that more specific concepts are used when speaking of given segments of the matrix.

There are also other sociologically based concepts of role and self such as George H. Mead's (1934) notion of the "generalized other" and the related process of role taking. Mead states:

The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unit of self may be called "the generalized other." The attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community...It is
in the form of the generalized other that the social process influences the behavior of the individuals involved in it... Only through the taking by individuals of the attitude or attitudes of the generalized other toward themselves is the existence of a universe of discourse, as that system of common or social meanings which thinking presupposes as its context, rendered possible.

This discussion does not elaborate the complex concept of self and the various levels or components which comprise the holding, building or developing concepts during the self process. Nor does it discuss the important triad that is inherent in each study of role, the individual, the other(s), and the behavior or behavioral interchange or interrelationships that occur.

Objectives and relatedness of "self" to psychology:

In psychological study there is no denying that people live in socially structured organizations; that within these organizations individuals are grouped by divisions of labor; that the divisions of labor within the organizations afford the positions or roles that become necessary for the maintenance and perpetuation of social organizations; and that when people function in accordance with their ascribed and socially acceptable, aspired roles these groups of individuals become a social system which can exist beyond the needs of any one individual who comprises the system.

However, psychological interest is not entirely focused on the socially organized positional roles but on the quality of involvement of
individuals in social interactions and the effects of the interactions on the participants. While psychological attention is focused on social conduct, the underlying dynamics of the social behavior is assumed to be located in individuals, and in the reasons for and results of their social interactions in terms of psychological development. The sociological study of roles and self implies a positional-status arrangement existing within some type of interactional system; psychological role study assumes that interactions involve behavioral responses emerging from the demands of individuals, the feedback from the person(s) with whom they are involved and implicitly with the individual's cognition of the demands of the broader culture. This results in role behavior which can be the self process exemplified or manifested in certain situational contexts in which the behavior occurs, and is differentially appropriate or adaptive to the demands of the situation. Since role behavior is a means of observing and inferring the self process in human development, it becomes an important concept for psychological study. Since self is a process, hence inferential to scientific study, it can best be studied through its contents or its products. The contents of self process are the concepts that are cognitively developed as a result of interpretations and assessment of experiences. The products of the self process are the manifestations or exemplifications of the self contents in observable behavior, or as
exhibited in role behavior. Therefore, self process is assumed to be amenable for scientific study through its manifestations in roles.

Order of presentation:

The presentation of this dissertation has been divided into six chapters. The initial chapter discussed the problem of studying self scientifically, noting that one of the problems facing the serious researcher is to take a "metaphysical" concept and make it operational, permitting hypotheses to be generated as to make self fruitful for scientific endeavor.

Chapter II briefly describes assumptions of self as a process in human behavior. These assumptions relate to the cognitive-affective development of an individual's self concepts. The presentation of self process will highlight anlages of self development, the development of identities, role behavior, values, and responsibility. The foci of the chapter will be upon contents of the self process (identities as concepts of self) and their manifestation or exemplification in role performances.

Chapter III will present a psychological study of role, and critically examine the type of role behavior manifested by individuals as differentially related to the self process and other variables hypothesized as important to the identity structure.
Chapter IV includes a description of the research design and research execution, the principle concepts around which the study is organized, the interview format, a description of the sample, and the method for presenting data for discussion. The techniques, rationale and limitations of the study will be defined.

Chapter V focuses on the presentation of critical incidents as related to role theory in self development.

Chapter VI summarizes the results of data with respect to role theory and self concepts. This section will generate implications for deductive reasoning from the theory of role and inductively to the self concepts theory, attempting to specify variables that make self process a viable study for psychological investigation.
Chapter II

ASSUMPTIONS OF SELF AS A PROCESS

Defining the self process:

An attempt to discuss self is complicated not only by the complexity and intangibility of the construct, but by its pervasiveness as a central factor in all of the intra and interpersonal behaviors of man. The development of self would appear to be man's most essential enterprise. Self is the mediator and mediating process for man's organismic state or "being" in both his internal and external worlds.

The self process is construed by the present writer as a personal reference construct which involves a cognitive-affective or perceiving-interpreting action system operating on the formulation of hypotheses and expectancies derived from results of learning (actual and vicarious) and processing of experiences. The self process is a highly personal development relating concepts that represent an "inner" view capable of being projected with reference to external environments. Self concepts are the constructions that an attending, observing organism (possessing the attribute of awareness) places upon itself and its

1The development of self concepts has integral relationship with the development of ability to think: thinking is conceived as an elaboration of awareness.
environment. They represent interpretations and assumptions placed in the context of the past, present and future, as the organism seeks meaning of its relatedness to its surroundings.

The difficulty in defining self is that self often has been treated as if it were an entity, having a substantive existence beyond the limits of the corporeal organism. Self is referred to as the self or as the main thing to which the functioning organism reacts, and from which the organism establishes its existence. The entity self becomes a thing full of contents—the contents consist of self's ways or methods that attempt to explain and define what it is to the organism, as well as to others. By this reference, self transcends the corporeal existence of the organism (see Prentice, 1962) and can exist as an object apart from the boundaries of the individual.

Self has also been described as if it were a part of the organism, that is a part in the developing individual. (See Mead's discussion of "I" and "Me", 1934.) During maturation, according to this position, the individual gains increasing contents or size and complexity to this part which develops in parallel with his biological-physical attributes. This assumption while placing self within the organism still refers to self as an object, or organ-like part of a thing, or an entity within the entity simulating a symbiotic relationship of self and organism.

The danger created in describing self as a process is that the description of the process can make it appear that what is actually
being dealt with is the products of the process itself. This description has a tendency to destroy the delineation of various stages, levels, attributes or conditions that emerge during the process, with the result that the process appears to be an entity.

Self process as described by Horrocks and Jackson\(^2\) changes and progresses with the development over time of the organism. Thus, it is a developmental process. Because it is a process, self is inferential, but can never exist other than as the functioning of the neurological-physical apparatus of the organism. However, as a process self should be capable of being critically examined at discrete time periods and its progress to any point of development evaluated and assessed. As with most processes, only the products or contents can be observed. Products may be produced by the effects of the contents of the process at any point in time; self process contents are the qualitative and quantitative accumulations of cognitive constructions and derivations up to that time period. The contents of self process are identities or concepts, and the products are manifestations of these identities in role behaviors. Since self has been defined as a process it is necessary to describe the development and operation of this process.

Development and Operation of the Self Process: Overview

It is not expedient to consider self as a process without consideration of the development, operation and interaction of a system of values and assemblage of identities. As a result of maturation and learning and of acquiring expectancies based on experience, the organism becomes a self-building entity capable of perceiving, processing and interpreting information in such a manner that it creates meaning of itself against the criteria presented by its core of developing values.

Self is a mediating process that explains, interprets and hypothesizes the interior and exterior environments in any state of existence, i.e. past, present and future, with locus of reference as the organism itself. Self process developing from cognition is unconfined by space-time limitations. It is not permanently space-time bound.

Development of the self process:

During cognitive development, there is produced an assemblage of identities and a system of values enabling the organism to interpret and cope with the physical and social environment and with itself as a functioning physical organism. The dynamic process of constructing concepts of self becomes a developmental task of the organism, encompassing the psychic or affective-cognitive area and the somatic or
physical-physiological domains. With cognitive development, the self process produces identity concepts resulting in an identity assemblage or a flexible, stable organization of concepts concerning self. Briefly stated, self concepts are the products of the interaction of both emotion and intellect, and are cognitions bearing overlays of emotional feedback that modify original cognitive mental constructions. Self, then, is a perceptual, conceptual, interpretative dynamic process, proceeding within the parameters of cognitive processing of experiences and actions of the organism through time, and is both facilitated and limited in its development by levels of cognitive operations. At any point in the developmental sequence, the efficiency, scope and range of development of self process depends upon the level of cognitive manipulation made available by the results of both maturation and experience.

Self concepts are many faceted concepts, forming the parameter within which at conscious behavioral levels, cognitive processes operate. Self concepts are the organism's symbolization of itself (Nixon, 1962). Functionally, self concepts consist of series of personal beliefs and attitudes\(^3\), that dispose the organism to act-react to itself as it does to any object in its environment.

---

\(^3\)Beliefs are affect modified cognitions; attitudes are organized beliefs, focused on specific objects or situations, predisposing an individual to respond in a preferential manner; attitudes are the applicable results of cognitive reorganization of concepts possessing prior attachment of affect. (See pages 43–44 for additional discussions.)
Cognitive basis for self process:

The self concepts are cognitive-affective organizations that interrelate concepts for interpretation and reassessment as to create various meanings of the organism and of its place in its surroundings. Self concepts may be further described as value based cognitive-affective symbolizations developed over time through maturation and experiential accretions of a functioning organism. During development of cognitive operations, the individual cognitively constructs rules for information processing with which he "operates" on his cognitive contents. Rules set criteria for standards by which the organism can categorize and classify cognitive representations relating to his actions and functionings. With these rules an individual can judge his own modes of conduct (Piaget, 1959). Such judgments are derived from use of his value system and are related to his self concepts as self perceptions, self evaluations and self attitudes.

A source of self concept formation can emanate from labels or signs forming pre-conceptions or representations of self (Maccoby, 1966; Buhler, 1962). These labels or signs, external means of reference of the individual (products of socialization), become part of cognitive representations and when combined or related to other bits

\[4\text{Values are rules and criteria the organism develops during cognitive operations and information processing that set standards for modes of conduct, or behavior and desired end states or goals.}\]
of process inputs [i.e., biologically determined gender stimuli, Kohlberg (1966)], begin to be integrated and organized as cognitive classes [see Glaser (1968) for discussion of concept formation]. These references when employed by the individual in describing himself bring to the threshold of awareness, affect with which they were originally processed. Social signs or labels become modifiers or conditioners of total cognitive structures.

It is assumed that during the first quarter of an individual's life span he is primarily assimilating experiential data and developing concepts by which he can seek meaning as an unique entity by individuating himself from his environment. These are the years of building, revising, and restructuring concepts of self and accommodating these concepts to the social and physical worlds. During this period, the individual begins to test his cognitive constructions against reality. He may attempt to change or modify his cognitions by perceptions of consensus appropriateness and self satisfaction. It is throughout life that an individual attempts to assimilate culture (primarily through symbolic organization) and adapt himself to the point of permitting (a) independence, (b) identities of individuation, (c) conceptualization of alternatives for purposive, directional and aspired existence.

---

(d) responsibility, and (e) the attainment of mature self love as manifested in selflessness (Sullivan, 1953) or non-possessiveness (Fromm, 1956).

**Operation of self process:**

To be operative, self process must have a context, a coded or programming schema, differential experience, internal and external interaction, cognitive capacity and feeling-affect. Self evolves from learning, beginning in uterine life and continuing throughout the entire life of the organism limited by the parameters of its genetic code. In describing the self process, the idea of preformation must be rejected. The developing organism does possess a genetic program which guides its formation as a physical organism by maturation and growth potentials, but at conception the psychic or mental aspects have not been programmed; this is largely developed in a social environment (Sherif, 1962). However, anlages of self development occur *in utero* by sensori-motor action created by the developing organism upon its

---

6 Biosemiotic principles assert that all living substances possess two inherent qualities for perpetuation and maintenance of life, self assertion and self realization (Rothschild, 1962).

7 Anlages are the foundation of subsequent development, or rudiments. They are the first recognizable aspects for beginning development of a specific structure of an organism.

8 Hebb (1949) and Piaget (1952) assert that the organism is probably born with either cell assemblies or schemata that enable it to function and selectively interact with his environment.
environments. It is upon these anlagés that rudimentary schemata are constructed and permit the later more complex structures to occur. It is possible that these anlagés of self depend upon discrimination of, or reaction to, stimuli based upon sensori-motor-affect and form primary-somatic self preconcepts. Thus, at brith the organism possesses highly global, amorphous, schema for somatic representations (Werner, 1948), or anlagés for the later more structured cognitions of self ex utero. Neonates have been observed as manifesting differences in behavioral styles or emotional and physical states. Such "predis-positional" patterns of behavior evidenced at birth, result from repeated action-reactions to environmental stimuli in utero, including stress conditions (Sontag, 1935).

Conceptual Bases For Self Process: Its Origins

Somatic concepts of self process:

The newborn is a composite of functional systems, having responses, directional behavior and possessing low grade stimulus hunger. As the environment offers new experiences the organism begins to program into itself directionality, expectancies, sets and rudimentary percepts of somatic origin that will eventually enable him to perceive himself as a physical entity in his environment. Somatic concepts will continue to develop throughout the self process, evolving from cognitive development with the assimilation of cultural influences,
awareness of stereotypes, perception of body appearance and physical and functional effectiveness (White, 1959).

With development of somatic concepts, evaluations of one's body image against an evolving criteria for the soma will create attitudes of positive and negative self perceptions. When the somatic concepts of self deviate from cognitive developed standards, this results in cognitive reassessment behavior manifested by a variety of behavioral adjutive mechanisms, continuing until the perceived inconstancy, discrepancy or dissonance is vitiated or eliminated (Festinger, 1957), and results in adaptive and/or adjutive behavior. As the individual experiences social interactions, his concepts of soma change from egocentric preoccupation to concepts of his body as compared and related to others' standards. In other words, criteria for standards have been modified by social experience gaining feedback from other's evaluation of his appearance.

The first tasks involved in building concepts of self concern those that locate, articulate and control parts of the physical entity and develop responses and coordinations leading to control and manipulation of environments (Harlow, 1950), for satisfying selected stimulus hunger⁹ (Shoben, 1962). The organism's behavior is predominately action-oriented. Actions are affectively integrated into

---

⁹ Shoben (1962) refers to selective responsiveness as a dimension of self.
the cognitive system as the infant learns to react to others as functionally facilitative of his needs and as providers of experiences. These early interactions enhance the development of representations of soma. But, prior to the intervention effects of social agents, the developing organism possessed needs inherent to its living state. Biosemiotic principles stress that a characteristic of all living systems is organismic restlessness. These "energies" are channeled and become psychologically identified as tensions. When these tensions are of a consummatory function they are referred to as tissue preservation or primary needs. Primary needs are tension states with a biological-physiological reference. With birth, satisfaction of primary needs are interfered with by the intervention of external agents in the form of caretakers. As primary needs are being met there is an elaboration within the cognitive-affective system, by processing of reinforcements and rewards as affective feedback emanating from the infant's somatic demands. In addition to having had its primary needs satisfied, the organism processes feedback as to its competence and effectiveness at meeting its own demands. With the formulation of the somatic self pre-concepts, lower level value concepts, based on discrimination of effects of his behavior, establish worth, goodness, badness, pleasure, etc., (resulting from the effects of the person's interactions with the environment). The somatic self cognitive representations, emanating from a biological basis, emerge as (1) establishers of standards upon which
behavior is determined, and (2) criteria set for evaluating one's own actions. Thus they are the beginnings of value criteria.

**Psychic origin of self process:**

With the development of symbolic organization mainly through the social influence of language, the organism begins to develop symbolic representations relating to its own actions. Symbolic representation for itself, i.e., I, me and mine reference, will develop through the possession of the mental property of an invariant—object constancy. The individual becomes a stable, permanent object among other objects. With the mental ability to cognize a self reference point, events and actions can then be spatially-temporally located and related to the individual. He places his world into perspective with himself as the locus. This self locus is primary for autistic, or egocentric thinking, and for a later emerging function of cognitive processes, decentrism. The ability to decentrate enables roles to be appropriately performed.

**Motivation-needs-values-origins in self process:**

It is with the psychic self concepts that motivating forces develop (channeled tensions) for self exemplary needs or for the desires and want states. As the basic (primary) needs become socialized and elaborated, and as the individual distinguishes the perceptions relative to his somatic boundaries, he begins to operate by means of purposive
behavior. However, the transition from focus on tissue needs to self needs may remain a conflict-potential throughout life as each ascend to the level of awareness as drive states or as impulses to action. The conflict between need and desire is the basis for much fluctuation in mental adjustment.

Initially, interactions between an individual and his environment are encoded and processed (decoded) into cognitive structures and provide a basis for value development. Later self exemplary needs appear. Such needs are derived from values and are intimately related to the development of individual conscience. The early states of the individual in which the tissue needs are primary and goals are the satisfaction or consummatory state of somatic needs, are changed as values (rules for criteria and standards) assume the primary function of changing and modifying individual behavior. Thus, when values ascend to the primary functional level, goals become the objectification of the secondary order needs (manifested as behavior styles, e.g., nurturance, affiliation) the values have created.

In summary, in the beginning of the developmental cycle, the first order physiological somatic needs and environmental interactions

---

10 Purposive behavior can, in this instance, be synonymous with instrumental acts.

11 Self exemplary needs are those "wants or desires" that establish a perpetuating pattern and directionality for purposive living.
are of importance for the establishment of anlages of cognitive structures and for the development of cognitive schema of somatic representations. But, as the physic self (those constructions that relate to established structures with the later intervention of symbolic representation through images, ideas and language) takes a dominant position in the self process, the second order or elaborated needs begin to gain in importance until at maturity the self process operates and is primarily influenced by the value system. The value system emerges as criteria or rules for determining the second order needs and behavioral modes of conduct. It is during the formal stage of mental operations when ideals are relevant and assessable in thinking that the value system has gained primacy. Needs then are created by the value system that serves to mold, define, and relate identity concepts into a stable and flexible assemblage. Thus, those identities in adult life of highest significance in the self process are representative of values held and tend to take precedence in the actions of the individual. Eventually the ravages of age on the physical organismic structure cause the value system to yield to the first order physiological-somatic needs.

As the individual relates his conceptualization of self (hypothesized identities) and evaluates himself in terms of their effective manifestation, the values he is constructing are the criteria he uses for evaluation. The choice of roles he employs to test an identity is the goal (an objective of self exemplary needs) or a
behavioral mode directed by his value system. However, during the developmental process, the self concepts are formulated and reassessed by two processes. The ideal concepts of self are based on the criteria established by the value system. The operational concepts of self, the actual self manifestation, are based on perceptions of reality demands, manifested by testing conceptualized identities in role performances. These two processes provide discrepancy data for determining self attitudes, self esteem and self satisfaction.

Concept of others as related to self process:

As the individual is adapting and locating himself to the contextual environment he concomitantly is developing concepts of others (Piaget, 1955). An individual's concepts of self bear a direct relationship to concepts others form of him (See discussion relating to reciprocity and effects of decentralism of thought: Piaget, 1950). The process of self evaluation is reflexive (Homans, 1958) in that an individual is able to evaluate and act towards his own behavior in both the same way he reacts to others and in the way they react to him (Turner, 1956). The greater the number of significant figures who substantiate or confirm an identity concept the more resistant the individual is to reinterpret or reassess that concept in his cognitions. Since affect modifies cognitions (Schachter and Singer, 1962) it reinforces the value of that identity. Similarly, when significant others' conceptions are
nonsubstantiating, or of negative reinforcement the individual eventually
will be forced by affect feedback to modify or reassess his concepts
according to the new informational inputs relating to those concept-
tualizations.

Reevaluation of an identity concept cannot be a simple
'intellectualized' task. If an hypothesized identity had received prior
reinforcement by significant others and no longer continues to gain the
resubstantiation sought, there results emotional as well as cognitive
involvement. There is temporary resistance to change while reassess-
ment of cognitions, or accommodation occurs. Resistance to cognitive
reassessment occurs when prior cognitive-affective interpretations (or
meanings) of that identity concept were important to the structural
organization of self, i.e., that identity concept was interrelated with
other identity concepts within the cognitive organization of self.

Role origins: development of the products of the self process:

As an individual is developing concepts of self and adapting them
to his environment, he is also developing concepts of others by a
process of exterior figure socializations. He does this by assigning
roles (classifications of concept categories) to significant surrogate
representatives in his environment. It is through this that he builds a
picture of his social world. Each role surrogate becomes
representative of a concept category. These role assignments develop functional concepts to be used in reality testing of identities.

Through roles the developing person is provided with a means of social participation. Roles also provide the means of exemplifying his identities, but an individual can only "take a role" after he has a cognitive basis for understanding or deriving a meaning of the role. Concepts of others may develop through actual experience with social interactions, or vicariously through seeing, hearsay, imagination, or reading. With a development of understanding of role expectations, when an individual meets discrepancies in his perceptions of what is representative of a role category (formation of a role stereotype) he will be faced with problem of changing role criteria. He may persist with the original conceptions and appear at odds with other's evaluation of his role expectations. However, developmentally this discrepancy in expectations is usually caused by constrictive criteria, by inadequate criteria for classifying cognitions, or from lack of experiences to elaborate cognitions.

Role behavior is a function of perceptions of others' demands, self expectancies and styles of behavior in response patterns that can be related to manifested identity concepts and the amount of accruable benefits in each social interaction. If beneficial to self meaning the identity concept tested in a role performance gains in importance in an assemblage of substantiated identities by becoming interrelated with
other substantiated identities. The self rewards are intrinsically felt and are reinforced by acceptance of the role by significant others. Roles most likely to gain greater personal benefits become more probable of enactment if they are congruent with the individual's value system. Throughout life significant figures and groups play a large part in identity development and in the maintenance of an identity assemblage. Building concepts of self, or the development of contents of the self process, is a process of the individual's cognitions and is an autistic function, though the eventual context in which identity concepts are manifested for feasibility, enhancement and modification is essentially a social world.

Identities: The Contents of the Self Process

During ontogenesis, through cognitive organization, the individual evolves hypotheses or constructs identities comprising his concepts of self. These concepts can be aspirational—what he would like to be, with a future possibility reference, and are related to his value system. If an individual is forced by situational demands to assume an "identity" not in accord with his concepts of self, he manifests a role playing behavior. But all identities are tested by role behavior. An hypothesized identity is manifested in role taking behavior by which an individual attempts to reality test a concept of self. An identity perceived in an individual by others, but which he
does not himself conceptualize (i.e., an anti-identity) is manifested in **role playing**. An identity that is fantasied, imagined or tried out in pretense play, is manifested as **role pigmentizing** behavior in which others are not inherent for the enactment. The coping behavior dealing with the enactment of the hypothesized, other-perceived, or pigmentized identities is the focal point in the operation of the self process. Any given identity is the result of the dynamic process of cognition focused on the organism. An hypothesized and pigmented identity is a construct evolving from the physical-physiological development of a living organism possessing awareness, evolved to the complex level of mind, or that process by which an organism can function with mental operations as to perceive, symbolize and manipulate itself and adapt with its social environments.

**Identity: concept formation:**

As stated previously, somatic and psychic representations of self must have evolved for references of self to be cognizable. It is during the pre-operational period that a child develops symbolic schema\(^{12}\), becomes aware of more than one dimension, and begins to be able to

\(^{12}\text{Piaget (1959) states that it is during this period that the symbol}
\text{ic function appears: language, symbolic play (the beginning of fictional invention) deferred imitation, i.e., occurring some time after the original event, and that kind of internalized imitation which gives rise to mental imagery" (p. 10). It is as a result of symbolic ability that representation of actions into thought becomes possible, although action is still on the actual function dimension for much of this period.}
perceive role attributes. Actual role taking can occur only when the individual is able to perceive and attribute certain styles of behavior to others. (See Gollin, 1958, for a relevant discussion of discrete, parallel, and interrelated attributes of concept development.)

To effectively perform a role, a child must be capable of decentrism. It is when a child perceives a role as having distinct behavioral attributes that his role behavior permits identity concepts to be manifested either in reality, play and fantasy or imagination. Role behavior results from the cognitive-affective developmental process.

Play is important to the developing child; through certain forms of pretense, imaginary play he can rehearse or posit a role that may someday be available. Fantasizing is primary role behavior and always remains a basic part of his egocentric thought processes and permits the self concepts formed, to be "tried out" in the realm of autistic privacy.

Prior to the ability for role participation a child must have some permanence to his gender identity, for lacking this concept he does not engage in role taking behavior but resorts to "imitative play" (Buhler, 1962).

During the middle childhood period, a child's approach to "self" is descriptive, concrete, limiting his concepts to the raw data of his

---

13 Those behaviors that form the expected responses of a particular role.
perceptions of himself in situational contexts. He does not speculate
or question his identities but relates himself through his actions and
derives cognitive representations as to his effectiveness and efficiency
in the social context. From his evaluation of his effectiveness, he
develops self attitudes and builds a foundation of conceptualizations
(or identities) which he can later test against other's evaluation of him.
(For comparison, see Mead's "generalized other" concept, 1934).

It is during the adolescent period that the ability to reason by
hypotheses emerges. Thoughts of self no longer proceed from actual to
theoretical but can start from hypotheses as to establish or verify
meanings of self. In this manner the adolescent's thinking takes the
form of hypothetic-deductive reasoning. The adolescent begins to form
hypotheses about himself which he then may test against reality through
actual manifestation of role taking behavior. He also may completely
figmentize a role in his hypothesized constructions and "think" it
through without resorting to reality-based performances.

During the process of self development an individual constructs
an assemblage of identities in his cognitive organizational structures
consisting of identities or related sets of identities that have been
reality tested either by actual, play or fantasy role behavior. The
types of roles taken during different developmental periods are
influenced by an individual's needs and values.
Some tests of reality of an identity are especially crucial and may create major changes of interrelationships in an identity assemblage. This is especially true of those affect laden identities associated with peers, family, and occupation. The more important and interrelated the concepts of self, the greater the risk is incurred in role taking (e.g., Homan's exchange principle, 1958). To alleviate negative evaluations to a manifested identity an individual attempts to cognitively rearrange or reassociate an identity in a set by assigning new importance to other substantiated identities, thereby enabling him to derive new interpretations and meaning from his self concepts. However, rearrangement of an identity set often results in "floundering" behavior, "cognitive dissonance", manifesting of defense mechanisms, withdrawal from role, and may cause the individual to operate temporarily at earlier mental operational levels.

As can be assumed by the foregoing discussion, it is impossible to understand the development of self without taking into account the organism's cognitive development; one which is capable of increasingly complex formations of complex contents and products, limited only by the level of manipulation available and experiential data processed by the organism. With cognitive development an individual builds a perceptual-conceptual-interpretative system through which he views and relates himself to the world. Developmentally the issue has to do with the levels of cognitive manipulation available to him. The
progress is through qualitatively different operational levels, tending
towards greater abstract behavior. It is during the hypothetico-
deductive period of mental operational ability that thinking becomes
propositional and interrelatedness of propositions becomes possible.
The individual is no longer confined by space-time immediacy as he was
in lower levels of development. He becomes a theoretical, system
building organism and begins to question, hypothesize and idealize
identities (concepts of self) as formulated by his value system criteria.
His concepts of self are related to standards for the types of roles he
may appropriately manifest. With his values the individual evaluates
the manner in which he performs the roles he takes.

It is assumed that roles change as contents of self change. Self
contents are a developmental function of the invariance of space-time.
With cognitive development, self concepts also are intimately con-
trolled by the ability to formulate invariant concepts of space-time.
When all actions are tied to the immediate event, the individual cannot
cognitively perceive himself as continuous. Self has no relatedness to
past behavior. It is only when the individual can conceive a memory of
past actions and can relate his immediate environmental cues to past
actions from which he can derive expectations for self, that he begins
to interpret meaning of self from his needs, and from the demands of
environmental events. With development of expectations and anticipa-
tions of events, he begins to have a past, present and future reference
of himself in relation to his environment. With cognitive maturity and
development of hypothetico-deductive reasoning he is able to perceive
self as relative to the space-time dimension, and can operate with
future probability of available roles. In this manner he develops a con-
tinuity of self despite the changing nature of identity concepts and
roles.

Integration of identity concepts as structure of self process:

assemblage:

It appears that by the second decade of life the individual is
increasingly involved with the task of definition and location of himself
in the broader social context (Erikson, 1950; Buehler, 1962). To
accomplish this task the individual must clarify, resubstantiate, re-
assess and rearticulate his identity assemblage and reintegrate the
identity concepts he has formulated with his value system. A charac-
teristic of the period following childhood is the emergence of values
(as compared to needs) as instigator of modes of behavior. To restate
the postulate; in early development the physiological and associated,
elaborated or socialized needs had primacy and values originated and
evolved from such needs; by middle adolescence "needs" (desires)
stem from values, as values determine behavioral directions or
behavior styles and desired end states, in keeping with the individual's
evolving concepts of self and in conformity with socially engendered
roles.
When an individual tests an identity through a role, the resulting need gratification is a function of successful exemplification of self in role behavior and social reinforcement of the role enactment. During late adolescence, identities relating to major developmental and social tasks are role taken (Super, 1960; Erikson, 1956). It is during this period that an individual may encounter what is called the "identity crisis". Having arrived at the cognitive level enabling him to hypothesize identities, he attempts to organize, stabilize, and assess previous cognitive constructions through reality testing identities in new roles. An individual successfully resolving a "crisis" (a state that occurs in any major transition point of life) will reassess his earlier concepts of self, developing new identity clusters or sets, and gains new interpretations or meanings of self. This process results in rearrangement of the identity assemblage. Rearrangement is cognitively accomplished by abstracting aspects or parts of previously constructed concepts, (i.e., reclassifying and/or recategorizing prior cognitions) forming new concepts, permitting the generation of additional hypotheses of identities.

Eventually the individual will have defined and developed self concepts in which he has built confidence from enactment in roles. Through role enactments he will have gained feedback from others as to the validity of his hypotheses of self and will be forced to reassess identities in the light of congruence of his beliefs of self and others'
evaluation of him. With social experience he will learn proper role behavior and will learn in which situations an identity may appropriately be manifested for substantiation by significant others. With time and experience he will have evolved a secure, stable yet flexible assemblage permitting him to feel membership in his society by creating reference, definition, meaning, and location of himself (his own organism) in his world.

Malintegration of the self process structure:

The roles the individual takes to implement his identity concepts are judged by others against their perceptions of reality demands. The judgments or evaluations applied by others, become harsher and less flexible as one matures. But each role promoted or projected upon an individual by significant others (as culturally ascribed or prescribed) must be acceptable to that individual's values, giving him satisfactions necessary for self exemplary needs, otherwise, the individual will resort to playing a role.

Role playing can become a problem to the individual because it can result in role confusion. Personal alienation and individual unrest are partly based upon playing role assignments demanded by others. Individuals also may become identity diffuse. This may occur when the individual has been unsuccessful in resolving conflicting roles, lacks inner referents (the criteria or standards for evaluation) and lacks
cognitive adaptability to a new experience. Given such diffuseness an individual may fluctuate between unbending resistance and over compliance. Despite occasional resistances, the identity diffuse person (Bronson, 1959) is dependent to the point of passivity (Lomas, 1965), accepts any externally demanded role or will imitate idealized concepts. He does not test reality through role taking of hypothesized identities congruent with his value system, but role plays performing a role in keeping with demands of others. Role play behaviors are not necessarily based upon perceptions of role requirements appropriate for self and society, but on what he thinks others expect.

Identities also may be idealized and conventional concepts of self. These concepts, however, are given social and reality evaluation by manifestation in role taking behavior. The realities of social participation provides information of concept feasibility and appropriateness or relevance of self concepts to the social environment. Since some behavior is never overtly manifested, but operated on "mentally", it is assumed that some identities are not reality tested but examined or tried out in fantasy, imagination or play and discarded, or retained until the situation presents itself when the concept may be manifested. Limited self cognitions result from limited experiences and prevent development of sufficient and adequate criteria for judging self and others. Role participations or social experiences are requisite for development of satisfactory reality based self conceptions.
When an individual has evolved a fairly stable yet flexible assemblage of identities his self esteem is the resultant of his self perceptions and the values he used to evaluate the appropriateness of self he has constructed. His self esteem is exemplified by his attitudes of self. If the situational contexts and personal attitudes are favorable, the self views tend to be favorable. Inferring from attitude formulations of others (i.e., Kretch, Crutchfield, 1948; Newcomb, 1960; and Rosenberg, 1965) the dimensions for attitude formation are content, direction, intensity, importance, salience, consistency, stability and clarity. Self attitudes appear to differ in these eight dimensions.

The ability to perform culturally demanded roles appears to be partly the function of maturation, physical adequacy and emotional stability, cognitive clarity of the role requirements, and awareness of others' needs and self needs. It may happen that reality testing of identity concepts result in change by cognitive reorganization. The transition period of cognitive adjustment and role adaptability is manifested in self uncertainty (see Garbin, and others, 1967). Individuals must establish new definitions and meaning of self through reinterpretation of their functions in and relatedness to their environment.

Change involves a discontinuity and lack of constancy with previous sets of related concepts. It is only with the ability to perceive oneself as both a relative and constant factor in one's environment, that an individual can tolerate or rationalize the lack of constancy of self
concept categorizations that results from reality testing feedback and from the processing of informational cues for societal role expectations.

The adolescent or adult who is identity diffuse has difficulty in maintaining self continuity (Strauss, 1959) and in recognizing his past concepts as related to present constructions. Security that comes with continuity of some cognitions of self is essential for self development and personal adjustment.

Stabilized-flexible structure: identity assemblages:

In order to maintain a stable structure of self concepts, certain identities gain salience by the specific evaluations that have been applied to them. It is important to summarize that self process is a developmental function and that its contents, identities, are capable of qualitative change throughout the life of the individual. Since identities are subject to change, the products of the process—exemplifications or manifestations of self in behavior or role taking behavior—also are subject to change throughout life. Therefore, identity concepts that are formulated and roles that are taken and figmentized are flexible adaptations of self process. The process itself develops greater stability by the relationship generated among substantiated concepts that are interrelated to acquire broader meaning of the individual and his behavior. The stability, constancy and continuity of self concepts
is inherent for formation of an identity assemblage. The assemblage is flexible and stable but never finalized. Hypothesized identities follow a similar pattern to that of the assemblage moving from states of lesser to greater stability. Unstable concepts have a greater probability of being discarded or revised within another set of identities. Less important identities have less resistance to change than do more central ones. The latter usually are heavily affect modified cognitive formations.

Since an assemblage becomes based upon value criteria, the individual's satisfaction of second order needs (self exemplary needs) is accomplished by striving for desirable value directed goals ("end" states). Goals are evaluated both by self reference and by others' values and must be acceptable to both if maladjustment is not to result. Efforts made by others to impose external standards not acceptable to self are usually met with resistance.

Values as function of self process:

The foregoing discussion presented the assumptions that values represent a system of evaluative criteria formulated by the individual during his process of development. They are developed by the inculcation of cognitive-affective encoding of results of learning, imitation and reinforcements, and by definition reached indictively from behavior. Values also are acquired through socialization efforts (over time) either
directly or vicariously with significant personages. Developmentally values are cognitive abstractions, forming criteria and standards for interpretation, evaluation and judgment. (Rules are behavior-event applications.) Values are standards and directives for modes of behavior (conduct) and goals. In considering the nature of values it is important to recall that values are cognitively formed and conditioned by affect resulting from prior actions, experiences, and beliefs. The combined affect effect on cognitive structures can preclude many attempts at intellectualizing behavior. Affect has modified a logical analysis of behavior and it is only when a person can attempt to "logically" or analytically separate the behavior from its affective interpretation (the process by which he acquired meaning) that he is capable of "objectively" describing his actions. Emotion is assumed to be a cognitive modifier preventing logical analysis of one's own behavior.

Values are relative; throughout development values are continuously modified, elaborated and refined, by past experiences, cognitive structuring of information and actions, and environmental circumstances. The roles taken and the behavior styles manifested are related to these three conditions.

Values can be expressed by an attitude, indicating a preferential action or feeling towards persons, things or situations. Such attitudes are manifestations of directed or focused values in the cognitive affective system.
Attitudes are important to the value system and to the self process. They are based on certain organized beliefs; beliefs are cognitions structured in the cognitive-affective system. From this interrelationship, it becomes evident that attitudes are inherent in the value system, although on a lower level of organization. Attitudes become habituated behavioral (overt and covert) responses more specifically focused than values. Values for the self process are developed from discrimination of sensori-motor-actions, forming bases for rules and become further elaborated as criteria and standards of conduct (modes of behavior) and end states or goals of the self process. Therefore, values are more fundamental, dynamic and directive than are attitudes.

Occasionally the literature is replete with the importance of ideals. Ideals are expressed objectives of a value. Ideals are aspirational and usually represent a goal or desired state. An attitude is an expression of a way of reacting to things permitting one to take a role needed to achieve an ideal. An idealistic person is one who emphasizes ideals over reality conditions. For some individuals, this occurs because of inexperience or due to inadequate role testing experiences. These individuals must learn to adapt their assemblage of identity concepts by increasing role participations to effect generally acceptable constructions of self. Since the idealistic person often discounts reality, he faces the possibility of adjustment difficulty when reality cannot be manipulated.
Some individuals, in order to adhere to ideals, will role play rather than role take their identities, preventing a risk of important self concepts.

To summarize; values are relational schema developed from past experiences encoded into the cognitive-affective system. Values are cyclical types of cognitive reincorporations. They result in enhancement and modification of original criteria by reality experiences, and are dependent upon the operational level of cognitive ability and quality of experiential data for processing and interpretation. Since many experiences are shared in common with others, similar value standards develop, but the ultimate interpretations have a personal self referent and are therefore an individual accomplishment. It is in a social context that one's criteria or standards are evaluated by others as socially moral or immoral.

However, it is important for the psychologist to remember that even the antithesis of socially approved or morally sanctioned behavior for any specific individual may represent a desired state when defined in terms of that individual's idiosyncratic values. The problem rests in providing an acceptable alternative to his standards by providing beneficial social experiences that will enable cognitive modification to occur.

A person learns, as part of his social adaptability, that his values are to be applied in a discriminating and flexible manner, and must learn
that some of his values may not be realistically applied in every situation encountered.

In general, values and their accompanying attitudes develop from interactions with the possessor's environment and his cognitive affective processing of the influences to which he has been subjected, and to which he has selectively attended. But, environmental effects are pervasive to the extent that with increasing age, people in same environmental contexts tend to develop attitudes and points of view in conformity with those persons in the environment who share similar roles.

People need experience in the process of decision making to enable them to make valid decisions concerning their self concepts. Much of this experience can be gained through social interactions in which the individual is able to react to others' evaluation of his identity postulates. With increasing social evaluation he is able to gain refinement of his own developing standards, and in doing so becomes very discriminating of criteria for evaluating self by relying less on externally conditioned standards. With approaching maturity through the application of values the individual relates self to the development of individual conscience. An individual requires social participation in forms of roles to test the adequacy of his judgments and self standards. He also needs to be made aware of his limitations, and requires social support to implement his decisions. It is through social experience that
development of social and self responsibility can occur and is related to the assumption and adoption of social roles.

**Responsibility: a function of self process**

The attainment of responsibility is an important developmental task mutually beneficial to the individual and to his society. Responsibility is not an unidimensional concept.

Interior responsibility involves accepting a dependence upon oneself for being consistent with self concepts. It emerges from manipulation and competence drives. This type of responsibility relates to maintenance of self-dependence or is manifested as self caretaker.

Exterior responsibility involves a sense of relatedness to others and a reliability or an accountability to others. This form of responsibility may be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, that is, either self initiated and reinforced, or externally initiated and reinforced. Intrinsically motivated, it represents the identity assemblage or the developing self concepts through behavior styles or modes of conduct determined by either needs or by the value system, and is manifested in role taking behavior. The intrinsically motivated person can be said to be "self actualizing" or "self fulfilling" of self expectations.

Exterior motivated responsibility for others may be a behavior style that results in aggrandizement and is manifested in role playing. It relates to fulfilling others' expectations for the individual and if the
expectations are not those that relate to his identities then an individual plays a role in keeping with social or others' demands of him.

The individual's perception of his functional effectiveness must be cognitively-affectively assessed. For an individual to perceive himself as responsible, he must achieve a relative degree of autonomy, as represented by a belief that he is independent and separated from others' control of his actions and behavior. He perceives himself as the initiator of his actions. However, autonomy is a relative condition and must be individually defined. Some persons appear to be independently capable of performing and coping with tasks. They appear to possess autonomy in a behavioral sense, but upon investigation are performing demand or prescribed tasks and do not have freedom of choice as to how they would react. Others appear to be autonomous but are responding because of inner drives, or through a compulsion. Some are limited or bound to a subculture from which they lack broader cultural experiences to conceive alternatives for their actions. Their subcultures can be constractive to experiential possibilities and tend to confine role choices thereby limiting the variety of conditions available for testing identities and the development of self-other responsibility.

Responsibility is a requisite of civilization. As responsibility declines, individuals become more "selfish" or self-centered, less self dependent, and less willing to be held accountable for their own actions to themselves and to others. Thus lack of responsibility eventually
becomes both a social as well as a personal disorder. Opportunities should be made available to the individual, enabling him to exhibit and accept responsibility for his actions and for his behavior to others by permitting him to manifest his identities in appropriate roles in keeping with his needs and value system.

Roles: products of the self process:

Three postulates of role behavior proposed by the present writer are:

A role can be a concrete manifestation and implementation of an hypothesized identity presenting an observable product of the self process; or,

A role can be an observable behavior representing the performance by the individual of prescribed, demand behaviors as determined by the situational context; or

A role can be an autistically constructed mental behavior, positing and implementing an identity, representing an unobservable product of the self process.

From these three postulates the underlying assumption is that roles are a behavior. Roles, as behavior, may be overt or covert in performance. For the remainder of this section the discussion of roles will center on the relatedness of roles to the developing self process and not
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For a discussion of roles in this chapter, roles will be confined to a general statement. Particular aspects of roles as differentially related to self concepts will be presented in Chapter III.
on the different dimensions or variables hypothesized as relating to
type of roles assumed by an individual in manifesting or exemplifying
his self concepts.

Role behaviors consist of those behaviors perceived as appropriate
to situational demands as applied to the individual and those demands
imposed on the situation by the individual's self system and may
represent the behavioral outcomes directed by the organism's impulsion
to achieve certain "end" states.

Roles stem from cognitive processes and develop in correlated
parallel with the identity assemblage; both roles and identities are
dependent upon cognitive development for their construction. Role
behavior is in the cognitive domain because it is selective and
internally organized by cognitive relational schema. Thus, roles are
not a reflection or reproduction of an association of events from the
social world into the individual's response patterns but are organized
and interpreted representations that provide meaning of the world from
the organism's ability to place himself into its contexts. Roles help
provide location, and definition of the organism in relation to the world
around him. To be of importance to the development of self, the roles
a person takes bear a functional relationship to his needs, his behavior
styles attributes and to his system of values. As previously stated,
these three factors become interdependent and reverse in order as to
origin of organismic behavior with maturity of self development.
Succinctly stated, a role may be a self manifestation and can provide an individual with the means of placing his self system and its specific concepts to tests of reality. (Prior to this testing period many identities were posited or assumed by the organism through effects of modeling others, hearsay, and other vicarious methods without the necessity of directly experiencing and performing an action to conceptualize "self" in the social world).

Roles are performed in given situations. As such, they can substantiate and elaborate value criteria by providing a reality basis for ideas of self reference and autistic self thoughts. Some roles are appropriate for specific contexts. Knowledge of role performance appropriateness is part of the learning process. This type of knowledge results in the ability to select identities for manifestation in specific contexts, and not in others, and for the eventual ability to combine identities for adaptability of self to situational demands. By doing this, the individual can test an hypothesized identity while also taking an substantiated identity during role enactments (e.g., if a person hypothesizes an identity of a creative or artistic person, he may also have an identity concept of a leader, and can take, for example, the role of a scout leader through which he can lead and direct the troop while teaching and developing crafts within the troop meetings).

The more general or pervasive an identity (e.g. gender identity) the greater its manifestation in situations and roles, and the more
interrelational its position becomes in the identity assemblage.

Substantiation by others of an identity places it into the assemblage; further resubstantiation in different contexts, increases its stability in the assemblage and provides flexibility to it by providing interrelatedness of that identity with other identities. This relational quality of identities provides enhanced self concepts and increases discrimination of self from others. In other words, identities can be networked or recombined to provide many meanings and self interpretations of the developing individual. However, with the interrelations of identities when an important identity is prevented manifestation (in a role) or denied its conceptual "existence" (e.g. a worker who is fired) the amount of cognitive dissonance and self disorientation (loss of structuring to the assemblage) would be a direct result of the prevasiveness of that identity within the assemblage. Maximum disorientation occurs when that identity was interrelated with the major part of the assemblage and no longer can be cognized as an identity concept. Although resubstantiation of identities through roles creates flexibility and stability to the assemblage and allows for self continuity amid change,

\[15\] This statement is postulating that a structure is greater than the sum of its contents, by the combinations and permutations that develop within the contents of the structure. This is a case in which the organism has created a relatively stable structuring of "self" and can project this as a constant, stable self "construct", even though the identity concepts and roles are variable in contexts. Some psychologists have referred to the individual as possessing an 'essence' which is more than the identities he has formulated.
it may also create a tendency to rigidify the assemblage if new identities are not occasionally conceptualized and potentiated in roles.

Since values provide a criteria and standards for modes of conduct and are basic to self, if available roles are appropriate to situational demands but incongruent to an individual's values the roles will tend to promote cognitive conflict if they are "demand" roles.

With maturity, restriction in the choices or role adoptions also occurs by role availability and sanctions in society, individual physical condition, as well as individual values. Even though an individual may recognize alternatives for satisfying self needs, his values prohibit the adoption of roles at variance with the outcomes directed by his values. Thus, values are molders of an identity assemblage of identities and help to maintain self stability.

It is during the cognitive operational period in which hypothesis formulations and alternative decision makings is possible, but some individuals develop limited conceptualizations because their cognitive styles preclude the ability to seek alternatives. As a result, they persist in a role performance that was originally manifested to test identity concepts even though the role behavior is inadequate and unsatisfying for present self needs. These individuals are unable to satisfactorily posit alternative roles to achieve self concept substantiation. They continue to derive negative feedback and modify their identity concepts with negative affect, instilling a negative self attitude.
Confusion over role definition and role differentiation can create anxiety. Transitional anxiety is characterized by an individual in periods of change during which he moves from an accustomed state to one in which a state of equilibrium of adjustability and adaptability is sought. The individual must cognitively define roles through which he can manifest concepts of self in keeping with new situational demands and his own development.

In many situations, a person may perform a role that is different from the role as he interprets it. At times, he also resorts to playing one role while attempting to take another. If he does not encounter reality resistance too often he can adjust to the discrepancy. However, if reality proves too demanding he may retreat into daydreams to provide a meaningful role that is self satisfying and self directed. If fantasy roles gain for the individual greater satisfaction than reality can offer, the individual may resort increasingly to daydreams as he withdraws from social participative roles. A psychotic shift results by which the individual's fantasy roles become the roles he continuously takes in real life.

However, roles may be forced upon an individual and if he perceives them as essential to his self concepts he will take them, otherwise, he plays the role expected of him. Factors influential in role taking include level of cognitive operations and cognitions developed,
personal attributes and abilities, and relationship with significant others who are perceived as representatives of a desired state.

A social role can be a manifestation of an identity that is bound to the social context in which it is exercised. The individual encounters difficulty if he perceives his behavior as appropriate, when it is at variance with social expectations. It is during the development of his identity concepts that the individual assumes certain behavior styles which characterize him and provide an observer with the opportunity of seeing how that individual approaches or handles roles to implement his identities.

The value system of each individual sets the criteria for self evaluation and creates the style of behavior manifested in social interchanges. Behavior styles develop over time as an integrated whole pattern of responses. These integrated responses become stabilized and reflect the stability of the assemblage. They are also the means the individual has to be effective in assuming his own directionality and purposive existence.

In order for a student of social and behavioral science to understand behavior it is less important to determine a normative distribution of attitudes and values than it is to learn about the effects an individual's

---

16 For instance, the literature related to "needs" provided by McClelland (1961), Murray (1938), Edwards (1954), or Atkinson (1958) pertain to styles of behavior.
values and attitudes have upon his concepts of self and upon his adaptation and adjustment to his environment. This can be accomplished by studying the effects of contents of the self process (re: identities) and the products (identity concepts manifested in roles) of the self in situational contexts.

Restatement of assumptions:

In summary, self is a process that develops over time. With maturation, learning and expectancies based on processed experiences, the organism is assumed to be a cognitively self forming entity capable of perceiving, processing and interpreting information against the criteria presented by developing values.

The organism, because it possesses cognitive ability, is capable of selective processing of stimuli and events. A discrepancy is formed between coded (processed) stored schema relating to self and to stimulus inputs from the environment which direct and activate the individual to role performances (overt and covert). This activation is a self reinforcing, self motivating and self regulating organismic response. Inputs are susceptible to subjective interpretations because they are processed cognitively and modified due to attached affect. The rules for decision making against which information is processed are value based. Values are the criteria and standards for modes of action or conduct and desired end states. These modes of action are
performed in roles and they implement self concepts by satisfaction of such second order needs as achievement, affiliation, nurturance, etc.

The end states of existence represent the maximal potentiation of the organism by fulfilling terminal values of the self process.

The broad assumption presented states that what has been called the self is a cognitive-affective process of concept formations that eventuates in a series of beliefs and attitudes about the organism as self. If attitudes are organized beliefs predisposing one to respond in a preferential manner, then this subsumes the statement that certain stimuli developmentally become discriminated and cognitively evaluated as good, bad, pleasant, desirable, acceptable, undesirable, etc. Since values are assumed to be standards or criteria for modes of conduct or desired end states of existence, it is postulated that people develop attitudes and beliefs about objects and situations as the means of guiding and focusing actions for defining and judging self and others. It follows, then, a series of attitudes and beliefs and modes of conduct relating to self are part of the value system of the person.

Therefore, the operation of the self process is a cognitive affective process which provides the knowing, feeling, beliefs, criteria setting system of, and for, the self by establishing standards for an identity assemblage. The identity assemblage is a stable-flexible structuring of the concepts formed during the self process. The contents of self (identity concepts) are producers of roles allowing the organism
to implement the assemblage of identity concepts by substantiating and redefining the contents through role behavior. Thus, the self process is a continuous, flexible process which over time tends to create greater stability of self meanings for the individual through its contents and products as defined by its identities and roles.
Chapter III

ROLE BEHAVIOR: ITS THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS
FOR SELF AS PROCESS

It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss role as a multi-dimensional concept, differentially dependent upon self contents, evolving from cognitive and motivational factors.

The assumption previously postulated states that roles are exemplifications of the self process, that they are self concepts (identity derivations of cognitive activity) manifested in role behaviors. From that assumption three qualifying postulates were presented. These postulates are:

(1) A role can be a concrete manifestation of a hypothesized identity or set of identities presenting an observable product of the self process.

(2) A role can be an observable behavior representing the performance by the individual of prescribed, demanded or expected behaviors he perceives as determined by the situational contexts.
A role can be an autistically constructed mental behavior, positing and implementing an identity or set of identities, representing an unobservable product of the self process.

These three postulates will be further defined and conditional variables will be presented as relating or contributing to the quality of role behavior.\(^1\)

It is not the purpose of this chapter to critically analyze role literature. Rather, it's purpose is to focus attention upon those dimensions that appear to be relevant and have not been identified by others as necessary conditions for roles. The use of role concept has evolved primarily from sociological theory.\(^2\) Role usually has been equated with a social-interaction function resulting in expectancies of behavior determined by positional relationships. People are assumed to behave in accordance with a preordained set of responses. These

---

\(^1\)For clarification of the present discussion, it is important to define the terms that will be used in the development of corollary statement. These terms, self and identity(ies) concepts, reflexive, motivation and locus of control, and reality are defined in Appendix B.

\(^2\)Sarbin (1968), Biddle and Thomas (1966) have presented surveys of role literature. The present writer has included a critique (Appendix A) of the sociological nature of role theory and research and has indicated the problem the sociological approach presents to the psychologist endeavoring to view role as an exemplification of self-identies.
response patterns are postulated as learned through the socialization efforts of others in compatible and interactive positional or status arrangements. While it is generally accepted that positions have an effect on the participants of a role, the variations of behavior manifested and the motivations for role enactment expressed by the participants are not based on an unidimensional sociological factor. The study of role involves more than a knowledge that certain socially expected behaviors are prescribed, or that each person is required to perform in accordance with the socially appropriate response patterns. There is a need to stress that individuals are involved in these behaviors and psychologists look at overt behavior not as an end-in-itself but as a valid way of predicting behavior by studying performance, motives, concept formation or other aspects of many dynamic processes occurring within individuals.

For example, birth order research is not a psychological role study of what the first child is expected to do in comparison to the last child or to his parents, but a psychologist studies the factors of how and why an individual reacts to the awareness of himself in relation to others and what factors qualitatively and quantitatively change his behavior. Hierarchy or position may or may not be an influential factor. In other words, the locus of role for the psychologist changes from the sociological expectation of set behavioral criteria to factors that
determine how participants perceive, interpret, and derive meaning from situational contexts.

Expectations and interpretations have psychological importance since these functions are developed through the cognitive-affective processing of experiential data. The way an individual behaves in a role and the meaning he is able to derive from situational demands would be highly dependent upon his level of cognitive development. Since each person has certain needs and desires relating to his self structure, his attempts at satisfying these conditions are assumed to be idiosyncratic. An individual perceives others in a variety of ways, depending upon the situational cues he is able to assimilate, and how he relates this information to his prior cognitions. The individual interrelates himself to others according to the way he has been able to structure meaning to the perceived context. As a point of illustration, some people can be affectionate to their spouse in the company of close friends but are business-like in a work environment. Is this behavior only the result of socially determined criteria, or has the behavior been determined by the individuals' interpretation of the socially expected behavior modified by their own wants and self demands? Others in the same context act differently. Are discrepant patterns of social behavior solely a function of lack of understanding of role expectations or are there other factors involved that are primary to role behavior? Would
concepts a person develops about himself, the way he perceives and interprets himself, be important in determining the type of behavioral patterns he manifests? Would he seek to selectively "be involved" in certain situations or emit certain behaviors to satisfy or fulfill certain self standards he has developed? Perhaps the fact that an individual has participated in a particular role and not in another is indicative of self process? The psychologist should study the factors that condition or modify behavioral manifestations and until those factors inducing an individual to social interaction are controlled, no understanding of role behavior can be achieved.

General factors in role behavior:

The following derivations will briefly state implicit conditions relating to role behaviors as the bases of developing roles as exemplification of the self process.

Roles have been postulated as emanating from the self process. Role is a performance initiated by the individual, originating from cognitive operational processes that enable him to formulate, test, confirm, negate, modify and validate conceptions attempting to gain meaning of his own entity. These conceptions are the ideas of self reference that define and locate him with respect to others and are the means by which he can evaluate himself according to criteria he has established.
Roles have also been postulated as a function of self-other context. Others have importance in many ways to the developing self structure. It is with others that the child can form his primary cognitively perceived homogeneous classification relationships as he identifies with significant others in his environment. It is from the actions of others that he learns what is expected of him; he learns the expectations, rules and proscriptions of his society. He is an active participant in the social learning process. It is through others that he sees, hears, learns and can fantasy roles that are condoned, encouraged, prohibited and future anticipated. It is through others' reaction to his performances that he gains feedback and can appraise concepts of self he has hypothesized or fantasied. Others provide a realistic basis to his value system and modify his conceptualizations, permitting decentrism to balance out egocentric thought constructions.

Roles are a function of motivation. Motivation for performance in roles can be externally or internally reinforced. Modifications of behavior or conduct is related to the source of the motivation. Source of motivation or the locus of control of behavior is a psychological phenomena based entirely on the conceptions of an individual. If he

---

3 For a definitive statement of self, and self concepts, see Appendix B.

4 For a discussion of motivation as used in the present theory, see Appendix B.
believes he is the one in control of what is happening to him, then he evaluates his conduct in terms of criteria he has established for his conduct. If he believes no matter what he thinks he should do, the outcomes or behavior is determined by others than himself, then, psychologically, he is not responsible for behavioral results. He feels the locus of control is extrinsic to him. He behaves in accordance to a schedule of reinforcement and to the external criteria for evaluating his behavior. This factor becomes a determinant for responsibility.

Roles are a function of reality when others are involved in the interaction. When a role is an inner constructed "realism" not consensually validated as to perceptual givens of expectations and requirements, then it is a non-reality based performance. Roles that are non-reality based are manufactured in fantasy, imagination, and pretense play. This quality of role involves the positing of possible, although at times, improbable enactments of concepts of self. In fantasy, a child can conceive of himself as being anything he wants to be without the restrictions of reality intervening.

---

5 Rotter's (1954) work has importance in describing this psychological dimension.

6 For a definitive statement of reality as used in this dissertation, see Appendix B.

7 Eli Ginzberg (1951) discusses the levels of vocational decision making as developmentally progressing from fantasy, to tentative, to realistic levels of choice.
the individual with feedback to evaluate his concepts in terms of others' expectations and their confirmation of his mental constructions.

With these four conditions in mind, it is proposed that roles are differentially related to self, others, motivation and the locus of control of behavior, and reality. At this point in the present dissertation it is relevant to apply these conditional factors to the three postulates of role behavior. Each postulate will be discussed separately and summary statements will present each postulate with its corollaries.

To summarize, within the concept of role as manifestations of self process, there are qualities of role behavior that must be distinguished. These role qualities are differentially related to identities, reality, motivation, perceptions of situational and contextual demands expected by others, and the cognitive operational level of maturity the individual has attained that qualitatively and quantitatively affect the processing of inputs resulting from direct and vicarious experiences. Events and situational cues are selectively perceived by individuals and are processed and interpreted as expectations affording the opportunity for role assumptions.

**Role behavior: its qualitative conditions**

The earliest role performance is role figmentizing. Role figmentizing behavior originates from those identities (or primary
conceptualizations) lacking a reality base. The identities are either exemplified in fantasy, daydreams, imagination or from an egocentric view, and occur in psychotic shifts, psychosis or autism. The manifested behavior may be appropriate or inappropriate to the situational or environmental demands, but the important point is that these external demands are nonperceived or unattended by the individual. The behavior emanates from a subjectively construed "reality". Identities are intrinsically initiated by self demands, and not by external expectations. Motivation is intrinsic and results in self reinforcement by self satisfaction or self dissatisfaction or rejection (denegation or abasement) through the process of evaluating the identity concept in the figmented role by the standards developed in the individual's value system. Role figmentizing is not externally motivated by extrinsic reinforcement or punishment because the external reality as accepted by consensus opinion or mutual consent is not a part of the role figmenter's selected perceptions. What others demand or reinforce does not determine how he perceives his role. Thus, role figmentizing is non-reality based, intrinsically motivated identity "trying" or testing, and is directly related to the self system demands.

---

8 Psychotic shift, as used by present writer, is assumed to be a "created" description of a psychological phenomenon. If others have previously used the phrase, apologies are offered for its present usage. Psychotic shift is defined as a progressive preference for reality detachment that occurs when an individual becomes increasingly dependent upon non-reality bases for his cognitive constructions of self, which become exemplified in fantasied roles.
Because role figmentizing behavior is not social interactional, it is considered as non-reflexive.\(^9\) Role figment behavior develops throughout the life span of the individual, enabling him to posit and hypothesize both identities and situations in which external criteria do not alter his standards for self evaluation.

Many writers describe "play roles" situations as rehearsal roles. These roles are herein described as imitative or social learning roles practiced by repeating prior learned behaviors (learned both vicariously and directly). However, some individuals use pretense behaviors to reconstruct the behaviors of another but such role behavior is not based on decentrism nor on the understanding of attitudes, values and expectations from others' standpoint (Turner, 1956). Instead the role behavior is based on an individual's construction of what he regards as the attributes of the role in terms of his own mental constructions, regardless of the reality of the context in which he is placed. Therefore, figmentized roles are not reality based. They are a function of self representations or identity concepts an individual constructs of himself at that moment.

An exclusive or prevalent use of role figmentation results in detachment from reality denoting a psychotic shift from a mutually perceived and interpreted reality to a subjectively defined inner

\(^9\) For a discussion of reflexiveness as used in this dissertation, see Appendix B.
constructed world. It is to be noted that an infant has often been described as autistic—reacting to a subjectively construed world because of his cognitive inability to perceive and interpret from a decentric view. The infant, developmentally, must first build his concepts of self from his own actions (Piaget, 1950) as he constructs cognitive schemata. This cognitive activity results in an egocentric perception.

With the development of cognitive operations, allied role processes occur. These are role taking and role playing. Role taking is the result of cognitive-affective constructions and interpretations of self as applied to an environmental context. Identities are subjected to the reality of contexts as determined by perceived situations or environmental agents' demands. Role behavior or role performance may be either appropriate or inappropriate to perceptions and expectations of the observer(s), because role taking is directly a function of both the self system demands and the perceptions and expectations of external requirements.

Role taking behavior is self-reflexive. It is intrinsically derived from the self system through hypothesized identity concepts and is evaluated by the values being developed by the individual. As a result of role taking behavior, identity concepts become modified by feedback from the environment and from an individual's evaluation of his own behavior. Behavior is intrinsically motivated, initiated by self demands and is reinforced by self satisfaction, or self abasement or denigration.
The feedback gained by testing an hypothesized identity or set of identity concepts in a role taking performance is a necessary condition for role taking. Feedback results in modification of cognitive structures by attaching affect, and is reflected in the self system's evaluation of an identity in action. To summarize, role taking is reality based, intrinsically motivated and originates from self process by cognitive-affective processing of interactions and standards for self evaluation. The locus of control of role taking behavior is located within the individual. Role taking eventually modifies the "all things are possible for the self" attitude, and by the intervention of reality into cognitive constructions, an individual learns to determine the probability that some self conceptualizations are more likely as self definitions or are more probable of acceptance and substantiation than are others.

As role taking develops another form of role performance occurs. This form of role behavior may be called role playing and is also a function of cognitive development. Feedback from enactment in the form of affect is not directly related to self concepts because concepts of self are not included in the role playing performance. Anti-identities, those identities one does not conceptualize of himself at that moment in that context, or those concepts not attributed to him by his own interpretations, are the ones he overtly performs. Role playing is reality based on situational or environmental demands. These contextual
demands are in the forms of required, ascribed or prescribed expectations as determined by external criteria. The external demands of the social act are not related to an individual's self system demands of his own needs. Role playing is extrinsically motivated and evaluated, but the results of the evaluation do not affect the person's identity structure. However, with maturity and stability of self meaning, the individual's value system precludes his participation in certain roles. To summarize, role playing is reality based, developed from anti-identities rather than from identities an individual has conceptualized of himself in a given context, and is extrinsically motivated through external reinforcements.

The loci of control for an individual's behavior are external to himself. The reinforcement of his behavior is by sanctions, proscriptions and demands of role expectations imposed by the social context. Role playing is non-reflexive to self concepts, but knowledge of results of performance are cognitively encoded. In this manner cognitive dissonance may alter a previous cognition and change conceptions of self to include interpretations of an anti-identity or parts of it. In this situation, the individual assumes role taking behavior and

10 Knowledge of results (KR) has been studied by Edwin Locke (1967, 1966) and others. Self reflexiveness does not always follow from knowledge of results. Unless a self standard has been established KR is not a sufficient motivator for evaluation of self, although cognition of performance are considered as input data.
attempts to substantiate the new identity concept. This will occur when affect having been encoded, has modified previous cognitions with the result that new interpretations or meanings of self may be conceptualized.

The three forms of role behavior having been explicated in the foregoing discussion as discrete, the further point should be made that an individual's role behavior at any point in time may represent any one of the three role forms or it may represent a combination of them.

To the observer, the behavior may be indistinguishable except by his perception of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the role response. However, a given role performance may be assumed to have reference to the self process if it can be posited as the outcome of self-evaluation together with a cognitive-affective structuring of stimulus inputs as relevant to the individual's self-percepts.

The following example is an illustration of role interchangeability. Role playing is the manifestation of anti-identities. When an individual receives external reinforcement for these anti-identities, he assimilates into his cognitive structures the results of his actions. In evaluating his performance, if he can relate parts of the anti-identity by cognitively integrating aspects of the anti-identity to differentiate new concepts in terms of his self needs and values, he is able to formulate new identities. These new identity concepts can be role taken when the context permits their manifestation. Since role playing
a part involves cognition, producing behavior at variance with an individual's self percepts, it follows that cognitive dissonance or cognitive strain (Sarbin, 1968) will often ensue. In the event dissonance does occur it may be eliminated or reduced by abstracting, accepting or reorganizing an anti-identity as a possible self-representation. However, when this has occurred, the individual is no longer role playing but is role taking.

An individual also can deny relationship to the anti-identity by evaluating external demands and reinforcements. If expectations are not in keeping with a person's value system, the anti-identity is discarded as a possible self hypothesis and may continue to be performed as role playing behavior fulfilling the criteria of external contexts. The individual disregards or discounts the environmental reinforcements of his performance as non-consequential to his conceptions of self. However, with the development and elaboration of his value system some role playing behaviors at variance with his standards for modes of conduct will be rejected and he will either withdraw altogether from the context demanding the role or will impose his self criteria on the context by role taking, thus representing himself as he cognitively-affectively perceives himself.

---

Sarbin (1968) uses the word cognitive strain to discuss the effects that behaviorally may be manifested as a result of mental accommodation of data. He feels Festinger's (1957) dissonance connotes a "sour grapes, sweet lemons" impression of attempts at assimilating and accommodating discrepant or new data into prior structures.
Constant external reinforcement can affect the structuring in the identity assemblage. If an identity concept held by the individual is given positive reinforcement (substantiation each time it is manifested) it is elevated in importance within the assemblage and becomes interrelated with other identity concepts and roles. The change in salient position of an identity occurs as an attempt is made by the individual to alleviate cognitive discrepancy created by the way he perceives the importance of that identity in relation to his values and needs and how others perceive the value of his behavior. Many of the positional changes in the assemblage occur in periods of transition during which certain role performances expressing concepts of self are no longer acceptable to others nor to the individual's needs or values.

Prior to a statement of corollaries of role behavior, it is necessary to emphasize several points basic to the study of role behavior. First, it is crucial to posit identities as cognitive constructions, and hence, the possession of identities and assemblage of identities on the part of the human self-perceiving organism. Second, a self-perceiving organism's state of cognitive developmental maturity is central for an understanding of the interpretations the individual places of the demands placed upon it. Third, the assumption of the observer that the self-perceiving human organism is capable of understanding a consensus perception of reality (decentrism). And finally, the importance of quality of the mental processes that the self-perceiving individual
has at his disposal for restructuring cognitions by inputs and feedback from its experiences. It is to be noted that the present dissertation refers to affect as the feedback that modifies or qualifies prior experiences and also refers to a value system that developmentally progresses in its complexity and applicability as it creates standards, rules, or criteria for modes of behavior and end states of existence. These criteria or standards when applied to the self become useful for evaluating self concepts and for determining behavior styles manifested by the individual in his strivings or directionality.

A schematization of the necessary but not independently sufficient conditions for role behavior is presented in Table 1.
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Behavior</th>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Reality</th>
<th>Identity Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Taking</td>
<td>Yes-Interactive Self-Other-Self</td>
<td>Intrinsic locus of control-Self</td>
<td>Yes-Consensus, mutually perceived</td>
<td>Self concepts-identity concepts manifested in contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Figmentizing</td>
<td>No-Not Interactive</td>
<td>Intrinsic; locus of control-Self</td>
<td>Non-reality, subjectively perceived</td>
<td>Self concepts-identities not in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>Interactive but non-reflexive to self structure--Related to performance</td>
<td>Extrinsic; locus of control--Others</td>
<td>Yes-Consensus--Mutually perceived</td>
<td>Anti-identities, contextual derivations of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Taking</td>
<td>Yes-Interactive Self-Other-Self</td>
<td>Intrinsic locus of control-Self</td>
<td>Yes-Consensus, mutually perceived</td>
<td>Self concepts-Identity concepts manifested in contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Although each condition is necessary, no one condition is sufficient in itself to create a specific quality of role behavior. However as conditional factors change, the quality of role behavior changes to the next form either directly above or below it in the chart. The two more primary factors are identity base, conditioned by reality. Interdependent with identity base is motivation--locus of control and interdependent with reality is reflexiveness. These two modifiers of the primary factors qualify role behavior. Since identity concepts and perception of reality emanate from cognitive process, the latter is fundamental to this theory. (For additional comments relating to the Conditions for Role Behavior, see Appendix A, pages 139-196.)
The following statements are formulated with the conditions of role behavior as stated in Table 1 as corollaries for the three postulates of role behavior.

A. A role can be a concrete manifestation of an hypothesized identity or set of identities presenting an observable product of the self process.

1. A role taking behavior is intrinsically motivated with locus of control of behavior assumed to reside within an individual.

2a. A role taking behavior is reality based and the results of the manifestations of behavior is processed as feedback and is reflexive to the self assemblage.

2b. A role taking behavior is reflexive, and is related to both self demands and to demands of the situational context.

3. Role taking behavior can change into other qualities of role behavior if certain conditional factors, as differentially related to self, motivation, reality and reflexiveness, change their direction.
B. A role can be an observable behavior representing performance by the individual of prescribed, demanded and expected behaviors as determined by situational contexts.

1a. A role playing behavior is extrinsically motivated with the locus of control of behavior assumed to reside in others.

1b. A role playing behavior is the manifestation of those aspects of performance demanded by others as appropriate for the context.

2a. A role playing behavior is a manifestation of anti-identities not derived from cognitively organized concepts of self.

2b. Anti-Identities are cognized as demanded behavioral enactments, for functional effectiveness, satisfying perceived external demands.

3. Role playing behavior is reality based, interactional but not reflexive to self structures. The results of the manifestations of behavior are evaluated as performance criteria and not as evaluation of hypothesized identity concepts.
4. A role playing behavior can change into other qualities of role behavior if certain conditional factors change, that is, if self, motivation, locus of control, reality or reflexiveness change their directions.

C. A role behavior can be an autistically constructed mental behavior, positing and implementing an identity or set of identities, representing an unobservable product of the self process.

1. A role figmentizing behavior is a mental construction of an identity concept or set of identities, intrinsically motivated with locus of control of behavior assumed to reside within the individual.

2a. A role figmentizing behavior is non-reality based and external feedback is inconsequential as others are not cognized as basic for substantiation of cognitive self constructions.

2b. A role figmentizing behavior is non-reflexive to self structure, by its lack of social interaction.
3. A role figmentizing behavior can change to other qualities of role behaviors if certain conditional factors become differentially related to self, motivation, locus of control, reality or reflexivity.
Chapter IV

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF STUDY OF SELF
AND ROLE BEHAVIOR

Rationale and purpose:

It is the purpose of the present study to explore the process of self development as determined by identities and their manifestation in role behaviors.

In-depth interviews with a group of male adults is the method used to provide necessary data relevant to the proposed theory. Since the theory is a preliminary statement, it is assumed that semi-structured interviews would provide

a) evidence to support or lend credibility to the assumptions upon which the theory is based.

b) additional evidence to elaborate the primary postulates.

c) suggestions for variables important to the process of self development.

d) suggestions for alternative postulates for self theory, that is, negate, refute or cast doubt on
some of the proposed assumptions of self in roles.

The semi-structured interview format is a composite of the following approaches:¹ (1) Adlerian historical data gathering technique; (2) Wohlberg's (1954) technique for case study; (3) a modification of White's (1952) method of interview and Kenniston's (1968) co-researcher technique; (4) a modified autobiography as proposed by Thomas and Znaniecki (1918); and (5) specific "lead" items relating to self concepts, behavior, roles, values, goals and interpersonal relationships that are pertinent to the objectives of this study.

The data presented in this study are provided by selecting incidents for illustration. The interviews were held for a maximum of two hours each sitting, extending for a maximum of three sessions, spaced approximately a week to ten days apart. The interviews were held in private at the convenience of the interviewee, usually during the evenings. The conversations were tape recorded on two hour cassettes.²

¹ The combination of these methods enabled the interviewee to free associate, and respond to direct questions of events and experiences of past, present, and future conditions. The respondee's comments were focused on both reality probabilities and on non-reality possibility bases.

² The interview tapes will be deposited with the Department of Psychology. Transcripts are not included in the Appendix section of this dissertation since the subjects were assured that the interviews were confidential and would not be made available.
It is important to note, that cooperation for involvement in this project was a prime requisite. No compensation was offered. Only those adults who were willing, were non-threatened by the prospects of personal disclosure, and were intrigued by participating in a study of themselves were interviewed.

The implications conveyed to the participants was that they were 1) co-researchers (as Kenniston suggests) and 2) experimental subjects (as White contends) and by relating their thoughts and behaviors in perspective to their interpretations of context and self, they would provide substantiation, refutation or suggest alternative hypotheses for an empirical study of "self".

To summarize, this research design is of heuristic value in that it intends to provide data from which inductive and deductive inferences can be made relating to both self process and role behaviors.

Limitations of the study:

Those familiar with the methods of research in behavioral science will recognize that this study will fail to meet certain objective criteria for data gathering. This design precludes the availability of ordinary controls, setting dependent and independent variables, and elimination of subjective biases.

A premise underlying the selection of this research design is that typical research methods, though quantitatable and statistically
valuable, would not enable the objective of the study to be achieved.

A goal of scientific method is to define and differentiate the casual from the causal, and to prevent the constriction of interpretation of results by objective reporting of data by separating results from conclusions and implications that are inferred. This method of reporting enables others to replicate the design, reinterpret the original data and accept or refute the conclusions drawn by the experimenter. These assumptions imply that prediction and control would be inherent in each design.

This study is an attempt to seek whether researchable variables do exist, and as such, is a priori to defining the variables and controls for their realistic contributions as dimensions of a theory.

It is perhaps worthwhile to mention that many research efforts begin by looking or listening before a control study is attempted. Polanyi (1958), Piaget (1958), Freud (1904), Thomas and Znaniecki (1918), Kenniston (1968), James (1890)\(^3\) and others have obviated this method as a preliminary step, as necessary for understanding what it is that can be researched, or what is happening before a statement of why or if-then

---

\(^3\)James in 1890 said, "Self...seems to be basic for all human beings, and it is strange for a science so to construe its domain of interest that fundamental and universal observations are ruled out of bounds...Moreover it is a realm of observation with which we are concerned in considering the problems of self."
is made. Even in the most rigorously controlled experimental conditions, a subjective element is present in the collection, description, design and interpretation of data. Rosenthal (1966) documents the effects of experimenter bias infiltrating the experimental condition, as unknowingly contributed by the experimenter. It is hoped that the awareness of the subjective involvement of this researcher in the selection of incidents, will be retained, but that data will lead others to draw their own interpretations thereby stimulating scientific curiosity in the study of self and roles. It is assumed that this technique will permit deductions to be made of the data for empirical definitions and will provide statements to the proposed theoretical position.

Subject sample:

The sample consisted of nine adult males, ranging in age from 25 to 39 years of age. All of the sample were white. They were, with the exception of one, all advanced in formal educational training in either professional or academic careers. One sample member, kept as a "ballast" member for the sample, had not completed senior high school
(a drop-out in the tenth grade). He eventually attained a high school equivalency diploma while in the service.⁴

To summarize personal and family histories would create a false, mythical average male which would not be a description of this group. This group does not attempt to be representative of any population nor will it be used for bases of statistical analyses. Averaging of frequencies of responses would serve little purpose and would create an illusion of homogeneity of variance.

These participants were willing, capable, and interested individuals. They were as different in their background experiences as any eclectic group of humans, yet they were assumed to possess similarities. The search for similarities are the foci of efforts of the present study. It is hoped that revelations about concepts of self, role participations, and the self meanings and definitions personally constructed will both induce and deduce postulations of dimensions or

---

⁴The sample member referred to, was an original interviewee who volunteered for participation. He became a vital subject in that his self structuring of personal meaning based on concepts of self was of interest, even though his educational and social experiences were dramatically different.

The selection of an "older" group of young adults was a subjective preference. The writer has, within the last few years, interviewed and studied responses to open-ended statements of many hundreds of youth from ages 16 to 30 years of age. The writer found that people in transition states between, or in anticipation of, change in roles or in concepts of self offer the most interesting interviews. As A. Freud has stated, adolescents are difficult subjects for self analysis, a point in fact, which would be defeating to the intrinsic demands of the present methodology.
potential variables for study. The "critical statements" revealed by the respondents as "important", and other events of significance, will be summarized or presented whenever appropriate for clarification of theoretical comments. However, to maintain the confidentiality of each subject, only few statements will be presented in detailed quotes.

**Instrumentation:**

As previously stated in this chapter information gathered from the respondents was derived by an interview technique. As White contends,

> Any attempt to study other people must rely heavily on interviews. There can be no other adequate substitute for the obvious procedure of asking the subject to tell all that he can about himself and his environment. (1952, p. 93)

The format used culled information concerning family, perceived inter-relationships of family and significant others with respect to the interviewee, discipline, ideals, early memories, fantasies, school and social relationships, interests, problems, fears, attitudes and beliefs, value formations, specific events, situations and behavioral responses, aspirations and goals of present and future, anticipations of contextual or social change, perceptions of continuity or discontinuity in expectations of self, and present role status and probability of role occurrences.

A sample of the semi-structured interview format is presented in Appendix C although it is to be remembered that the structured format
is a reference tool only. The natural progression of conversation was
the impetus for the questions generated by the interviewer. The inter-
viewer was guided by item contents although pertinent items were
directly asked of participants whenever it was deemed necessary.
Chapter V

PRESENTATION OF INCIDENTS RELATING TO SELF
AND ROLE BEHAVIOR

This chapter will attempt, with reasonable brevity, to present
selected comments of some interviewees relating to the topic of self and
role behavior. In order to accomplish this purpose, the interviewees
were permitted to free associate but were somewhat structured in their
thoughts by responding to "lead" questions that acted as stimuli for
possible digressions. At times the responses were quite elaborate and
appeared tangential to the purposes of the investigation. However, the
informal nature of the interview permitted a comfortable conversational
atmosphere. Further, the interviewees were not sure what the
experimenter was "looking for" in their responses (this was mentioned
by them in their post interview discussions) and, as a result, the con-
tent of their responses as well as the quality of information they
divulged was less biased and less restrictive.

A minimum of interviewees' comments will be presented for
illustrative purposes. The responses will attempt to provide information
concerning the following:
1. the development of concepts of self as identity concepts
2. saliency or importance of substantiated identity concepts
3. continuity or discontinuity of self meaning over time
4. broader interpretations of self across situations
5. types of role behaviors evidenced
6. subjective interpretations by the respondee of factors that influence manifestations of self through roles
7. effects of values on self exemplifications
8. implications for locus of control of behavior
9. effects of awareness of reality or non-reality on identity concepts manifestation, and
10. consistency or inconsistency in behavior

The first four (1 - 4) groups above will focus on presentation of comments relating to self as process. The next six (5 - 10) groups will focus on self as manifested in role behavior.

**Development of identity concepts:**

An attempt was made to discern how subjects cognitively conceptualize self references. It was assumed by the present investigator that identity concepts could be obtained from interviews by relating perceived similarities, differences, sameness or opposite relationships
to specific others or role representatives. This was accomplished by
several methods. The first method was to ask the person to describe
someone who was most like them. Some illustrations of their
comparisons are presented.

(Name) had similar feelings to me, and same aspirations
and same positions, work,...we went all through school
together...have a shared destiny as far as what we'd like
to do...he is kind, trustworthy, honest....(later he de-
fines himself as) kind, considerate, honest, personal
integrity, trustworthy.

My wife...her belief in higher values of middle class...
honest. Her belief in the sacredness of marriage, and
the purity with which it should be upheld, and, her high
goals as far as her relations to humanity and fellow man.

Another interviewee described himself as avoiding conflict, that
his younger sister would fight (beat up his tormentors) and said, "I
never fought with anybody. I tended to compromise, avoid conflict...
also a characteristic of my mother."

The next method used asked the interviewees to describe someone
who was most different than they were. The following comments refer
to those people who were perceived as most different from the subject.

By elaborating, the interviewees perceived identity concepts they
hypothesized of themselves that were not perceived in their exemplar.

Some examples are presented.

In many ways my brother is like me but very different.
He is what I'd be like if I didn't go to college...I'm
aware of his feelings, his values and politics. He
can't see my point although I could see his...(he
describes brother, and father in a family composite statement)... But I think to a large extent I'm very opposite, like in religion... its meaningless to me and ah, this, you know, you can't say anthing about your country, you know, if you say anything wrong... He has no room for improvement.

(He continues differentiating self from father)

My father was very critical and harsh, maybe that's why in certain areas I never got any feeling of confidence. I definitely feel that, on the other hand, trying to be sincere and genuine and not put on a big show I got from him... but I tend to think differently, more logically and rationally, in terms of alternatives, for instance, politics, if they don't like him (a politician) they won't listen to him... you can't discuss things... raise voices...

You can see blood pressures rising.

Other comments referred to specific people as different. These comments were usually the most elaborated. Within the comments there is observed a referral to both similarities as well as differences of the exemplar to the interviewee. It appears by having a base for reference that comparisons are easily constructed. It will be shown in later comments that meaningful reference points for conceptualization are necessary to construct a concept. Without categorization criteria, the person will cognitively restructure and reorganize data until he can construct a concept.

Some examples of differences mentioned by subject derived from his exemplar are offered as illustrations of the thinking process involved as a person describes areas of difference between self and another individual he perceived as important.
One interviewee who does not want to be, nor perceives himself as, an authoritative person, saw his father as, "always played the role of king, the authority." Another interviewee refers to an uncle as different in some important ways that conflicted with his standards.

He is more independent than I am and probably more involved in bettering and improving his own career at what I consider to be the expense of some, what are to me, more personal relationships.

This same subject later describes two friends as both like him and different in certain respects.

They both have a very good sense of humor--sharp wit. They enjoy being together, both of them need other people and they enjoy their work, they enjoy their students--just like people--like to be around people...I'm older and a little more mature, I'm not as athletic, I'm a little bit different personality in the sense that, that I will, well, course this may be a function of age, but I am a little more stable, a little more mature.

Another respondee also referred to similarities and differences when attempting to compare himself to another person.

I'm most like Dad...I guess I am...I picked up his sense of humor. At times I'm tense, but I have this paradox, too, looseness. I have a tolerance of values...but area of humor comes closest. Strangely enough sometimes at home we tell jokes, bad puns. I was closest to Mother. She would talk out what Dad was supposed to have done. There would be scenes, we children didn't know how to react to it. Dad was somewhat at a distance...I had empathy with him, sympathy with her...set the emotional tone of my later life...atuned with hers, I'm very sensitive.
The third method used to arrive at conceptualizations pertaining
to self required the respondee to relate and describe someone they knew
who fit certain descriptive terms (or concepts). The respondees were
usually capable of describing a person typifying a given concept when
they set the standards or criteria for defining the concept. For instance,
they were asked, "Who do you know that is ________?" After
describing the concept interpreted in terms of attributes of an exemplar,
the interviewees were asked to compare themselves. In this manner,
each interviewee cognitively formulated the standards for a concept.
The interviewee stated how he perceived himself in comparison to
attributes or instances of a concept (Glaser, 1968) representing the
exemplar. This method permitted each interviewee to idio graphically
rate himself using self criteria established for polar points, i.e., I'm
like that, I'm not like that, and the extent or quality of difference each
responder perceive. This type of analysis enabled each subject to
locate himself with reference to an exemplar by constructing an anchor-
age or point of origin against which he could compare himself.

A comparison of this type enabled a breakdown of a larger concept
(e.g., idealist, moody) which is the organization of integrated
attributes that were perceived as defining a specific human stimuli
which in this case was the exemplar. The identity concepts formed by
the interviewee were assumed by the investigator, to be the result of
differentiating and reintegrating the attributes of the exemplar and reclassifying these attributes into a concept that symbolized and individuated the interviewee. In building comparisons between self and exemplar the subjects were capable of differentiating between self and exemplar, and divulged a multitude of identity concepts.

With the ability to cognitively conceptualize self references the interviewees were capable of postulating identity concepts they perceived as specific or as unique self references.

The following are excerpts of comments that attempt to describe how the interviewees constructed their concepts of self with reference to a given concept by contrasting themselves to an exemplar. The first example refers to the concept of "handsome" or "good-looking".

(Name) is probably one of the nicest looking guys I know. He's not tall and he's not real dark but he is attractively slender and yet quite athletic. . . . He doesn't wear his hair real long but medium long and it looks nice, and he's got a lot of hair which is attractive to me since that's one of my few good features . . . . However, I'm decidedly inferior to him in looks and in body formation and facial expression and probably speed and agility of movement.  

In attempting to describe "popular" this interviewee summed his interpretation of the concept by combining the attributes of a few persons to formulate his exemplar. He said:

1It was interesting to note that the interviewee as described by the investigator is approximately six feet, with dark hair, and slender build.
I guess I don't think of any particular person, I kinda think of a composite of two or three of the kids I went to school with who summed it up for me, at least what it meant to be popular...
I guess my definition of popularity is someone who is socially attractive and socially effective. I, in high school for instances, was, ah, kinda medium in both areas. I guess I felt like that at the time...It may have been a rationalization and I'm not sure it's true but I felt like at the time that probably negative prohibitions of my family kept me from being as socially attractive as I might have been if I had been freer to conform to the normal behavior of my peer group at the time. As far as social effectiveness is concerned, I was a good student and I was in the band and some of the choral groups and so fairly effective socially in a sense. Although not...well here again, medium in athletics, fair...made the first team usually in baseball but not in any other sports, and a kinda medium actually in both areas, social effectiveness and social attractiveness.

A perusal of the above comment reveals that the subject was capable of not only defining and describing self with the exemplars but in rating himself on some cognitively constructed continuum.

Other subjects were conceptualizing identities by the same method. In response to the term "idealistic" one subject said:

(____) he's a member of (Clergy). He spends lots of time in thoughts. He sets up his life in idealistic goals...I think at one time I had invested a lot of my time being idealistic. Now I'm 60 per cent skeptical and 40 per cent romantic. I see all possibilities. I spent blocks of time in romantic and idealistic thinking...At one time I entered (profession) as a means of salvation...
However, there were instances in which some of the subjects were unable to define the concepts in terms of standards of self. As a result, by not having a standard which they had previously developed, they had difficulty perceiving an exemplar for that concept. For instance, this subject was asked, "Whom do you consider to be the most masculine person you know?", he responded:

Anybody? I got to give that some serious thought in terms of my interpretations of stereotype...I don't think, oh,...particular masculine, eh,...is one who reeks of sinew and, uh, acts in tough masculine ways, that's a caricature of it. To me, masculine is in terms of responsiveness to others, ah, Tom Jones? to me, its unmasculine to be hung up on masculine...uh, people I know...They enhance...funny, I jump from one stereotype to another. I would think the ideal man...who exhibits most of traits of stereotype, independent, assertive, self sufficient to some extent, but not too much...responsive to other people's needs and wants, other people's feelings and also sensitivity and awareness...and certain aspects, gentleman. Lots come close, lots of fellows. Maybe I'm building an image of myself? Not too far, not too dissonant. I don't feel, I'm not unmasculine...Yeh, in terms of my definition, the things I value, I fit it, yeh.

To briefly summarize, these excerpts were presented to illustrate the assumption that identity concepts are formulated by the individual as cognitive constructions or representations of himself. When the investigator presented any concept to them, the subjects were able to interpret the concept in terms that related to them. They cognitively reconstructed instances or attributes observable in others that were
capable of being self references. These "instances" were reclassified by reassessment and provided a basis for an identity concept from the concept offered by the experimenter. This method was useful even when the concept was not originally perceived as applicable to self, because the interpretation of the concept permitted the interviewee to think through all the attributes that might be included within the concept. By distinguishing the attributes of the concept, the subject could then react to each attribute as a perception or representation of himself.

Specific role representatives in identity concept formation:

The subjects also were able to describe someone they perceived as outstanding. After describing that individual they were asked to compare themselves to that person. Comments were related to specific people and the role in society they (the role exemplar) represented. The role representative was described as a status or position figure in society, such as a father, professor, economist, politician, or friend. These "outstanding" persons or role representatives were usually persons who were currently important to the respondee and were perceived as someone they fantasied as similar to themselves or would "like to be like", or to emulate in the near future. The respondee attributed to this person those concepts of self he perceived or
hypothesized as highly desirable in himself. But in most cases these identity concepts were cognitions that were exemplified only in role figmentizing behavior.

He's a funny guy. You can't figure him out. But I consider him an outstanding guy. He can function well in any field. He's a real intellectual, in all areas. I'd like to think someday I'll know art like him...Sometimes he's kinda an authoritarian...I'm not up there but I'm adequate...it'll depend upon discipline. I think of myself that way, as trying to be understanding and open minded....I try to consider how others feel.

An outstanding person? Senator (Name). He was a publisher of a newspaper, fine family, pretty sharp, lots of financial backing, a very giving person, strong, almost inflexible, gentle, great understanding, politically a philosopher. But, I'm no comparison, even now I don't have the opportunity to do what he did.

However, it is worthy to make mention of the identity concepts this subject perceives as important to himself. He described himself at various points in his interview as: a friendly person, a giver not a taker, gentle, loves his family, thoughtful, wants to be successful and make "tons of money", a senator or some type of politician, a maker of speeches, remembered as Boss (his name) by others. He also described himself as flexible but felt others denied this in him.

Another interviewee gave this account of an outstanding person.

I've already mentioned ________ the things he did, as a social scientist and as the person who is concerned with the things that make things really go...with clarity. He's to me an outstanding person
and here (designating a university) in his field, he's interested in students and encourages us to think, for that I think he's outstanding. It'd be nice to see I was a "budding" them. I don't have nearly the grasp of things... and I look to him as some sort of a guide. In some ways his competence is something I admire and I'd like to have. (Underlines are the writer's emphasis.)

Again his interests and I share it with him... getting at essentials of something, he doesn't waste a lot of time--time-efficiency is a thing I value.

The few comments presented above revealed that these subjects were perceiving in others qualities that they desired or hypothesized as the way they perceived themselves at future dates.

Saliency or importance of substantiated identity concepts:

Many of the concepts of self (identities) mentioned by the interviewees were substantiated by others. This was discerned by two methods. The first analysis focused on the substantiation gained by feedback from others who were perceived as significant or important to the subject. Briefly stated, the comments were:

I'm less moody to other people... and I'm more moody at home. My wife commented about this, says I'm a different person around other people than I am at home.

I'm not demanding at all. It's hard to point it out on a continuum but I consider myself flexible. My wife says I'm not, that I have a way of getting what I want by plotting and planning. That may be true, but,... I'm probably less flexible in reality than I think I am... And I think I do (have a temper) but I'd say it's controlled. I fight this... I'd be so happy
to tell people what I think, but I know it isn't appreciated. The more education I get, the higher you go in the academic world, the least they expect it... and you lose academic points. It's not a good idea. But I have a few friends I can blow steam off with... I also have a tendency to dominate conversations. That's one of my weaknesses even to the point of side tracking conversations other people are interested in and I'm not. My wife brings this to my attention now and then and I think she's probably correct. I'm a little bit sarcastic, too.

The second method of seeking the factors that produced saliency of substantiated concepts focused on situational factors. In this last illustration the respondee made mention of factors in situations or events that modified his behavior. He stressed the restrictions emanating from expectations of a professional nature that prevented him from "being himself", that is, manifesting himself in role behavior.

Substantiated identity concepts were cognitions modified by affective feedback. Interviewees responded to the question that attempted to cull information concerning their most important perceptions of self. One said simply, "I'm like Nixon, uh, conservative"... but modified that reference with, "My own thoughts are not with the mass or with those called conservatives". He realized another important identity concept and relates, "You know, humor is a strong element, and it runs all through my friendships. If there is no humor, there's no friends. I hadn't thought about it, but it's an important element." (sic)
There were incidents related that showed a change in salience of previously important identity concepts. This is inferred by the author as lending credibility to the premise that identity concepts are capable of change. They are flexible, reintegratable concepts that are re-organized to give new meanings of self.

My most important concepts? I guess being a friendly, loving person... to be a giver, not a taker. Being a Christian at one time was number one, but not this time, that's not number one. But, I think I'm a damn nice guy.

As a youngster, I always wanted to be in the service. I joined the ROTC. Now I'm totally against rank. Now if you gave me admiral, I'd tell you to shove it. But all my themes in high school... commie threat... Barry Goldwater, sun rose and set on him. All my brothers were in the service. I wanted to be in too. Besides they were in Greece and Rome, look at all the places you go and do and see in the service. Physical problem, I overcome, but eventually I was rejected... maybe a reaction formation?

This incident depicted a cognitive-affective reorganization of self interpretations because of the lack of manifestation of identity concepts that had previously been role taken and role pigmentized many times during his youth. He stated that as a youth he always played soldier with toy guns (not sticks) and knapsacks, and imagined himself in the service in his favorite fantasies. When he was a ROTC candidate, he was able to manifest his hypothesized identities in role taking behavior by assuming a soldier role. Eventually, however, situational and physical factors prevented the substantiation of that identity concept in
his identity assemblage. The assemblage is a hypothetical construct representing cognitive structuring of important identities that give a meaning or interpretation of self at any particular time and across situations.

Continuity of self: constancy of percepts:

There were interesting constancies of concepts of self originating from somatic references. Self interpretation derived from concepts of somatic reference showed a constancy of self-perceptions despite physical changes. The constancy of concepts of self may have been the result of two conditions. The first condition may be the influence of interpreting prior identity concepts into current self meanings, a reassociation or reintegration process. A second condition for constant manifestation of certain identity concepts is that somatic identity concepts are important concepts and are salient features of meaning, persisting over time. These concepts of somatic identities were heavily affect modified cognitions and appeared to be interrelated with other conceptualizations regarding athletic ability, illness or healthiness percepts, height, weight, strength and physical prowess. The following excerpts are presented to lend credence to both of the postulated influencing factors.

As far as looks I've always had an inferiority complex. I always thought I was the ugliest...I was pretty ugly, skin and bones, stature-concave chest,
big hole in chest, lordosis, curvature of the spine, rounded shoulders. I'd say pretty ugly. I was always a little bit smaller to me, it seemed. Even though others were smaller, wiry type I just wasn't. Now since I got married, I gotten up to be a big slob, 180, but I'm down now to 160. I wear clothes to hide my defects. I go swimming and it doesn't bother me now. I don't idolize body men, and I don't compete with them. I don't mind, really mind, competing with a Rock Hudson type because I think I got more to offer in certain ways. My looks are still below average, below par, I got a big beak, don't consider myself handsome... I would make an effort to keep my weight down, you know, man my age, heart—everything you read...I am also dress conscious. I don't want to look sloppy, fashionable at the time...I shave to go out. Shop more than the average guy and I can't stand body odor.

Or,

I was a little kid, a scrawny kid, and ah, I don't know, I can't think of anything distinctive. I was a funny looking kid, I always had my arm in a cast. Now I'm not as scrawny. I see myself as being small and wish I was bigger. I admire bigger people, bigger men, anyhow. Now I don't think I'm funny looking. I'm at least average as far as looks are concerned. I haven't had any girls attack me. (laughs) I would like to think I was taller. I would loved to have played football and, I don't think of myself as wanting to be someone else (now).

One interviewee stresses his identity concepts of "goodlooking" by the feedback he has received. He sums up his conceptualization of self in the following comment, "In general, I think I'm goodlooking. The only way you can tell, is you get feedback from people. My wife thinks I am goodlooking,...in height, and strength."
In order to determine whether there was continuity or discontinuity of self over time by the interviewees the questions focused on the description of themselves as youth and on the comparison of the youthful meanings of self to their present definitions of self. As youth, these subjects perceived important identity concepts that had gained resubstantiation many times in many roles, throughout their experiences. A subject relates the manifestation of an identity concept that became pervasive through most of his percepts of self.

My mother is mentally ill...has been committed to several institutions five years ago. In retrospect it was on-going as long as I can remember. I thought it was marital troubles, fights, I can remember accusations...aware of it to the extent I was quite involved. I envisioned myself as a peacemaker. I was involved in keeping peace between Mother and Dad. I intervened. From my view, my role was as peacemaker...(underlines by the writer).

At a later point in the interview sessions, he summarizes his "overall or general" self. He states, "...involvement in interaction with Mother and Dad made me what I am--a peacemaker...forced me to see two points of view in any confrontation and makes me ask what the heck was going on." The present writer has underlined certain phrases in the above comments. These underscored words are indications that the individual was role taking and not role playing in roles as an intervener or peacemaker. It would seem from his commentary that he originally figmentized himself as a peacemaker ("I envisioned
myself"... but, at some point he manifested this identity concept into his role of "son". His role taking behavior was a manifestation of the identity concept of peacemaker. His referral to, "I was quite involved" is one indication of self manifested in role behavior (or role taking behavior).

One interviewee went into great depth to explain how he gained "specialness" in terms of his self meaning or an individuation of self from others. An abbreviated version of his comments is presented.

I wanted to strive to be special, to be valued, not to be average or ordinary...to your peer groups you just a (professional) so I was going to specialize. The trouble is each time you get another peer group I found myself relating to and saying, "I don't see myself as special", and in fact I didn't get that feedback from them. It surprised me. I was just everyday with my peer group, (Now) I'm better, different and have something special to offer so that when I look for a job I'll have this on everybody. I'm different and it's difficult to define a peer group now. No one in the rest of the country has this like me, so maybe that makes me comfortable. (Earlier he commented) I probably want to be the best...competitive...see myself as doing better than the next guy although I tend to compete with specific individuals...Mother would say I wanted to be the best.

It was not a difficult task for these respondees to comment on the continuity or discontinuity of self meaning over time and across situations. They apparently were focusing on certain cognitions that are continuously being substantiated by being manifested in reality situations. Some interpretations of self also were generalized and not
confined to specific situations. Interpretations of self were either
simply phrased or elaborated with many qualifying conceptualizations.

Two comments are presented to show how each individual has defined
himself.

I consider myself moody. Sometimes I'm up and
sometimes I'm down for no apparent reason. At
times I'm listening to music and I don't want to
share it...get depressed. I consider myself not
particularly socially outgoing, fairly introverted...
I enjoy being by myself especially in summer.

I'll describe myself as lovable, honest, with
personal integrity, capable of understanding others
and empathetic and sympathetic with some
problems they might have, capable of being
obstinate. I make mistakes in relating to others.
But I set up a system with myself by which I
become aware of these...I have a capability for
development. I am limited in intellectual realm...
I don't have any image of being a brilliant scholar...
but I can contribute. I dislike the slowness with
which I move, and I don't formulate goals in some
future...If I was more sure of myself...I'm a
plodder in some respects, and wish I were quicker...
I tend to be contemplative.

At a later session, the subject who provided the first quotation
said, "My basic personality--no major changes. I was quiet, some-
what inhibited and there wouldn't be many kids at all I was close to."
Now he sees himself as "a quiet, shy guy, like being with a few
people,...but less shy."

However, one subject was faced with a problem in attempting to
respond to the question directed toward description of an overall or
general self that were not time-event confined. He said succinctly,
"One me is a very difficult thing to pin down. There are too many parts...I keep talking about my goal as getting all my parts together."

Since it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to probe into the reasons for any comment made by the subjects, it can only be speculated that the comments of the last respondent may have resulted after he revealed the broad range of identity conceptualizations that were capable of being formulated by him by the methods used in the present study.

Self and Role Behavior

Role behaviors, as postulated in Chapter III, was described as observable and unobservable behavioral manifestations of self, and as observable behavioral responses perceived appropriate for situational demands. Conditional factors were assumed by the present writer to determine the form of role behavior manifested by the individual.

Attempts were made during the interview to determine:

1. how individuals cognitively interpret situations.

2. what are the stimuli to which they knowingly react.

3. how they expect themselves to be, that is, whether self involved or performing an action.

4. whether the anti-identities are cognitive phenomena, by reference to those concepts
of self expected of them that they do not hypothesize of themselves at that moment in that situation.

(5) if there was a motivational effect or locus of control for role assumption.

(6) if there was an awareness of reality or non-reality basis for identity concept exemplification.

(7) whether factors, external to their control, limit, define or modify performance in roles.

(8) whether intrinsic factors limit, define and restrict performance in roles.

During the interviews the subjects mentioned the following qualifying conditions when asked how they behave in specific social, educational, personal or occupational interactive situations. The situations were described as role specific.

A partial listing of some of their comments is presented to identify a few of the factors which were consciously attended to or acknowledged by the interviewees as affecting their manifestations of identity concepts.

(1) really depends on the situation
depends on how he reacts to me... it's that-- I react
but here, I'm supposed to take the initiative
at a party... I hesitate... I tap the situation
In a group... I was the only student... I think
I spent all my time sizing up what they're going to be like.
I size up the situation... what kind... what level... who's there
got to be careful about what you wear, not to be too swaggy... what you say
I'd be very choosy about the areas we'd talk
I'd feel inhibited, worried about faux paws
I'd have a more sexual frame of reference (with girls) than I do in church
it depends on the size of the class, professor, who's in it.
I'm afraid to be me, to be completely free 'cause of personalities
certain situations call for certain things from you
have to do things that are socially acceptable-- something I don't like to do but I do it.
(15) to get to where I want...I have to do a lot of _____ called grad student...have to play and kiss a lot of ____.

(16) the restrictions and responsibilities on me...

(17) If someone was watching me, I might do it.
   (under pressure from performance demands)

(18) I do it matter of factly and I'd have no interest

(19) I can't always be honest...it's the "politic" thing to do

(20) It's the fact you got to do it, but I'll learn to cope and do it.

(21) the male role dictates males don't cry

(22) I feel compelled to have to say it's great when it's adequate.

(23) They were expecting me to behave differently

(24) groups have an inhibitory effect in putting myself across

(25) with authoritarian...I'm not about to be myself

(26) to some extent I mask or hide my identity in certain situations.
Role taking and role playing behaviors:

The comments listed revealed a consciousness or awareness by the individuals of factors that influenced the manifestation of identity concepts through role behavior. Many of the conditions they mentioned were situational requirements, or imposed by the demands of social interaction. In some of the interview discussions it was very difficult for the respondee to state how they perceived themselves, or wanted to present themselves in specific roles because their behavior in these roles depended upon many factors. In other words the way they perceived a role was largely determined by their self conceptions, situational cues, their values, and the benefits they perceived from the role in terms of both their self needs and others' expectations. Many subjects could describe how they hypothesized they might act and how they did act in certain roles by estimating what effects they would or did have on the situation and what the situational requirements they anticipated might be or had been placed upon them.

An interviewee described how he perceives himself and his behavior in a friend role:

It depends on how he reacts to me. On the whole it's that, I react. I'm not gregarious. I don't usually take initiative, but here I'm supposed to take initiative, but socially, I don't start. That's not me.

The subject refers to both role playing demands and his reaction to the imposed anti-identity, "That's not me."
In a professional role another respondee described what transpired when he was required to perform a role he had not previously had the opportunity to assume or through which he could confidently substantiate identity concepts.

They're expecting me to behave differently...since I have been a student for eleven years when I went down there I should be saying Dr. So and So with a great deal of respect. Instead I found myself saying, "Yes, Ted", this and other, and being uncomfortable with it. But I felt I was expected to be considered a peer, and should behave that way...To some extent, I'm not sure of what's appropriate or inappropriate for I haven't played that particular role for very long or had much experience...At the time I responded to a situation...The next time...I think I'll approach it a little different.

Another subject described this incident of conflicting roles.

I can't stand to sit around and nod to people. I do it sometimes cause...one of the criticisms I get is I'm too aggressive. For instance, (at work) I disagreed with some of her interpretations. The role that was reinforced was to "play student" and I don't like to play student...I don't like to be dependent. At times, uh, I like to be dependent...

It appears from this comment that the subject is required to role play a "student role" while he reacts strongly to the demands placed upon him by assuming the role--that of being "dependent". This concept "dependency" was an anti-identity that he was expected to manifest as a self percept, as appropriate for the role performance. In this situation the conflict of role playing an anti-identity that was at variance with his self conceptualizations resulted in defense
mechanisms. Another incident reported by an interviewee who attempted to role take an identity concept for reality testing through a student role resulted in his retreating or "disengaging" his self from the role performance.

I suppose I take the role of a provocateur. I like to express myself and my ideas. But it depends upon the instructor. I sometimes play "nice student" if I feel it wasn't my place in his classroom. I'm conscious of my role, sometimes I trip up...more and more aware...I expect myself to enter into discussions. I won't sit back and let the class go by without saying two words. But larger groups have an inhibitory effect in putting myself across to others. I start frank, start speaking...jovial...see if they match up my sense of humor with theirs and if I get a cool reaction, I disengage...I back out.

When the subject attempted to reality-test an identity concept through role taking behavior, the feedback he received was encoded as modifying cognitive concepts of self. To alleviate cognitive dissonance caused by a discrepancy from anticipation of acceptance and feedback of the manifestation of his hypothesized identity in a reality situation he "disengages" or withdraws from the situation the identity he postulated of himself. Further information was not available as to what he did in the situation after he had withdrawn or had divested his self from exemplification in that role.

That excerpt also presented a self reflexiveness factor ("I expect myself..."). The interaction was reflected or directed back on to his hypothesized identity concept and became a self-reflexive
condition of role taking. This condition is the result of processing feedback from others in a social interaction onto self. Since this individual became "disengaged" and withdrew his identity concept from the role, it is assumed that non acceptance by others was cognitively encoded and had affect-modified the conceptualization of self.

There were many incidents related by the subjects that attempted to respond to their perceptions of others' acceptance or non-substantiation of their exemplifications of self in role taking behavior.

(as a teacher) I was shy, students have misperceptions they think I'm dogmatic, authoritarian...(He does not perceive himself as an authoritarian figure, just shy, quiet, capable of mutual understanding, non-dogmatic)

I think others think I'm ambitious

Sometimes I get the feeling from peers around here, they think I know more than I normally do.

They think I'm smarter, understanding, attending, but I'm capable of disappointing others because I try to convey good, kind and understanding and don't always act that way.

Brashiness--my wife says I talk fiercely and say things I don't mean, and this offends people. I've toned down. I don't feel I want to be brash.

People think I'm much more Christ centered than I think I am. Some of my Columbus friends doubt my sincerity about being one or the other. That's the way they see me and I don't.

A subject described how he perceived himself and how he perceived others responded to him. The first part of his comments refer to his role taking and role figmentizing behaviors.
(as a student) They used to call me Boss (name). We ran the political machine that ran the student body. (His role pigmentizing was to be a senator or political figure, making speeches, and tons of money.)

(at work) Oh I played the part... I was the darlin', the junior executive on his way up. I sought out the key men in the department much to the disgust of my co-workers... Then I got into the insurance business—there's a lot of acting as a salesman. You just don't go out in a dumpy mood and sell. You got to be happy, interested in people especially selling.

The latter part of his comments suggests that in order to achieve his aspirations he had to role play, adhering to performances or behavioral responses that were perceived as obligatory for achieving the rewards he desired. A corollary regarding role playing behavior (see Chapter III) stated that the locus of control for role playing behavior was extrinsic to the individual. An individual responds to the reinforcements in external conditions for the rewards he seeks. In this case the interviewee states his role plays the "up and coming junior executive" effectively with anticipation that the rewards he seeks will be granted. According to Homan's economic exchange principles (1958) (a social-balance theory) accruable benefits are measured in amount of expenditures. In this case the expenditure was in effective, convincing performance and not in investment of concepts of self.

Another individual discusses the effects of responding to contextual demands which were at times variant with his concepts of self. He states:
I'm the middle of the road type, between my values and integrity and my expectations and views of what they expect. I will cater to their expectations if I think they are at all reasonable, but if it violates too much what are some of the things I believe in, I rationalize or get out of the situation.

This individual apparently has been able to cognitively alleviate the dissonance he receives from assuming an anti-identity. However he is restricted from accepting anti-identities that violate his values. In order to remove "cognitive strain" or cognitive "dissonance", he either reorganizes his cognitions to accept a new interpretation of the anti-identity, and if that cannot be, or is not accomplished, he withdraws himself from the role by no longer participating in the situation or in the social act.

**Situational cues for self manifestation in roles:**

If situations were perceived as new, strange or threatening, the individual usually performed a role by role playing behaviors. Many situations or sequences of behavior that emitted role playing behavior were difficult to elicit from the respondee because they did not wish to convey the impression of falseness or acting. However, to some subjects role responses that satisfied situational requirements were considered natural behavioral reactions. To others, the awareness of threat, or potential threat in new or strange situations, or situations in which they would not "be involved" or feigned interest was a reason for role playing. They role played in order to adjust to the behavioral
requirements they perceived as an obligation of the role into which they were placed.

Some interviewees interpreted situations as "threatening" to important, substantiated self meanings and changed role taking behaviors into role playing, or immediately role played until they felt secure in attempting to manifest an identity concept for reality testing in a role.

I'm sensitive and I feel comfortable to being vulnerable when I think the other person is not going to hurt me for being vulnerable, but I think he has the power to hurt and he's going to hurt me, then I put up the swaggering "Cool Man" kind of stuff. As I told you before with new relationships sometimes, as when we talked about women... that the situation demanded it...makes me put up air of coolness...

In threatening situations...not benefit anything by revealing self. With an authoritarian professor, I'm not about to be myself and expose my values to that kind of person.

I put up a shell...

Perhaps if you're not skillful, you can give the impression of being false by being considerably different than you are. (Note that skillful denotes performance criterion.)

Role playing occurs naturally in social interactions where certain behavioral responses are required of the individual. This individual relates how his profession requires him to project a certain image of himself.
I'd like to be able to complain...to let my hair down like at home and act the way I feel, but I usually try to keep a stiff upper lip around people that I don't know well or that don't know me well, and have had people ask me why I was so cheerful when I wasn't really cheerful at all. I simply emulate optimism, I think in situations where I'm not well known or do not know the people well...

In friendly situations not perceived as demanding specific behavioral responses, the subjects more readily engaged in role taking behavior by manifesting identity concepts they hypothesized of themselves, or, for which they sought resubstantiation. These situational cues provide information of role requirements and were the type of situations in which they described being themselves or being "involved" or "comfortable" with themselves and others.

**Role figmentizing behavior:**

The subjects, even in adult years, engaged in figmentizing identities. Closely related to figmentizing identities in roles was their aspirations for their self image, especially with respect to position and status roles. Some of the figmentized identities conceptualizations were consistently reoccurring in their fantasies. For instance:

When I was a child I used to want to be a pilot and an aeronautical engineer. Now I still want to be a pilot but my wife opposes it and it's expensive.

Two factors prevent this identity concept from being exemplified. The first factor is his wife's opposition, and the second factor is the
cost of training. Both these factors are related to reality. Since role figmentizing behavior is non-reality based, the restrictions placed upon the role assumption of pilot were not a deterrent in his role figmentizing behavior.

Another subject describes a role figmentizing behavior he engages in simultaneously while role taking.

Yeh, some of these are fairly imaginary...like when I play athletics. I had kind of emulated (name)...I'd take an imaginary stance, how they (the sports figures he emulates) handle the ball, Now, when I still play, I'd think about how they hit, serve....

Some role figmentizing behaviors are overtly manifested in play situations, through which the make-believe element forms the acceptable condition for non-reality based identity concepts.

I used to like to be in the military. I saw myself as someone in the service. As a youngster I used to play military. It had to be realistic, no sticks for guns, knapsacks...(as an older child) I imagined myself in the occupations of my brothers, as army soldiers.

Role figmentizing behavior is closely related to aspirations for self in the near or not too distant future. One interviewee sees himself as a "prophet", another imagines himself as a "future pioneer", or "I perceive myself as a hero" or "embodied in people who can be powerful."

The following is an excerpt of one subject who felt that much of his satisfaction was obtained in figmentizing identity concepts. When asked if he daydreamed or had fantasies, he remarked:
All the time...I'm a Walter Mitty type character...
all sorts of fun things, like, that I'm giving speeches,
getting elected to Congress, and doing little more
in the limelight here and there. Oh, I've probably
seduced more women in dreams than Carter has liver
pills. I've always been a daydreamer. I don't
understand anybody who doesn't daydream. Sex
would be number one...Favorite? Oh yeh, political,
being a senator, being Ole Boss (name). But, that's
a fantasy in this stage of life.

It was revealed that the favorite fantasy of his interviewee was
not anticipated as being manifested in reality. The opportunity for role
taking as a politician was not perceived as available to him.

An interesting group of responses centered on the question of
work and its meaning in terms of self as exemplified in certain roles.
Since this type of response diverges slightly from the focus of this
study only those comments that are related to self in roles will be
mentioned. One of the distinctions presented by some of the
respondees was that "there is a difference between a position and a
job" or "between work and occupation". Work was defined as "my
mission in life" whereas "job or occupation was toil." Another
interviewee elaborated and said, "my fulfillment is in work." To the
question asking what either work or occupation means, this man
comments:

That distinction was made fairly clearly to me
last year, work and a job. I take a job as some­
thing you do to make money, where as work you
do out of interest, out of what you want to do.
That is the distinction I virtually hold. I don't
want to work at a job. Work has some sort of
meaning, work contributes knowledge, enlightenment, self importance, money isn't always a goal... want in my work some sort of self satisfaction and accomplishment and critical acceptance by peers.

When work is defined in terms of satisfaction of self, by substantiations of identity concepts in meaningful roles, then work is not perceived as a job but as intrinsically meaningful to the self needs, as well as fulfilling society's obligations for adult responsibility.

Results of role assumptions to self:

An interesting variety of responses were derived when the interviewees discussed their fears. There were a range of fearful conditions but on elaboration the locus of fear was related to the perceptions of self. Some of the fears directly impinged upon structuring of self meanings, whereas other fears were founded upon violation of values that were criteria for self. One individual feared a loss of self control--a fear of locus of control of his own behavior, by being vulnerable to manipulation. This is a very interesting area for study of self and when approached in depth could reveal highly important or salient concepts of self. These concepts are capable of producing loss of self meaning if they were denied manifestation as identity concepts for that individual. A brief variety of "fears" is included.

My fear of abandonment...my fear of insecurity... fear in getting the Ph.D. that I might have to sacrifice personal integrity and it'd not be worth it...
I always became involved with one person, committed...
I wish that I wasn't that way. Person who is less
committed to a person is in control of the situation...
Person who is involved is vulnerable to being
manipulated.

Those things that violate my values or personal
integrity. I fear I'll be a "camille", a dishonest
individual...hideous.

As a male I'd like to keep intact physically...Right
now though its fear of failure...this defines my life...
fear of failure, fear of not being able to live up to
someone's standards I met. Even as a child I feared
not being able to accomplish what I set for myself.

The comments were focused on a fear of implied external threats that
would cause a loss of self primarily through loss of control of what was
important to self.

Values: intrinsic factor modifying self in role behavior:

Values were defined as the standards and criteria for conduct or
actions, and end states or ideals and goals. In this section values
were described by the interviewees as determinants for molding inter-
pretations of self and for the meanings derived of self by cognitively
evaluating identity concepts manifested in socially available roles. By
manifesting identity concepts in role taking behavior an individual can
evaluate himself in terms of the self standards he has cognitively
formulated.

The importance of values to structuring and maintaining a self
meaning is shown in some of the following comments. Values are
restrictive to certain responses the individual may be expected to perform.

Value most, personal integrity, ideas I consider my own, being honest with myself. My own man... But I can be pressured to go along. Being faithful to ideas and self, what I stand for, and my goals. I don't compromise about those things. I may have to compromise with reality if I can't have them, but I suppose I'll always fight...

Cooperation, if it didn't conflict with my values... (He explains a paradox he perceives.) I place some of my values within the expectations of others. It can be a delusion... but I don't feel coerced if I can see a relationship to later on.

I don't have this charisma by which everyone I meet likes me... I don't go out of my framework of values to please others... I tend to stay within my frame of values.

Many values were described as a comparison to what others "stand for" and what they feel is important. Values were individually defined and cognitively constructed. They are not an incorporation of "things" from society, but are standards and criteria that individuals ascribe to objects, people, events and to self. To determine whether persons perceive a change in their values over time and if they felt their values were social "oughts" or personal constructed criteria the subjects responded:

We tend to change very much from family values

Varies... father and mother were somewhat different
I can't get that (values) from any one person...it's a personal philosophy...train of thought, I rationalize in myself.

My values have changed from what they were.

The comment reproduced below is presented as an illustration depicting the process an individual follows in applying his values. He thinks through a desired situation in terms of his values and what the effects would be. This subject cognitively evaluated (applied his criteria) what the consequences of his behavior would mean to his society and to his self.

Well, we hit the sex thing but when you think it through as carefully as I have it's not worth it, 'cause all you are going to do is wipe yourself out and you lose everything that's important to you. Like in our society you just don't do such things. And there's that feeling of getting caught. But you're always caught when you live with yourself. You'd know and that in itself is bad enough--and the fear of getting caught, you know, I'm chicken.

Summary

The interview method provided information pertaining to identity formation, structuring of meaning of self and the relationship of self to roles.

Identity concepts formation depends upon conceptualization of self image instances or self representations. These representations are amenable to integration and reorganization forming many "self or identity" type statements. The implication derived from interviews,
lending credence to assumptions made by the present writer, is that identity concepts are changeable and capable of differentiation and re-integration to provide concepts of self for manifestation in reality situations, or for exemplification in non-reality based contexts. These concepts are capable of being made manifest through available social roles, but it is through the postulation of role behavior that an investigator can begin to differentiate those performances that are intrinsically related to self and those performances that are divested of self components. High self risk situations, potentially threatening contexts, strange, unfamiliar or new situations and certain demand contexts have been described as conducive to performance behavior (role playing) in which self involvement is not a factor. Motivation, both intrinsic as shown by locus of control for investment of self components, and extrinsic, as shown by the production of required behaviors by external reinforcements, was depicted as a factor for the form of role behavior the person assumes.

Reflexiveness was an important factor in providing information for assessing role behavior. Reflexiveness is proorted to be an important construct for psychological study. It is applicable for self evaluation of identity manifestation, and depends upon the processing of others' reactions for modification of cognitively constructed identity concepts. Self reflexiveness is postulated as a factor conditional with a reality base.
A non-self reflexive factor results from interactive behavior. It is based upon the actor performing an action and the results of his actions as evaluated by others, are cognitively assimilated as performance effectiveness and not reflected into self structures.

The interview method has generated questions pertaining to the advisability of roles as a psychological study. Roles are sociological structures in society. The listing of roles a person assumes, or aspires to, in his life is unproductive for psychological inquiry. Roles become important to a psychologist when the focus has changed from roles and their attendant "behavior" to a study of the dynamics underlying role behavior. The differences in behavioral responses may vary as a function of self, others, motivation, and the basis of reality. Roles can provide the individual with the opportunity to be what he wants or as he cognitively defines himself, or to be as others expect him. A role is a means through which an individual can place his cognitions regarding self into "being" by enabling his self conceptualizations to be made manifest. But the role itself is not a determiner of the self meaning of an individual. It is through the social role that the individual can reality test his conceptualizations by role taking behavior. Reality in the form of others participating in a social act provides feedback information as to the effects, merits, or benefit of the identity concept to the individual.
Since cognitive functioning is assumed to be an on-going process, self as process is a continuous development. Cognitions are capable of integration and reorganizations for generating new interpretations of self that are a function of prior experiences, present cues and future postulated conditions.

Concept formation is assumed to be a cognitive function that continues throughout the life of an psychologically intact organism. Therefore the concepts a person constructs that relate to himself are capable of change. The behavior produced is also a function of change. But some identity conceptualizations have importance and are integrated into other concepts. This produces the constancy or perpetuation of some concepts over time and across situations.

Two interviewees summarized their self as process by saying,

I'll be frustrated as long as I'm resigned to the fact I'll never be in a stage of completion,

and

I'm so much different today than ten years ago, it's a dynamic process.
Any system of organizing ideas such as the building of a theory not only incorporates givens and observances of the phenomena under discussion but includes a strong dose of inference. It is the inference that becomes the subjective, personal, deductive element which helps formulate a theoretical position. So it is with the study of self as process. Three inferences of self as process are:

I. Self process is developing over time throughout the life experiences of the individual.

The criterion by which such a statement can be made must be related to the probability that the assumption is based on enough evidence and repeated confrontations with circumstances to lend credence and support to the statement. In this theory substantiation for the above assumption can be abstracted from the 'subsystems' that are operative during the progression of the self process. These subsystems are derived from cognitive-affective bases, in the form of identity concepts and their exemplifications in role behaviors. From
the statement just made, it may become obvious to the reader that
cognitive development is considered as a fundamental process inherent
in self development. The term process implies a conditional change is
integral to the system; that the progress is amenable to change over
time; and, that when process includes progression, it infers a
directionality in the form of a potential of the system.

II. Concept formations of the self process are the identity con-
cepts an individual organizes concerning instances of self references
and self representations processed by integration and differentiation of
prior experiences. Instances of self are developmentally integrated and
organized and are modified by other factors.

Some observations concerning this assumption are obtained from
discussion with interviewees. Their histories indicated multiple
interrelationships of behavioral responses, contextual factors, self
needs and perceptions of self-other demands, as modifying identity con-
cepts throughout life. At specific points in time, certain identity
concepts postulated by them also were substantiated by others. These
identity concepts were recallable in contexts, (e.g., actions,
behaviors or events) and were discussed as self exemplified in
situational contexts. Through time, identity concepts were modified in
terms of their importance, and became interrelated with other identity
concepts. The process of integrating, interrelating and reintegrating
identity concepts created broader structuring of interpretations of themselves.

III. The structuring of self meaning is assumed to occur through the postulation of an identity assemblage. The identity assemblage is both organizing and organizer of identity concepts and role relationships together with all processed feedback\(^1\) that went into making an identity concept from a self referent experience. Thus, the identity assemblage is not just a self image, or an evaluation of one's self, or one's values, but is the organizing activity that permits interrelations of identity concepts giving definition and meaning of the individual across situations, specific to the moment, and to future conditional contexts and events. In other words, the identity assemblage is more than just the sum of identity concepts; it is the mediating, processing, and organizing process of self experiences. This structure (a hypothetical construction) subsumes the assumption that identity concepts are hierarchically organizable (systematized) by which these identity concepts or sets of identity concepts more vital or important (at any point in time) become salient. With self as a process the organization of the

\(^1\) Weiner (1954) refers to feedback of information as "resulting in adjustive performance", creating possible "multiple contingencies" and also creating variations of behavioral manifestations and contextual applications.
assemblage or structuring of self\(^2\) precludes permanent rigidity or completeness to an organization of identity concepts. This is prevented when the assemblage is viewed as organizing of potential orderings of relationships of identity concepts enabling interpretations of one's own meaning to be derived. The assemblage is continuously operating throughout life by reintegrating identity concepts and differentiating meanings of self.

Thus, James' (1890) comment that self is the sum of different roles is an incomplete explanation of self as process and does not explain the integration of identity concepts and roles, or the differentiation of meanings of self from all the roles to which James alludes.

By viewing self as a process, attention shifts from identity concepts as an end product or from focus on a self concept or an identity (Erikson, 1950) to the process of identity conceptualization (building through process of integrating and differentiating cognitive constructions) and exemplification of the identity concepts in roles. This becomes a process of cognitive-affective integration and differentiation of meanings of self over time.

Self as process changes the focus of study from behavior as an end in itself by which self is a resultant by-product of behavior, to the

\(^2\)Koryzbski (1951) discusses structure in terms of relationships, stating that to have structure one needs a complex or network of ordered and interrelated parts.
view that self as process is inherent in creating or initiating certain behavioral responses and is an integral function of cognitive developmental activity. Thus, a self as process position changes the question of inquiry from, "Does man have a self?" to, "During the process of cognition, what are man's identity conceptualizations and how does man know himself and give himself definition and meaning at any point in time?" In this manner, self as process is the study of cognitive-affective developmental behavior in which the locus of reference is the organism.

The purpose of this chapter will not undertake the larger task of postulating hypotheses and corollary statements for the broader theory of self as process in human development. The focus of this chapter is confined to role theory as delineated in Chapter III, although the three postulates and their corollary statements pertain to the assumptions underlying a self theory as adapted and presented in condensed version in Chapter II.

The interviewees used in the present study were able to discuss various role behaviors, as differentially related to self, others, motivation and reality. Although with retrospective statements it is not only difficult but perhaps improbable that complete credibility can be held for the reasons given in self analysis of behavior, it is not the purpose of this dissertation to provide cause and effect data on normality and pathology of self development of individuals. The
purpose rather, is to observe if within individuals certain processes do occur, and whether changes, consistencies, continuities or discontinuities of process can be discerned. Thus, individual differences are not of concern. The chief concern is whether general principles of developmental phenomena occur.

Historically, a discussion limited to a description of positional roles, instead of self in role behavior theory, resulted in a "backward" type of post-hoc analysis. In other words, if identity concepts are postulated as primary conditional factors in manifesting role behaviors, then identity concepts plus the modifying conditions postulated in Chapter III (Pages 77-80) should be the locus of inquiry. However, the historical approach has been to look at overt behavior in positional roles, per se. A study of roles had been thought to enable prediction and description of identity concepts of the individual. Post-hoc analysis through a study of social role assumptions leads to a cul-de-sac of reasoning, for observable behavior may be the manifestation of identity concepts or set of identity concepts, anti-identities, or may be unrelated to the self process as activity manifested in the form of organismic reactions or habit.

The question, then, becomes, "How is the study of a behavioral response able to specify the underlying conditions for its occurrence?"

The position taken in this dissertation is that the study of role behavior should not be directed towards an end product (the observable activity
phenomena) only, but at defining and controlling for the qualifying conditions constituting the genesis for role behavior.

The theory presented thus far stems from three role postulates and their corollary statements. These postulates were:

A. A role can be a concrete manifestation of an hypothesized identity or set of identities presenting an observable product of the self process.

   1. A role taking behavior is intrinsically motivated with locus of control of behavior assumed to reside within an individual.

   2a. A role taking behavior is reality based and the results of the manifestations of behavior are processed as feedback and are reflexive to the self assemblage.

   2b. A role taking behavior is reflexive and is related to both self demands and to the demands of the situational context.

   3. Role taking behavior can change into other qualities of role behavior if certain conditional factors, as differentially related to self, motivation, reality and reflexiveness, change their direction.

B. A role can be an observable behavior representing performance by the individual of prescribed, demanded and expected behaviors as determined by situational contexts.

   1a. A role playing behavior is extrinsically motivated with the locus of control of behavior assumed to reside in others.

   1b. A role playing behavior is the manifestation of those aspects of performance demanded by others as appropriate for the context.
2a. A role playing behavior is a manifestation of anti-identities not derived from cognitively organized self concepts.

2b. Anti-identities are cognized as demanded behavioral enactments, for functional effectiveness, satisfying perceived external demands.

3. Role playing behavior is reality based, interactional but not reflexive to self. The results of the manifestations of behaviors are evaluated as performance criteria and not as evaluation of hypothesized identity concepts.

4. A role playing behavior can change into other qualities of role behavior if certain conditional factors change, that is, if self, motivation, locus of control, reality or reflexiveness change their directions.

C. A role behavior can be an autistically constructed mental behavior positing and implementing an identity or set of identities, representing an unobservable product of the self process.

1. A role figmentizing behavior is a mental construction of an identity concept or set of identities, intrinsically motivated with locus of control of behavior assumed to reside within the individual.

2a. A role figmentizing behavior is non-reality based and external feedback is inconsequential as others are not cognized as basic for substantiation of cognitive self constructions.

2b. A role figmentizing behavior is non-reflexive to self structures by its lack of social interaction.

3. A role figmentizing behavior can change to other qualities of role behavior if certain conditional factors become differentially related to self, motivation, locus of control, reality or reflexiveness.
In essence, credibility for the postulates is gained through the methodology of this study. However, a controlled study stipulating the factors modifying each role behavior would be the method suggested at this point to discern whether the factors postulated do in fact modify each condition. However as stated in the procedural section (Chapter IV) the purposes of this dissertation are to:

1. gain evidence to support or lend credibility to the assumptions upon which this theory is based.

2. gain additional evidence to elaborate the primary postulates.

3. offer suggestions for variables important to the process of self development.

4. offer suggestions for alternative postulates for self theory, that is, negate, refute or cast doubt on some of the proposed assumptions of self in roles.

The methodology used in this dissertation constituted an attempt to seek whether researchable variables do exist, and was a priori in defining the variables and controls as dimensions of a theory. The interviews provided insights in so far as they enabled new problems to be uncovered and deductive and inductive statements to be generated. Perhaps the fundamental problem facing a developmental psychologist is in discerning whether the process being studied is continuous or discontinuous through the life span of individuals; and, if the process is discontinuous, does that discontinuity necessarily denote a pathology? The problem of consistency or constancy also is one of
differentiating whether the process becomes a pathological, rigidifying development or whether constancy is a function of normal progression. In the present study, the focus is not on observable social roles but on the underlying process of self as exemplified through roles.

The problem of consistency or constancy lies either with the process or within the components of the process. In this study the components are the identity concepts, referred to as the contents of the process, and their manifestation in role behavior, referred to as products of the self process. The first set of deductions to be derived from self theory and role behaviors are:

I. The process of self is a continuous process throughout the life span of the individual.

II. The inconsistency in self as process occurs because components (identity concepts and role behaviors) are constantly changing or are a function of change throughout the process due to the ecology of self and environments. These deductions generate the following induction for self theory:

A. When the process of self is discontinuous, normal development of self is interferred with.

1. This will result in a discontinuous self process or in a pathology of self continuity and self orientation with a loss of interpretation.
of spatial and temporal location of prior experiences to present self definition and meaning.

**Deductive statements**

The following statements are presented as additional deductions from role theory as a function of self process, derived from deduction I.

**A.** With development certain continuities of self as process are evidenced.

1. Continuities of self process are due to cognitive affective interpretations of experiences and integration of present information processed in terms of self.

2. Experiences are integrated, organized and interpreted in terms of the individual's needs and value system as his frame of self reference.

**B.** With development, there are certain inconsistencies due to non-continuities in observed behaviors in the form of specific enactment in roles.

1. Behavior inconsistencies are due to interactions of self and environment.
a) Behavior inconsistencies are due to changes in physical, physiological and cognitive development of the individual.

b) Behavior inconsistencies also are due to changes in social, situational and contextual demands.

A second group of deductions relate to the constancy of the components of the process as derived from Deduction II.

A. Identity concepts are capable of being integrated and systematized into meaning fields.

B. Identity concepts are reintergrated and interpreted as self definitions and can be both situation specific and generalized across situations.

1. Generalizability of identity concepts across situations assumes saliency of some identities.

2. Specificity of identity concepts assumes that some identity concepts are specifically manifested in certain contexts.

The latter statements are deduced from the interview sessions. At points in time individuals were capable of both giving a broad self meaning type of interpretation and were able to relate specific identity concepts as a reason for particular role taking behavior. They were
able to give a generalized meaning of self, and to describe what a
certain role situation meant in terms of specific identity concepts
exemplified in the role taking behavior. A question to be asked is, "Is
this ability a function of higher cognitive operational levels or does
this type of 'double' self understanding occur at all cognitive develop-
mental levels?" The inclination of the writer is that this process is
the process of concept formation. Earlier in development when event
specific behavior is performed these self referent "instances" are
organized to form primary identity conceptualizations. As concept
formations, they are amenable for ordering and classification according
to separate meaning dimensions depending upon the demands of the
situation. Later, with development, identity concepts can be inter-
related and reintegrated to generate multiple meanings of self, con-
taining the condition that more salient identity concepts remain integral
to self meaning. This, then, becomes analogous with the aphorism
"nothing is ever lost in this world, but recombined into other things"
and also includes the adage that "some things are more important than
other things" to the individual and to the situations in which he is
found or in which he places himself.

The types of responses given by the interviewees appear to be a
function of both the structuring of an identity assemblage and the
posing of specific identity concepts exemplified in role taking
behaviors. It was shown that many identity concepts can be
exemplified in an available social role through role taking behaviors. Thus, a study of roles confined to or focused on specific overt behavioral responses would be fruitless in attempting to discern the underlying factors that initiated the response. A role of "student" becomes a superficially similar social outlet for many identity concepts. It may be observable manifestation of both role taking and role playing phenomena or may be unrelated to the role figmentized behavior of the individual occurring at that moment.

**Inductive statements**

The previous group of comments lead to the following inductive statements as qualifiers of the postulates of role behavior.

A. **Role behavior** is a phenomenon emanating from multiple bases. The focus of each form of role behavior is directed towards positional and status roles. **Roles** are socially expected responses but the manifestation of a specific quality of behavior is determined by the primary conditions of role behavior postulates.

1. Many identity concepts can be tested through a similar role.

B. Satisfaction of others' demands for assuming a social role can be achieved by efficient performance of
appropriate responses. Roles may be either related to identity concepts or anti-identities.

1. There is less variability in available social roles than in the underlying factor in the self process that initiates the response.
   a) Social context is a modifying factor to variability in role opportunities available or permitted.
   b) The greater variability of components in self process (identity concepts) with respect to variety of permissible roles available, produces discontinuous behavior over time.
      (1) The process of self is a continuous process.

2. The availability of roles are causes of disjunctive or disruptive behavior over time for certain positional roles are available only in different periods of the life span of the individual.
   a) The disruptive influencers on roles are determined by the following factors:
      (1) the developmental level of the individual
The statements presented thus far, emanate from the underlying premise of this dissertation, which implies that the dynamics of the self process as exemplified through forms of role behavior cannot be studied through the recording of positional or status roles. The results of coding self with roles assumes a 1:1 ratio of identity concepts with roles. In such a ratio, assumed, ascribed and aspired roles are related separately and are distinguishable to specific identity concepts. For such an arrangement to exist, each role is traced to an identity concept, or each identity concept is exemplified through a particular social role.

From the results of interview statements the hypothesized relationship (or ratio) of identity concept to role must be refuted. Anecdotal references has shown that any number of hypothesized identity concepts and previously substantiated identity concepts are capable of being manifested in the same social role. The role becomes the available
means for exemplifying the same identity concept over time and/or exemplifying different identity concepts than those that previously had been manifested. Thus, the variety of self exemplifications that become possible can create a difference in overt behavioral responses by the individual during a social act.

A summary of statements pertaining to self theory is presented.

A. Forms of role behavior are an available means for enhancing self process development by permitting exemplification, testing and substantiation of identity concepts.

B. Role behavior is not a synonym for, nor synonymous with roles.

1. Role behavior refers to the methods used by an individual as functions of both observable and unobservable cognitive-affective activity, and for enhancing the development of self as process.

2. Roles refer to specific ascribed and prescribed behaviors emitted during a social act and are differentially determined by a form of role behavior.

C. A study limited to social roles cannot arrive at a study of self as process.
1. Roles are convergent responses for self process components.

2. Roles are conditional and limited by social and personal factors.

D. Role behaviors are process formations that are dependent upon the factors relating to self, motivation, reality and reflexiveness as discussed in Chapter III. These factors affect role behavior through personal and social effects.

1. The level of cognitive development qualitatively changes the type of behavior manifested by the individual by changing the understanding and meaning of role demands.

2. The variety and availability of social opportunities for each individual changes the observable manifestations of self products due to needs and appropriateness of self and society.

3. Continuous identity conceptualizations and reintegrations of cognitive-affective processing of the individual's experiences are necessary for development of self components.

4. The value system molds the structuring of identity assemblage by restricting the
exemplification of self from certain roles when specific behavioral responses are required which are at variance with the individual's acceptable mode of conduct.

5. The locus of control of behavior conditions or qualifies the type of behavior the individual will manifest and his personal involvement in the social act.

Implications for future study

The interview technique undertaken for this dissertation enabled the following statements to be recommended for additional study.

A. When contexts are less specific as to role demands, role taking behavior becomes more flexible and generalized as to possible identity concepts manifestation.

B. As situational contexts are more specific, the individual displays behavioral consistency in assumed roles.

C. Certain roles are situation specific.

D. With age, individuals develop greater availability of reference groups permitting a wider social context for positing, exemplifying and resubstantiating identity concepts.
1. Reference groups availability reaches an optimal level controlled by:
   a) age factors
   b) social restrictions
   c) cultural norms
   d) personal value system.

E. In familiar groups a person more readily engages in role taking behavior.

F. In new groups or contexts a person usually attempts role playing conforming or fulfilling perceived role expectations.

   1. New situations can also be perceived as constituting potential threats to organized self meaning.

G. Role behaviors are not opposable behaviors in the cognitive affective development of the individual, but become more efficient in interpersonal interaction with decentrism and/or reciprocity.

   1. Role playing and role taking behaviors are necessary for the development of empathy.

   2. Role playing as a social learning experience is interdependent with role taking and provides knowledge of role requirements by defining the
limits of the person's social world as imposed by self and society.

3. Role playing experiences increase interpersonal adjustment.

H. Stability of personal meaning and adaptability of self in contexts occurs with age.

1. The stability of self meaning is conditional with social environmental stability.

2. Constancy of social environment reaches optimal adaptability levels.

a) Beyond optimal levels personal adjustment requires a re-arrangement of identity concepts into new meanings or discontinuity of self meaning or self interpretation occurs.

I. Through role pigmentizing behavior, an individual can broaden his association with reference groups, unconfining situational contexts from space-time-reality limitations.

1. Through role pigmentizing behavior a person can emulate a role model by conceptualizing identity concepts similar to those symbolizing the role figure in his cognitive constructions. The role figure is interpreted as representing important
self attributes hypothesized or posited as
desirable or wanted but which are at the time
incapable of manifestation as an exemplified
identity concept.

2. Role pigmentizing behavior can eliminate the
process of positing identity conceptualizations
and obtaining substantiation by others in
reality contexts through imaginary and pretense
conditions for acceptance of cognitive
constructions.

J. If roles are forms of social responsibility and individual
responsibility in society, what is the effect on an
individual's adjustment when the major salient identity
concepts are exemplified through a specific social role?
Does that individual run the greater risk of potential
self disorientation when the social role is no longer
permitted than the individual who has compartmentalized
or differentially clustered concepts into a variety of
social roles?

K. What is the need, effect, or influence of role surrogates
at different developmental periods of an individual's
life in terms of demands and expected social tasks?
L. It is recommended that a study of fantasy and play behavior be undertaken to define theoretically what factors emerge, to discern whether imitative, repetitive, imaginary, and pretense behaviors are developmentally determined and cognitively differentiated in relation to role behavior.

M. Infant observations have led investigators to suggest that reinforcement for actions is not necessarily a function of external reinforcement but appears to be a function of internal motivation of mastery or competence between doing the act and the effects of the act. In other words, the effects of an individual's behaviors are reinforcing if they are caused by the individual's own initiated activity, and the action is satisfying, if it leads to mastery. Intrinsic motivation of behavior should increasingly come under the control of social reinforcement with age. This assumption involves further development and usage of role playing (with age) to accommodate to social demands rather than focusing solely on meeting and satisfying self demands in reality contexts. However, a maximum usage of role playing is assumed to be reached in early adolescence. During this period propositional
thinking and hypothetical deductive thinking should both elicit and modify exemplifications of self in role taking behavior by restricting the quality of manifestations by the imposition of values.

N. People, in series of contextual situations, require many different role behavior manifestations. By accommodating to reference "others" who expect different behaviors, people will manifest many different concepts of self through role taking behaviors. W. James (1890) said that a person has a somewhat different "self" for every social relationship in which he is found. Weinstein (1969) also suggests that some individuals are adept at interpreting situations and establishing special positions in those situations to achieve confirmations of desired "concepts" of self. These identity concepts may be temporary and used as a means of achieving a self need or purpose. Would a socially perceptive person or socially "intelligent" person be a function of role behavior experiences, and would role experiences enable that person to perform in
accordance with social expectations by manifesting specific identity concepts that will satisfy both social and self needs and substantiate identity concepts important to a self meaning?

O. If role pigmentizing behavior is a function of self initiated covert activity, then competence of one's own activity is intrinsic motivation. It is speculated that role pigmentizing behavior primarily is an attempt of the individual to establish meaning of its own organism through subjective, egocentric dialogue, and is not synonymous with a "dependency" motivation of imitative and incorporative behavior.

This list presented a sample of the questions generated from the methodology used in the present study of self and role behavior. Self as process is the process that underlies the personal involvement of the individual in his world. Identity formations conceptualized throughout the cognitive-affective development of the individual, as manifested in role behaviors, are changing, flexible components of the self process. The increasing ability to integrate, differentiate and reintegrate identity concepts and to interpret self meaning in terms of processed feedback enables increasing adaptability of the individual to various contextual situations. Integration and organization of experiential encodings
enables a variety of specific interpretations of self to be made. However, substantiation of certain identity concepts give saliency to these identity concepts and provides a constancy of derivable self meaning over time and across situations. Thus "self" is simply a reference man used to refer to and to define his own organism. It consists of the permutations and combinations of all his experiences and potentials. At any given time man can only perceive a small part of all that he conceives himself to be. To assume that man can, at any given moment, perceive his entirety of self meanings is more than an anomaly, it is an impossibility.

In brief, the study of self as process is best attempted through the contents of the process (the identity concepts) and the products (the identity concepts exemplified in role behaviors) and not limited to focusing on the individual's positional and status roles. Since self as process is in part a study of human cognitive development, it is amenable for psychological study through its components. Since identity concepts are cognitive components, hence hypothetical constructions, the study of self is best attempted through the study of self concepts as manifested in role behavior. Role behavior has been postulated as possessing different qualities and to be conditional upon self, others, reality and motivational factors. Three postulates of role behavior were presented with modifying corollates. It is proposed that further research must control for the underlying corollary conditions in order for a study of role behavior as a function of self to be undertaken as psychological inquiry.
APPENDIX A
A CRITIQUE OF ROLE LITERATURE

The purpose of this section is to: (1) provide a rationale and justification for role in a study of self; (2) briefly summarize the field of role study; (3) highlight assumptions in general theories of role; (4) present some theoretical formulations of role taking; and (5) discuss experimental studies that attempt to validate or refute certain role taking or role playing hypotheses. This brief literature review of role theories will provide a transitional bridge enabling the writer to formulate certain assumptions concerning role that relate to process of self development.¹

The construct "role" has been in our conversational language for a long time. It is not a new construct but has become a metaphorical term. Sarbin (1968) and Biddle and Thomas (1966) discuss the historical development of role. The term developed from roll, rolle, or rowle, which was a sheet of parchment secured to a wooden roller conveying the part or script for an actor's recitation. It was the means of relating real life actions into dramaturgical metaphors depicting behavior interactions.

¹The postulates and corollaries formulated by the present writer are presented in Chapter III of the dissertation.
Borgata (1960); Nieman, Hughes (1951), however, criticize the use of metaphors in scientific communication because vague implications surround terms, such as role, leading to misconceptions. Such vagueness in terminology denies scientific method it's basis for operation.

Role language is at present largely a composit of scientific creations and lay terminology. It's heuristic value lies in its broad applicability or use, and that it suggests possible antecedents and conditions of behavior, but lack of precision tends toward ambiguity and instills uncertainty to the results of scientific endeavors.

Development of role theory can be largely attributed to social psychologists, although many other fields of study have contributed to the writings in this area. With emphasis on individuals' interactions within a socially structured organization, the social psychologist looks at both the opportunities and demands a social organization places upon the individual and the individual's obligation for commitment to these requirements. The acceptance of positional roles, resulting from divisions of labor, obligates each individual to certain behaviors, habits or acceptance of rules in keeping with the social order. Each individual learns the "order" of his society from others who attempt to socialize him. His family unit forms the first microsociety which is primarily responsible for teaching, training, conditioning and molding the individual so that he someday will be able to seek and maintain a place for himself within that social structure and can define himself in
terms of it. In the social viewpoint an individual's uniqueness will be definable in terms of the commonalities or similarities that exist between him and others within the society.

According to the social-interactionist position, child rearing practices, the means of imparting culture to succeeding members of a society, involve social learning by the younger of those expectations, rules and patterns of behavior which are related to roles existing within the society. From the roles he assumes, the individual develops and stabilizes concepts of self, posits identities which differentiate him from others and which influence his transactions with his environment. Self, as seen by the leader of the social interactional position (Mead, 1934), is essentially a social process. That assumption to the writer is in need of qualification. Self is essentially an idiosyncratic process that occurs with the development of the organism but involves social participation for the confirmation and evaluation of certain cognitive derivations.

General assumptions derivable from traditional defined role study:

During development, a person learns to adapt. Adaptation is intelligence (Piaget, 1952) and is the outward response to the environment, whereas organization is its mental counterpart. When a person adapts to his environment, he cognitively accommodates to the demands
he imposes on the environment and those that are imposed upon him by it. Adaptability assumes the development of social intelligence.

Flavell (1968) defined two aspects of a social cognitive development as:

(1) the general ability and disposition to "take the role"\(^2\) of another person in the cognitive sense, that is, to assess his response capacities and tendencies in a given situation, and

(2) the more specific ability to use this understanding of the other person’s role as a tool in communicating effectively with him.

Learning to "take the role of another", (Mead, 1934) has been studied as a "social cognition" (Vaughn, 1969) or as a function of social learning (Maccoby, 1959). Turner (1956) and Shibutani (1961) focused on the relationships between socialization practices and identifications and personal identities, developed by symbolic interactions and role enactments.

Turner (1956) prefers to approach the concept of role as a composite of:

Collection of patterns of behavior which are thought to constitute a meaningful unit and deemed appropriate to

\(^2\) But social cognitive development (Flavell's role taking) is not necessarily a result of exemplification of self concepts in roles. Obviously to understand another, a person must be cognitively processed so that his function, attributes and behavioral expectations are perceived and interpreted in order for meaning to be imparted to his role. But this does not infer that the individual is taking or playing the other's roles (as described in Chapter III) as relating to self process manifestations.
a person occupying a particular status in society (e.g., doctor or father), occupying an informally defined position in interpersonal relations (e.g., leader or compromiser), or identifies with a particular value in society (e.g., honest man or patriot).

He defines role taking as a process of "looking at or anticipating another's behavior by viewing it in the context of a role imputed to that other." He stresses by the above definition, that role is more than a response to another's behavior by arbitrarily determinable symbols or gestures.

**Summary of role concepts:**

Role stresses behavior, but the behavior is the focus of study in social interactional theory. Underlying factors originating within individuals who participate in a social act are treated as inconsequential for expected social role performance. Traditionally, roles as normative behavior are dependent upon expected or appropriate (the ought) responses. Socialization, the results of social learning, includes the transmitting of norms of society by learning expected behavior patterns that permit the society to continue existing and enables the individual to relate and define himself in relation to others in that society.

The social-psychological concept of roles, defines roles as overt behaviors of persons in social settings. Roles are referred to as social conduct. Roles result from cognitive responses because they are
dependent upon knowledge, perception, and expectations. The resultant products of cognitive activity are attitude formations that are prescribed as appropriate for a role enactment and its adoption as one's own "social self".

The study of the structure of roles (with its attendant behaviors) is the focus of attention of sociological investigators who view roles as a status or position concept. With this concept of role, the sociological worker controls for the hierarchical ordering of status or the social position for the manifestation of certain behaviors. To the writer that approach denies the individual per se, as an important variable in the self-other interaction. It becomes a study of normative standards and not of the motivations, level of understanding, and the development of self concepts of specific individuals who are participants in a social act.

Attempts at defining variables in roles:

For some social scientists, role is also the study of self through the study of individual involvement. Sarbin (1954, 1968) refers to this role dimension as intensity or organismic involvement; Goffman (1961) as engrossment. Sarbin posits an ordinal scale of involvement. The extremes of the scale range from zero-non involvement, to the extent that role and self are differentiated, involving few organic systems and no effort, to the highest seventh level, object of sorcery.
and witchcraft, to the extent that role and self are undifferentiated with
maximal involvement of the entire organism with much effort expended.
In Sarbins' description, self and physiological organic systems are
synonymous, differing by quantitative involvement of organic systems.

Sarbin's highest level of role-self involvement was labeled
bewitched, occurring when the social and physiological "controls that
limit the somatic and social effect of lesser stages of organismic
involvement may cease to operate. The effects may be irreversible and
the bewitched may die." Cannon (1942) had theorized that the
physiological events arise from the adoption of the victim's role. The
autonomic activity associated with fear act upon the body and result in
irreversible consequences resulting from cognitive-affective
interpretations of the taking of a role, and the type of involvement.

In order to understand what is implied by intensity or organismic
involvement, the writer feels it is appropriate to discuss the work of
Schachter and Singer. Schachter and Singer (1962) studied the
determinants of emotional states. They reported that literature has
shown physiological and emotional differences are subtle and the
variety of emotion, mood and feeling states do not match the equal
variety of visceral patterns. Because of this incongruity, Schachter
(1959) Hunt, Cole and Reis, (1958) and others suggest cognition as a
major component in an emotional state. General patterns of emotional
excitation exist in similar states and are different from state to state,
but the individual is assumed as being able to identify, label, discriminate and interpret his emotional state by the situational cues he perceives. Cognitions develop from present situational context, interpreted by prior representations or experiences and provide the criteria by which an individual understands, labels and interprets "his feelings". Cognitions apparently also create feelings. It would appear that they (Schachter and Singer) propose that cognition and affectivity are interdependent; that an individual having no immediate explanation for a physiological arousal will label his state and describe his feelings in terms of the cognitions he is able to develop; and that he can reinter- pret the same physiological state with a variety of labels depending upon the cognitive interpretations he derives from the situation. If, according to Sarbin's ordinal scale, there is an increasing level of emotional involvement in a role performance, then by Schachter and Singer's conclusions, there is cognitive-affective interpretation made by the individual of the situational context. Cannon's description of a bewitched person as "taking the role of the victim" may be interpreted as cognitions of situational demands (informational cues) with affective feedback causing intense physiological arousal that has irreversible effects on the soma.
**Assumptions of self and role:**

Understanding how the process of self develops, includes the study of the concept of role. The ability to assume roles has components in cognitive, affective and psychomotor processes.

Assumptions of self as process (Chapter II) postulates that as the levels of cognitive capacities and quality of mental operations of the individual change during normal course of development, the affective feedback that can be attached to self representations gain complexity of meaning for that individual. Social roles are interpreted as conditional depending upon probabilities and possibilities of occurrences. Cognitive-affective representations are dependent upon assimilation or bringing into a system the cues that have relevance, and accommodating existing schema by restructuring prior cognitions resulting from incorporating data and actions. Schema are not independent, serialational organizations but are relational. Each cognitive schema, when restructured, affect other structures resulting in a cognitive reinterpretation of stimuli affording the positing of alternatives or new meanings of events to the self.

Much of the behavioral expectation in roles is inferential. Both actors (or as many participants as are involved in the social event) infer certain expectations from the behavioral transaction, largely determinable to each by his perceptual interpretations of the other. Feedback from role enactments affords information about role demands and
provides social learning of role requirements. Social learning can be accomplished by direct participation and vicariously through observation or hearsay.

The locus of control of one's behavior is another concept not frequently stressed in role. Goffman (1959) discusses the presentation of oneself in situational realities as the point of view of the individual who presents himself to others, that "his interests will benefit if he is able to control the conduct of others," especially their reactions to him. He states control is achieved by influencing the situation which the others come to formulate. An individual can influence this description in such a way as to give others the kind of impression that will lead them to act voluntarily in accordance with his plans. "Thus, when an individual appears in the presence of others, there will usually be some reason for him to moblize his activity so that it will convey an impression to others which it is his interest to convey."

Goffman describes two kinds of communication; those of expression given and those relating to expressions given off, both created during a social set. He is referring to overt and covert behavior or to gestures or motions that are transmitted during interpersonal events. When an individual projects a definition of the situation by his actions to others it is assumed that others, however passive they appear to be in the transaction, will "effectively project a definition of the situation by virtue of their response to the
individual and by virtue of any lines of action they initiate to him."
Role assumption, the performance of a role through a social act, pro-
vides the individual with the means of presenting identity concepts.
Others reactions toward him also provide input as to his effectiveness
and appropriateness in a role performance.

Understanding the concept of role cannot be accomplished if one
considers role as a form of isolated behavior. According to Mead and
Faris (1937), a self-other relationship is part of the total social act.
An actor assumes a role by manifesting some behavior patterns and
determines his role through expectations derived from self cues and from
cues in the situational context.

Role expectations are traditionally assumed to be organization of
cognitions. Because these role cognitions were formulated by prior
experiences (directly or vicariously) they include an affective attach-
ment, or modification, as the individual reinterprets and evaluates his
experiences in light of present situational cues. These cognitions
determine the beliefs and attitudes of the individual concerning his
expectations of self and specify his expectations from an interpersonal
behavior exchange. In this way, role expectations may differ in content
or in structure by the level and quality of cognitive organizations of the

3 However social-interactionists have ignored the underlying
motivations for roles as originating from self conceptions. Thus, they
avoid the problem as to why some roles are performed and others are not,
as determined by the individual, not the social order.
individual participants assessing a role. However, due to similarities in social learning experiences offered by society (e.g., ascriptions as to sex, age, education) similarities in expectations develop. Sarbin (1968) believes that role expectations define the "limit or range of tolerated behavior" or are "specifications for adherence to group norms". He also states that role behavior does not consist of rigid following of specific directives, only that some end result be accomplished within some acceptable limit thus allowing for flexibility of individual responses. This view posits that self is a product of social responsiveness or social interactions.

The concept of role expectations integrates the individual (by his cognitive-affective processes) to the social structure (by his interpretation of the performance demands of others). Interpersonal-situational cues are the selected stimuli by which the individual defines, interprets and locates himself in the self-other transaction. The accuracy of his interpretations of the self-other locations is highly dependent upon his ability to decenter and perceive himself as either a third person object or as an object from another's point of view. Location of a self presupposes the location of others and that mobilizes the potential for a role assumption. This position also assumes that concepts of self are not initially hypothesized by the individual but result from the processing of external demanded social conditions.
Role literature also describes role performance as a skill or performance-motor task. The components consist of mental operational processes that enable the individual to infer from stimuli the expectations of the other as his self cues, and his ability to determine and effectively enact an appropriate behavioral response. In other words, the ability symbolically to adopt the other's position or location, to see things from other's standpoint as they relate to his performance and to behave in accordance with expectations. In this manner, he becomes capable of developing concepts about himself, by reacting to himself as he does to any physical object.

Summary of role and self assumptions:

It can be seen by the discussion thus far that general assumptions in role involve cognitive, affective and psychomotor dimensions. To the writer, socialization practices afford the opportunity for role learning. Roles are the vehicle for social participation and provide the inputs by which an individual can posit, develop and reject certain concepts of self through the interactive processes with others during his development. Roles provide experiences and help an individual structure reality and to define himself in terms of reality. The absence of role taking skills is a determinant of abnormal social development (Cameron and Margaret, 1951). The ability to assume roles has advantage for the individual by enabling him to define himself in reality
testing conditions and closely integrate the self concepts with the norms of his society.

Role problems: conflict of self and others:

Sociologically stated, the underlying assumptions concern:

(1) the norms of general, acceptable behavior considered as "good" for society and as "right" for each individual; (2) socialization practices mold and shape the development of individuals to fit specific roles in society; and, (3) that individuality or uniqueness is a form of deviation from societal standards. Fromm (1941), Reisman (1950), and others have presented the problem of individuality or satisfaction of individual's needs versus the satisfaction of the demands of society. However, psychologically stated, conformity to social demands must also include a concern for individual needs if a criterion of "satisfaction, adjustment and happiness" is to be established. A social conformity model of role is divested of the concept of self-satisfaction if the individual's values, attitudes, goals, aspirations and self demands are not considered as essential and as motivators for some role behavior. A role study based on the development of the self embraces the concept of social expectations and the concept of self expectations. An entirely social process view of role denies the development of personal identities; an entirely self-centered view of role denies reality testing of hypothesized concepts concerning the self. It is when demands and
expectations of self and society are incongruent that man faces a conflict and must resolve the dissonance that results within him.

Role conflict results when contradictory "oughts" are envisioned. When a person receives dissonance as to the appropriate behavior enactment (Festinger, 1957) or cognitive strain (Sarbin, 1962) he must resolve the cognitive discrepancies by seeking additional information from the environmental context as inputs by which to eliminate the discrepancy, or by reclassifying cognitions into alternative interpretations in order to gain acceptable or appropriate meaning to the self. With the development of propositional thinking, many roles can be interrelated and hypotheses of appropriateness can be devised, and redeveloped. Youngsters approach roles discretely (see, Gollin, 1959) and react to stimuli cues as discrete of separate phenomena. They are unable to understand the expectation of a multiple role interaction. Role, this writer maintains, is a self-other interaction in which self is a determiner for and reactor to one's own behavior. The outcome of behavior can be reinforced either intrinsically to the individual or externally by the demands of others.

Aronfreed (1968), describes transgression behavior and self criticism, but his conclusions are relevant to the involvement of self in role enactments. Aronfreed found that external orientation to behavioral cues does not discount the self in behavior analysis, but he relates conduct to the cognitive-affective interpretation of a situation as
manipulable and interpretable to the level of cognitive maturity reached by the individual. Attachment of affect, by interpreting the results of prior experiences induces a cognitive reevaluation of the present in terms of the past. This does not mean that each transaction is highly self critical (that involves an evaluative and judgemental action involving concepts relating to self, e.g., his identities) but that the perceived situation produces a cognitive interpretation of the state the individual is presently experiencing as a result of the cues he is assimilating from the environment (Schachter and Singer, 1962). Depending on the level of cognitive development the person can become more knowledgable and effective in performing to the demands of others because he has been able to perceive others' perspectives or views the situation in terms of their expectations, as well as from his own.

However, many demanded role enactments are precluded from occurring. Shibutani (1961) states that "a man can act with reasonable consistency in a wide variety of situations because of the relative stability of his concept of self"; that much of "what a man does voluntarily depends upon his conceptions of what he is"; and that most people have a "working orientation towards themselves. Their personal world centers around themselves using themselves as a loci of reference". This, to the writer should include the condition that a person will not perform a role that is opposed to the conceptualizations
he creates of himself, because he has expectations for himself in terms of a personally defined value system and the goals towards which he aspires.

Shibutani also states that for most people the ability to differentiate self from externals is fairly precise because people tend to see themselves as a biological unit. With development, individuals become able to define the boundaries of their organism, establishing those things they attribute to themselves and impart the rest to the external world of others. Through a functional relatedness with their environment, they develop concepts of self and others. The feeling of being distinct in a world of objects enables the following behaviors to develop: autonomy; a control of one's behavior; a capacity for decision making; and, the ability for efficacy in performance (skill development). These abilities are essential for maintenance of self concepts in social actions. The social act then is interpreted to be the event in which individuals interact in a behavioral performance and results in enhancing the process of self through social participations.

Specific theoretical and empirical studies relating to role construct:

A brief summary of the wide range of concepts included in role constructs will be presented to stress the communality among theoretical views and divergencies of orientation. Descriptions of roles are numerous. Perhaps Biddle and Thomas' (1966) restricted definition
describes the common elements in a social act—persons and their relational behavior. They describe role as a person-behavior matrix. Subsumed under this matrix are many variables. These variables are related to individual and group dynamics that create a variety of overt and covert response patterns. They stem from expectations, anticipations, cognitions, attitudes, proscriptions, perceptions, demands, standpoint of others, and many other dimensions all resulting from and existing in a social-psychological field.

Roles then should become the socio-psychological study of individuals interacting in a social context with the underlying motivation for behavior that individuals place upon themselves and others plus the demands placed upon them by the environment and its representatives. Factors such as cognitive level of maturity, perception, interpretability, skill application, communication, selective attention to covert and overt cues, structural arrangement of position or status, and involvement would become the controlling conditions imposed upon the participants in a social act.

**Historical basis of role theory:**

Many writers have postulated a theoretical or descriptive base for the study of role. There are both ambiguities in their formulations and strengths of evidence. Each writer approaches the concept of role from his own standpoint which in itself is a factor in role theory—the
ability to perceive from specific views or perspectives. There has accumulated a vast amount of writing on role in the last two decades. A casual glance through card catalogs, bibliographies, journals publications and current popular literature can attest to the popularity of the term. But the bases for a role theory have largely been developed from G. H. Mead's "self and a generalized other." Mead has inspired many to attempt an analysis of these constructs by proposing operational criteria to make them empirically useful.

Mead's contributions lie in his descriptive analysis of self, (the I and Me components), society (the generalized other) and behavior interaction (the ability to take the role of the other).

Mead defined "the self" as the result of a social process developing "two distinguishable phases, the I and Me. These two phases provide conscious responsibility and novel experiences in Individuals within a society". He states that is is "by the way a person acts" that he is aware of himself. "It is in memory that the I is constantly present in experience. I is the spokesman of the self." Self, to Mead, appears to be an entity, formed by the results of a social act. "The I is in a certain sense that which we identity ourselves." He further elaborates his distinctions between the separable but non-independent self constructs by the following statement:

The I is the response of the organism to the attitude of others. The Me is the organized set of attitudes of others which one
himself assumes. The attitude of others constitutes the organized \textit{Me} and one reacts towards that as an \textit{I}.

Apparently to understand Mead's two phases they can be compared as a subject and object concept. If so, then the \textit{I}, is the subject, the doer or the agent initiating an act or function, and the \textit{Me} is an object, the recipient of collective responses initiated by the \textit{I} (subject) or others. Self becomes a composite of past responses organized into a set of attitudes.

Mead elaborates

...and it is due to the individual's ability to take the attitudes of these others in so far as they can be organized that he gets self-conscious. The taking of all of those organized sets of attitudes gives him his \textit{Me}; that is the self he is aware of.

By stating the \textit{I} is the present action in a social situation, experience is acquired when an action has been completed. "Man has in him all the attitudes of others" (gained through completed experiences, \textit{sic}) calling for a certain response, that was the \textit{Me} of a social act, and the response is the \textit{I}." Mead's definition does not assume that uniqueness of self concepts is derived from hypothesizing identities. By using the concepts of \textit{I} and \textit{Me} as postulated by Mead the position taken by the present writer is that man can acquire only a social identity, because (from interpreting Mead) all of man's attitudes of self are the collective attitudes of the generalized other. In that
sense, man only can evaluate himself in terms of external standards and not in terms of criteria he has set for himself.

Mead's greatest heuristic contribution has been the postulate "taking the role of the other". An important component in any social act is the connotative aspect of words and gestures, that is, the attachment of meaning to behavior. The exchange of meaning in social interaction is labeled as the process of "taking the role of the other". Mead attributed two aspects to taking the role of another:

a) The ability to respond to self-cues from another's position, and

b) responding to other cues from a standpoint of another.

The first aspect (a) may be characterized by using the self as a third person object in social communication, and (b) may be characterized by anticipatory gesturings, e.g., mouthing or mimicking of others, during a self-other process of communication. Unfortunately, role taking has been used synonymously with both (a) and (b) resulting in the inclusion of many similar and/or related concepts (e.g., identification, empathy, sympathy, sham or pretense, modeling, imitation, role playing, learning and conditioning). Taft (1955) and Dymond (1948) have shown that prior experience with an expected response of others, increases the ability of an individual to make correct inferences about others. This is an important component of social interaction, conducive to social learning, but it does not
necessarily nor sufficiently constitute role taking. The (a) and (b) of Mead's postulates can be interpreted as behaviors by an individual that replicate that of others by emulating specific learned responses aroused by present cues that represented prior reinforcements.

For Mead, the interaction between initiator and preceiver results in the significant symbol. If an individual (the initiator of an action) reproduces the response of the perceiver, the reproduced action is the significant symbol. It arises from information transfer and is essential for social interaction. In attempting to understand Mead's structuring of role taking, self and society are inseparable; the self becomes a product of a social process that develops in a social context. The self gains substance from the "attitudes of others" achieves in role taking performances in reality contexts.

R. Turner (1956) has undertaken the task of defining "taking the role of others". He attempted to clarify the meaning and usefulness of role-taking behaviors and explore their relationship to empathy.

Role taking traditionally has been defined or described as a process of "looking at or anticipating another's behavior by viewing it in the context of a role imputed to the other", and it is accomplished by implication more than simply as a reaction to another's behavior in terms of symbols or gestures. Role taking is assumed to have a perceptual, mediational component. Roles have been previously
described as "consistency of behaviors which make a meaningful unit", and the coordination of expectations of behavior within the unit.

The self-other relationship constitutes an aspect of a total social act (Mead, 1934). Turner formulates different role taking types about the manner in which the self-other relationship "affords a directive to the individual in the formulation of what his own behavior shall be"...

In addition, he states, "once the actor formulates a conception of the role of the other, the manner in which that conception serves to shape his own behavior is unaffected by the accuracy or inaccuracy of theconcepting."

Turner's conceptualizations of role taking revolve around the adoption or nonadoption of the standpoint of the other as his own. According to him, standpoint is the core of role concept. He describes three general standpoints. First, a person may adopt the other's standpoint as his own, identify with other's role and it becomes a guide for his behavior. Second, the role of the other is viewed as a depersonalized norm or from the view of a third party, and "supplies datum necessary for implementing a third party directive". Third, the role of the other may be the standpoint of "its effect in interaction" as contributing to shared purposes. But in none of these theories is the dynamics for assuming a role posited. These theories do not explain why a person assumes certain roles nor the motivational impetus with reference to individual meaning. When the role of the other is used as
a mirror phenomena, as "reflections of a looking glass self" (Cooley, 1922) then the construct reflexive-non-reflexive is employed.

Reflexiveness refers to the "characteristics of the self as an object to itself" (Mead, 1934). Turner's concept of standpoint and reflexiveness are combined to differentiate the types of role taking that occur in a self-other role. Turner specifies six types of reflexive role taking. His typologies range from non-reflexive role taking by adoption of the standpoint of others without self-consciousness, to reflexive role taking in which self image is manipulated by the actor to achieve self goals.

Turner believes his types of role taking have implication for the concept of empathetic behavior, and he attempts to correlate reflexive role taking into specific qualities of empathy. To the writer, it would appear that role taking, role playing and reflexiveness would be differentially related to sympathy and empathy dependent upon the type of role assumed and the quality of reflexiveness.

To understand reflexiveness in role taking an attempt must be made to differentiate the underlying dynamics within the individual that are conducive to the quality or type of role performed. Major theoretical problems are focused on the isolation of variables which determine the self-other interaction. The locus of control for behavior, the cognitive formulation of norms (behavior expectations) as understood in context of the reality of the situation, and the type of self involvement must be accounted for. Turner's role types are informative and clarifying but he
does not discuss imaginative role taking, playing-at-roles or overt performance of role demands as does Coutu (1951).

Coutu distinguished the imaginative construction of a role (he called this role taking) from the overt enactment of role by pretense or sham (called playing-at-a-role). When Coutu defines role taking as the actor "imagining what the other person thinks he is supposed to do" it appears similar to Mead's taking the attitude of the other during the role process. However, the problem of explaining how the self as a process is developed by relating role to self has not been adequately accomplished by these theories. They mainly describe how the self relates to and fits into society, by the emphasis placed on the self-other interactional behavior.

Sarbin (1954, 1968) discussed the self involvement as aspects of organismic involvement and differentiated seven levels of role and self in terms of organismic expended effort. He states that learning of social roles is dependent upon the ability to treat an object or event as if it were something else. Sarbin contends that classification of concepts can occur only when one is able to adopt the concept of as if, so that disparate objects can be grouped by common concept elements and "since roles are organized concepts, taking the role of the other then is not possible without the as if ability." (Biddle and Thomas, 1966, Sarbin, p. 199)
Sarbin relates the as if ability to a skill or aptitude and it is applicable to "understanding diverse kinds of conduct" and as a condition conducive to hypnotic suggestibility (Sarbin, 1950). Sarbin attempted to show that enacting the role of a hypnotized person is "a function of the veridicality of the role perception, congruence of role with the self, and role taking aptitude." The latter he defines as the as if behavior.

Feffer and Gourevitch (1960) also attempted to study role taking ability specifically as a cognitive developmental task, correlating closely to the ability to structure a physical reality.

Piaget has been a vital force in describing for psychology the formulation of concepts of objects, space, time and physical causality, all related to the construction and understanding of reality. With the development of the acquisition of language (socially structured system of collective signs) thought is transformed by new social relations. At the level of intuitive thought social influences bear heavily on cognition, and the formation of reciprocity and cooperation in social acts are considered as necessary prior formations for development of logical thinking. Logical thinking has basis in relational properties. For an individual to be capable of relational operations he must be able to conceive of reciprocity, mutuality and conditional states and view or see objects from multiple bases. In other words, he must be capable of decentrism, differentiating his own viewpoint and viewing
things from other perspectives. It appears that decentrism becomes a parallel construct for Turner's standpoint concept, and includes the ability to coordinate viewpoints of others into ones' cognition so that restructuring and elaboration of cognitions occur and acquire new meanings.

Piaget states:

"as early as 1½ to 2 years the symbolic function appears: language, symbolic play (the beginning of fictional invention), deferred imitation, i.e., occurring some time after the original event, and that kind of internalized imitation which gives rise to mental imagery. As a result of the symbolic function, representation formation...the internalization of action into thoughts, becomes possible." (1957)⁴

It has been suggested by the present writer that with the development of symbolic play, a form of role that has not been described by theorists, ignored by them or ambiguously included, is the differentiation of role into role taking, role playing and role figmentizing (fantasy of imagination). The descriptive analysis of role by Coutu approximates this differentiation, but there is confusion as to the concepts "playing-at-a-role, and role playing." Coutu does not attempt to separate role play (as a performance in keeping with environmental demands) from role figmentizing (as an enactment in accordance with an

⁴Actions in immediate environment are coordinated with past actions, mainly on a behavioral level since the child does not yet possess the operations that enable him to represent them precisely as thoughts.
imagined or inner constructed reality). He uses the phrases "sham or pretense" but the problem rests in determining where the sham behavior is manifested; is it to fool others, in doing what they expect in order to satisfy them, thus, becoming a cognitive-motor function; or is the creation of a fantasy in which the individual cognitively-affectively participates?

Some researchers in role study use as if conditions for role performance. A literature review shows that sociodrama, psychodrama, sensitivity groups have been described as performing what has been defined as "taking a role", as role playing and role taking interchangeably. There needs to be a clarification as to what is occurring in the participants in these types of prescribed conditions. Are some participants role playing, others role taking, and some role figmentizing? And, if so, what is the predictable behavioral result of their role assumption?

Turner discounts the taking of a role as provided by sociodrama settings when the usage detached the role from their implied definition as to how the actor defines his role. Turner defines role taking as the manner in which a self-other relationship gives a directive as to what the behavior will be. In other words, role taking appears to involve

5 See Chapter III for differentiation of these forms of role behavior.
cognitive activity, but Turner does not define how and around what types of concepts the cognitions are formulated, organized and interpreted.

Sarbin states that the concept of self has "utility" specifically in connection with role expectations. Agreement between role expectations and self conceptions may vary from overlap to incongruency. "Folklore and recent research support the hypothesis that role enactment is more convincing, proper and appropriate under conditions of self-role congruence, and less convincing, proper and appropriate under conditions of incongruence." (Sarbin, 1968). But the question that plagues the psychologist attempting to study the interaction of self and role is what are the dynamics that underlie an incongruent relationship or that motivate an individual to "less convincing, proper or appropriate role behavior?"

The current popularity of role enactments, useful as a technique in sensitivity groups report differential changes in members of the group. Why have some individuals benefited or changed their self meanings and identity concepts, and their attitudes and relationships with others, whereas other individuals have not?

**Social identity and role:**

Sarbin (1968) attempted to clarify his original emphasis of self involvement in role expectations to include an emergence of a social identity. Role theorists assume that a social identity develops from
interactions with members of complimentary statuses. An individual gains a "looking glass self" (Cooley, 1922) dependent upon the type of external reinforcements offered, and determined by his social conduct.

Sarbin and Kulik (1965) describe social identity as those cognitions developed from "placement in the social ecology". This definition is dependent upon the location of self and others. Social identity is interpreted as the individual valuing the evaluations of his role enactment by significant others who have the rightful power to make an evaluation, (e.g., a coach praising a swimmer, or a critic judging an actor). These evaluations according to Sarbin and Kulik would constitute his concepts of self. This viewpoint appears to deny the establishment of personal standards of value and personally constructed goals by which individuals can transcend the values of their present society. The implication from Sarbin and Kulik's work is that identity concepts are by-products of others' evaluation. The question raised by the present writer is to what cognitive constructions are the evaluations of others processed as "feedback"? Sarbin and Kulik have stated that external criteria form the bases for identity concepts, whereas the present writer offers the position that identity concepts are cognitively constructed and exemplified in social roles. Others' evaluation of the concept manifestation is processed as feedback, modifying or substantiating the identity concept.
Recent empirical studies of role:

Janis and Mann (1965) attempted to illustrate that valuations, involvement and status create a change in behavior. A heavy smoking female was required to act the part of a lung cancer patient facing surgery. Her performance involved observable physiological changes in her emotional state. When her attitude responses towards smoking were compared to the subjects listening to a playback of a taped recording of the performance, it was shown that the actor was more anti-smoking than the listerners. There were behavioral differences or discrepancies observed in the experimental subjects. The question raised by the present writer is, "why did the acting subject's attitude change so differently than did the listening subjects?" What factors in the role conditions effected an attitude and behavior change?

Other experimental attempts at role "playing" and involvement have produced varied effects. Some examples of these experimental conditions are briefly presented to show how researchers are attempting to grapple with the as if condition, role playing phenomena, the question of reality and individual involvement.

In order to understand the effects of role playing on hypnotic susceptibility in children, London and Madsen (1968) report that "when children deliberately attempt to take the role of a hypnotized person it interferes with their subsequent ability to be judged involved by experimental observers." Their results suggest that the child who has
been subjected to role playing the part of a hypnotized person "by simulation of the hypnotic experience" is thereby inhibited when he has to switch roles and become deeply involved. It seems that role playing (fulfilling the cognitive-motor demands of the situation) does not automatically become a role taking situation (testing hypothesized identities).

Freedman (1969) discusses the problem of research for the social scientist. The effects of experimenter bias has been well documented by Rosenthal (1966). Demand characteristics and acquiescence may arouse suspicion as to the validity of social data. In order to alleviate the problem of questionable, ambiguous results, social scientists have begun to substitute "role playing" as an independent variable, by which forced compliance situations have created cognitive and behavior variations (e.g., Festinger's work). The problem as he sees it is with the use of "role playing" as pretense of actual behavior, e.g., pretending to be afraid and asking the subject how he feels.

"The basic difference between this and the usual method is that the subject in the role playing study is trying to tell you how he would behave if he were in a particular situation while the subject in the regular experimental condition is behaving".

The data from the former are opinions or guesses; the data from the latter are actual behavioral responses. What Freedman appears to be saying is that one type of research involves hypothetical imaginative creations whereas the other condition involves reality based overt performances.
Freedman stresses,

"Presumably, the more realistically the situation is made, the closer it is to reality, the better able the subject should be to imagine what he should actually do if he were in the real situation."

Bem (1968) states that role playing techniques is a "simulation and not the same as the real situation." He appears to be interested in "how various facts change people's guesses about other peoples' behavior or attitudes." Freedman adds that role playing technique "has no possibility of producing realism or spontaneity since the essence of role playing is the lack of these qualities...it's peoples' guesses as to future of hypothetical situations." Is this complaint actually about role playing, (the acquiescence to situational demands) or does it concern role pigmentizing (imagination and fantasy constructions)?

In a "role playing situation" Levinger and Moreland (1969) attempted to test whether attraction varies directly with interpersonal similarity and whether exposure to threat leads to a desire to affiliate with others who face the same fate. They tested interpersonal social schema by means of a grid in which silhouette figures representing self-other are placed on a neutral background. Placement is believed to be dependent upon subjects' personal cognitive schema or image representation for that interpersonal relationship. They found some degree of success with their technique but discussed its usefulness and limitations:
Regarding its role playing aspects the study succeeded in confirming a 'perceptual' hypothesis—that perceived similarity leads to person-other attraction; it was relatively unsuccessful in confirming an 'emotional' hypothesis—that felt fear leads to person-other approach. Apparently, it was easier for subjects to play out the more observable than the less manifest implications of their roles... It seems that unless more is learned about how to induce more realistic involvement under 'role play' instructions this technique will have only limited applicability.

They also queried about the type of systematic conditions under which 'role playing' subject's involvement is "most realistic and vivid?", and "what are the demand characteristic of the subject's psychological situation?"

Inherent problems in role studies:6

Experimental controls must be determined as differentiating the self demands from the perceived external demands the subjects acknowledge or those with which they refuse to comply. There are inherent problems in these role situations besides the interchangeable role terminology. The deeper problems center around the type of self involvement, motivation for behavior, and construct of reality. Some of the researchers stated that they felt their subjects were assumed not to be involved—what do they mean? Is it that the subject did not perform in keeping with the experimental demands or script requirements; or

---

6 The problems presented in this section are the foundations upon which the writer's role behavior postulates were developed. They are discussed in Chapter III.
that the subjects created their own situations, perceived as different than the situation created by the experimenter; or that the subjects were not perceiving an identity conceptualization in the part they were to perform and did not "place themselves" into the experiment? Each of these types of reactions affect the result of the experiment in a qualitatively different way. The behavioral result of the performance is not necessarily similarly manifested. The type of self involvement becomes crucial in a role experiment if results are to be generalizable so that predictability of behavior can be attempted.

The second level of confusion involves motivation. How are the demands and expectations perceived by the subjects? Are the demands intrinsically motivated and respond to self reinforcement or extrinsically motivated by external reinforcements. Reinforcement is both censure and reward. Do the subjects become self reinforcing by self satisfaction, abasement, or denigration, or are they motivated to perform in the role situation by the rewards or punishments placed upon them by the significant others with whom they interact?

The problem of reality enters into role studies. What has been criticized as "role playing" by researchers hinges upon the as if condition. The subjects are asked to behave as if, or to pretend, that a certain condition exists. When the situation demands a certain perception to occur, this creates a hypothetical condition which becomes a cognitive function. When subjects are asked to describe
how they would react in the hypothetical situation they are being asked to cognitively formulate a probable situation and to offer a possible behavioral result. The writer agrees with the experimenters who argue that peoples' guesses do not tell how people actually act, but how they think they will act. Their "guesses" are based on their interpretation of a cognitively constructed (hypothetized) situation not necessarily based on actuality, but created by hypothetical deductions. Prior to understanding as if situations, the underlying confusion as to reality--non-reality must still be determined.

When a person is asked to imagine or fantasize a situation, he is required to construct an inner view not necessarily in keeping with the external actualities that exist at that moment. However, is it correct to state that the situations that require or demand a subject to act as if are unrealistic? The experimental demands as perceived by both the experimenter and the subject are real, based on the reality of the experimental situation. The unreality dimension can only exist within the cognitive constructions of each subject. He fantasizes or pretends situations of his own cognitive manufacturings, not those that are externally postulated. In a pretense situation the person is responding to an inner reality construction, one that he has hypothesized as existing. Hypothesizing is a propositional cognitive level. There are as many solutions as there are hypothetical deductions. Hypothetical pretense situations allow freedom of
individual choice not necessarily restricting the individual to consider the social demands that are expected as proscriptions against individual behavior deviation.

Self involvement has been determined primarily by degrees of physiological change, but are there also certain conceptualizations concerning the self that are crucial in self involvement? Can hypothesized identities, those concepts by which the individual defines his location, existence, attitudes of self and his own meaning, be involved in some forms of role and not in others?

There also comes a point when role playing becomes a role taking situation. When the results of an individual's performance are evaluated in terms of the expectations of the performance, the affective feedback is incorporated (integrated) into his cognitions and evaluated in terms of his value system. The new cognitive organizations enable the individual to hypothesize different concepts of self and to test these hypotheses in a social reality--hence he role takes the hypothesized identities. Role playing involves a manifested behavior. It is assumed that, eventually, performing certain motor activities (overt behaviors) will create an attitude change in that individual. Attitudes are related to the beliefs and cognitions of the individual. Thus, a change in attitudes is a change in cognitive-affective structures. Concepts are organizations of cognitions in some relational arrangement. Self concepts are the results of cognitions relating to the self.
When a role playing performance becomes self-reflexive, the actor considers the effects of his actions on others but also pictures himself as an object for evaluation. This evaluative feedback is integrated into the cognitive-affective core of the individual and can modify previous concepts of self and changes a role-play situation into a role-take situation.

Role taking which is non reflexive is role pigmentizing. When a person does not consider the feedback from his environment, but considers it as non existent or inconsequential to his concepts, he is not assimilating the cues of his environment and cannot accommodate to the realities of the situation. Turner feels this is playing-at-a-role although that description is ambiguous. People play at many roles during their life but the level of reality is not always the same. Turner claims that playing house is role taking because a young child by identifying with the mother, "adopts her standpoint", and adopts what he thinks are her attitudes of the role. But Turner denies the factor of imagination by which an inner construction of reality is purposely responded to, disregarding the demands of "reality". People "who adopt the standpoint of others and by identifying with them, formulate identities", may be role taking but they may be also pigmentizing the reality if the situation. Their role enactment is not involved in a self-other social act, but in a self imaginary conditional context. When a role assumption involves testing of an identity, and is related to reality
(perceptions of behavior expectations of self and others), and is reflexive to the self, it is considered as role taking. When it is not reflexive, it is role pigmentizing. When a role assumption involves the performance of behaviors in keeping to the expectations of the demands of the situation, but is not a test of conceptualizations of self, and is non-self-reflexive, it is role playing or social conformity. When it becomes self-reflexive it progresses to a role taking situation. When a role assumption involves the trying out of identities in fantasy or imagination and is not reflexive to the demands of the actual environment, it is role pigmentizing. When it becomes reflexive, then it has become a role taking situation.

However, the motivation for the role assumptions and the loci of control of the behavior must be accounted for before a role statement is completed. Roles permit an individual to organize, identify, define, hypothesize and test concepts of self in a social reality and in his idiosyncratic thought processes. In egocentric thought processes, man does not test himself in relation to others but to internal criteria. If evaluation by others is not included into his cognitions, he develops autistically and cannot accept other perceptions and expectations as part of his self evaluations. Without the reflexive nature of role, an individual cannot fit into a predictable social unit, because he cannot learn to modify his behavior in keeping with social expectations or sociocultural norms.
The reflexiveness, intrinsic-extrinsic motivation, and reality components of role have strong impact on the reasons for role enactments as they relate to self and society. Since each person is an individual, his cognitive-affective structures, developed by his actions and reactions on the environment, are idiosyncratic. As fingerprints are unalike, each person develops his own cognitions and meanings of self, but a common basis of culturally prescribed expectations in the form of shared experiences and demand roles offer a social regularity to role behavior. Because individuals are different, differences may appear in the way each one interprets situations and behaves. But the commonality that exists in social expectations lends a degree of predictability as to what each person expects to occur in the social interchange. This behavior expectation enables him to posit concepts of self for (1) confirmation or negation by consensus opinion, and (2) self evaluation of the results of his role enactment.

Statements regarding the psychological relation of roles to self:

The historical and traditional concept of role had emphasized a socio-psychological examination of role demands. The major variable, role expectation, was described by its sociological-psychological antecedents and consequences. However, it is deemed imperative to examine roles from a psychological view point to ascertain whether role study can have value for understanding human behavior especially as it
relates to the individual and to predictability of his probable behaviors. As stated previously, the assumption of living organisms as open systems, implies "all things are possible" view, that the system is constantly undergoing change. The ability of human organisms to act, to possess awareness and to perform in accordance with learning, establishes regularity and enables a probability condition for behavioral prediction to emerge. Probability of prediction does not define a closed system but implies that patterns of action can develop as a result of learning. The study of self is at times considered too mentalistic a concept for psychological study because the possibilities of self development are open and inferential, hence unpredictable. With the inclusion of roles, concepts relating to self can be observed as the self manifested through certain behavior. If self can be manifested in role behaviors, then it is assumed that role behavior can be studied for variables that will enable the social scientist to predict the probable consequences of effects of self on behavior. With this purpose in mind, the writer has attempted to tackle the study of self by assuming that self is manifested in certain role behaviors. Attempts will be made to specify certain conditions for self manifestations through role behaviors in Chapter III of this dissertation.
APPENDIX B

TERMINOLOGY IN ROLE BEHAVIOR
Self and identity concepts:

Chapter II begins with the problems that have occurred as a result of semantic implications of "self". Munroe's (1955) discussion of self systems states, "Self theories have left the concept too far undifferentiated with the result that it becomes a philosophical universal instead of a developmental construct". Buhler (1962) prefers to differentiate phenomenal self from core self, leaving core self to include both the organizer and organized principles of perceptions of self. She perceives it (as does Grinker, 1957) as a "superstructure, a resultant of self perceptions and experiences".

Self has presented many problems in description and definition. When self is described with reference to a person as having a self, then self becomes an entity, adding to and creating many methodological, philosophical and metaphysical difficulties. When self is equated with a development of a structured whole within an individual then this too, eventually creates an entity or part-within-a-part relationship of organism and organs, as mutually co-existing and developing.

When self has been described as a process, then conceptualizations formed during the self process become the emphasis.
As an example, when growth is described as a process then the conditions or subsystems that delineate the growth of the organism, such as height, weight, dental changes, any incremental changes, are the means of inferring the larger process. Since self is a process, self process could refer to "coherence, unity and purposiveness" (Allport, 1960) of the process. Then, the emphasis of scientific inquiry falls upon the organizing systems that are subsumed within the process. For a self as process theory, the subsystems would be the developments of concepts of self. The broader development or organization and systems of organizing relationships occur as a result of the developmental progression of the larger process. Self as process would represent the organization of past experiences that gives meaning and definition to the organism in its attempts to relate past with present and to anticipate a future possibility. Therefore self as process is theoretically assumed to be a process and is amenable to study by its contents (the developed and developing concepts which result from organismic behavior).

**Concepts of self:**

In this dissertation concepts of self are referred to as identity concepts. Identity concepts were formed by integration and differentiation of specific self referent "instances." These instances were representations of experiences formed from event-specific
behavior. Integration of instances constitute a concept of self from which the heterogeneous elements in the concept formation become the individuating aspect for an identity concept. These elements posit the self reference concept or identity concept, which can be manifested in role behavior for reality substantiation.

**Conceptualization:**

The term conceptualization refers to the process of forming concepts.

**Identity assemblages:**

This term refers to the organization and organizing systems of hierarchical systematizing (a flexible hierarchy) presenting the most salient or vital definition of self meanings to the individual of himself at any moment. An assemblage is the networking of various identity conceptualizations with role results, values and attitudes modifying concepts of self. These components are interrelated, organized and systematized to give self meanings. Thus, it becomes a structuring of the identity concepts (conceptualizations of self) but notes a flexible and stable organization. The identity assemblage is a developmental structuring of the self process and is formed by cognitive-affective processes.
Reflexive:

Reflexiveness in role concepts refers to the "characteristics of the self as an object to itself" (Mead, 1934) or as the individual's concern with the way he appears in a social interaction.

Reflexiveness is similar to the concept of self consciousness. Reflexiveness is the act of directing an action back upon the doer of the act. In this dissertation an act is self-reflexive if the results of the enactment are directed back upon the actor (doer) are are integrated into his cognitive structures as affective feedback qualifying concepts of self. Non self reflexiveness occurs when role behavior is performed only in accordance with others' demands. Non self reflexive behavior is interactive but the results of outcomes of behavior are not incorporated into cognitive structures as self related information but as performance evaluations or information. Hence the feedback does not immediately qualify concepts of self. (See pages 72–75, Chapter III, for further discussion of the effects of feedback on cognitions and concepts of self.) Non-reflexive behavior is assumed to result from lack of interaction of self in reality contexts. Lack of interaction prevents reflecting feedback concerning self concepts from reality contexts.
Motivation—locus of control—reinforcement:

The definitions of these three terms are not mutually exclusive, for each contains aspects of the other. It is not the purpose to describe the philosophical genesis of motivation as inherent to all living systems. For the basis of this discussion motivation will be defined as a "specific hypothesized process that energized differentially certain responses" (English, 1958) and the "specific hypothesized personal or organismic determiner of the direction and/or strength of action or of a line of action."

Berlyne (1960) and Hunt (1965) have attempted to distinguish between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, relating the former to a homeostatic biological system, and the latter to a informational interactional discrepancy system. With the former, (extrinsic motivation) drive-reduction through consummatory acts theory is hypothesized to reinstate a balanced-quiescent state within an organism. The satisfaction or source of reinforcement is assumed to be extrinsic to the organism. In this system, the locus of control of outcomes of behavior is external to the organism. The loci of control is in externally scheduled reinforcements. Source of satisfaction for organismic condition is outside the organism and must be brought into the system. The external reinforcements, if sufficient, restore a homeostatic relationship to the unbalanced or disequilibrated condition within the organism.
Extrinsic motivation leads to the formulation of biological drives, and needs-reduction of noxious conditions theories in motivation.

Berlyne and Hunt each postulated that an intrinsic motivation is self reinforcing activity determined by the organism's informational interaction with his environment. The very condition of interaction is theorized as created by discrepancy of "coded stored information" and inputs from the event or contextual cues. The discrepancy is a basic condition that activates and directs the behavior of the organism, but it is self controlled by optional levels of difference. Recently Lewis (1969) has presented a summary statement as additional validity to the premise that self activation of organismic cognitive development is intrinsic motivation. Berlyne states the intrinsic motivation is affected by collative factors (novelty, complexity, surprisingness). Collative factors invoke such hypothesized behaviors as manipulation (Harlow, 1950) exploration and competence (White, 1952), or mastery. Reinforcement is located within the self process, for the satisfaction of informational interaction (experiential data) discrepancies of self and environment.

Reinforcement:

English (1958) defines reinforcer as a stimulus whose presentation is contingent upon occurrence of a response, and changes the probability of occurrence of the response. For intrinsic reinforcement
the reinforcer is self demands and self concepts exemplification. For extrinsic reinforcement, the stimulus is in the form of sanctions and demands of environmental contexts which the organism must meet or fulfill.

**Locus of control:**

The locus of control for behavior resides within the organism when the outcome for his behavior is no longer dependent upon external reinforcement. Rotter (1954) has described the psychological result on behavior when locus of control of behavior is either believed by the individual to be under his control (internal control) or under the control of others (external control). Locus of control of behavior is external to the self when the outcomes of behavior have been scheduled by others and are predictable by necessary response patterns to cue demands.

(See pages 64, 65, and 76 for additional comments relating to locus of control.)

**Reality:**

Reality could be considered as only that which is perceived, or selectively attended to by an individual. However, if reality is an egocentric construction, then the hypotheses an individual creates about himself do not undergo social validation. By not being able to reality test these concepts of self, the person does not integrate the reactions of others as feedback into his cognitive structures and
cannot modify his concepts to achieve socially confirmed, meaningful conceptualization of self.

On the other hand, reality is not simply a knowable thing nor does it result from a process outside of the individual. The process of learning to perceive and to understand, is to adapt the inner cognitive constructions by integrating the outer aspects into them, to create new constructions. Cognitive organizations of reality involve the bringing of aspects of the environment into the existing mental "knowns" and altering the individual's cognitive structures to make them adaptable or similar in quality to the "knowns" of the environment.

Murphy and Spohn (1968) have attempted to define reality by reference to Karl Manheim's term of the "sociology of knowledge". The sociology of knowledge is:

the deep dependence of human thought forms, cognitive and affective, factual and evaluational, upon the structured tone and ethos of society at a given time...a "multidimensional" reality...a world perspective and a time perspective...which make us realize to what an extraordinary degree the mind is not only a biological-evolutionary product, given to creatures who have sense organs and nervous systems like our own, but how deeply it is dyed in the rich hues of a culturally defined way of living, looking, feeling, and dreaming. (p. 79)

A developmental task is to be able to adapt to a sociocultural norm. Reality is continuously self-edited and depends upon the perceiving, cognizing and valuing functions of all participants in a social act. Reality is the relative constructions of inner and outer aspects of the environment. The cognitive organizations that develop
must be flexible and relative. Reality then, is conceived as consensual verification and continuous self checking of perceptions. These processes enable reality testing to develop in which reality has psychological meaning and "is defined for each of us in terms of the degree of compatibility between specific evidence and the broader system of beliefs which have been set up as a criterion for individual living. Such individuality is subject always, of course, to the corrections of geography and culture within which individual adaptations occur" (Murphy and Spohn, 1968).

Therefore reality also is socially defined and the criteria for "what things are real" are established by the cultural groups of which the individual is a member. Reality then, is consensual agreement or verification and continuous self checking of perceptions.
APPENDIX C

ROLE AND SELF--INTERVIEW FORMAT
I am going to ask you a number of questions concerning attitudes and observations of your youth and adult life. Feel free to expound in any way that you see fit to the questions asked. The ideal situation would be if you can tell me of any instances or facts that come to your mind in relation to the subjects presented to you, and if the situation arises, tell me of any instances or attitudes that you can remember or that you have now. In other words, if you can, answer by illustration.  

Structuring of identity concepts:

Q. Give me the names of your brothers or sisters, their age, and what relation in age they are to you.

Q. Think of your best friends during childhood and adulthood, and also your closest relatives. These people may be old or young, but are those people you consider to be close to you. Tell me who they are and describe them with reference to you.

---

1 These questions are a guide format only. They are used to initiate discussion of self references and self views. The interviewer should direct his comments to the natural flow of conversation. When multiple questions are combined, they should be asked sequentially, to generate additional comments from the interviewee, and to redirect his responses back to his own concepts of self.
Q. Thinking of your brothers, sisters, or best friends and relatives, who would you consider most different from you? (Time-period reference to be asked if not stated by interviewee.)

Q. What ways do they differ from you, or what vital and important differences do you see?

Q. Compare yourself with the people that you consider most different from you. (Each person named)

Q. Thinking of your brothers, sisters, best friends and relatives, who was most like you?

Q. How were they like you? (What traits did you see in them that you have?) How do you compare yourself with them?

Q. Who do you think or consider as having played well together?

Q. Who fought and argued with each other?

Q. I realize that in many friendships there usually is a person that looked after or took care of others. Who was that and what did he do that would make you think that he took care of someone? Describe.
Q. Was there any illness, such as surgery, broken bones, etc.
in your family (include interviewee also) or among your close
friends that in some way affected you?

Q. Thinking of the basic list that we started out with, were
there anyone or anything that you considered to be strange
or uncommon, and if so, how?

Q. Considering the list (or anyone at all) who did you consider to
be the friendliest, and what made them friendly? Compare your­
self with that person.

Q. Who was the most intelligent or smartest person that you knew
or know? Compare yourself with that person.

Q. Who did you consider as the person who made the best grades
in school? Then compare yourself with that person.

Q. What was your favorite subject in school, or what did you like
to study while in school? What made you like that particular
subject?

Q. What was the subject that you liked least, or the subject that
you didn't like to study in school? What made you dislike that
subject?
Q. Who would you consider to be the most industrious person, and the one who worked the hardest? What, in your mind, made him seem industrious to you? Then compare yourself with that person.

Q. Who did you feel got things done? Give me an illustration. Compare yourself with that person.

Q. What person did the most work or helped the most, and where, e.g., at home or school, work? Give an illustration and compare yourself with that person.

Q. We know of a number of people that we consider as having the most complaints or "cries" the most. Tell me about a person like this and then compare yourself with this person.

Q. There are some people that say things wrong most of the time, and always seem to get into problems because of this. Do you know of any? If so, tell me the type of things that they probably do say. Compare yourself with this person (if the interviewee did not describe himself).

Q. Who do you know that says that he is always unhappy? (Illustrate, if you can, and then compare yourself with that person.)
Q. Who do you know that feels that life is rather unfair to him, a person that complains most? Tell me what he is like, and then compare yourself with him.

Q. In every group we know that there is one or two people that appear to quarrel the most. Do you know of such a person? Give me an illustration, if you can, and then compare yourself with that person.

Q. Who do you know that sulks the most? What makes them sulk? Compare yourself with that person.

Q. What person do you know that causes the most mischief, either because he wants to or because he just does? Give me an illustration, and then compare yourself with that person.

Q. Thinking again of your friends and family (past and present), who would you say is the most conforming or most obedient? How are you like or unlike the person?

Q. Every family has a certain set of values that is more or less spelled out to them in their youth. In thinking of your family, what were the values that were important to your family? What were those things that were not allowed by your parents? Did
you conform? How? Was and is there anything that you did or do not conform to?

Q. I am sure that you know people that are openly rebellious, people that never did things that other people wanted them to. Do you know such a person? Describe, and then tell me how or in what ways you are like or unlike that person.

Q. Many people don't like to be bossed around, and yet there are some who can take it and some who can't. Who do you know that doesn't like to be bossed around? What particularly irks them? Illustrate, if possible, and then compare yourself with that person. How did you react in a specific situation?

Q. Who do you recall appeared to be punished the most; for instances, was yelled at, whipped, or spanked? Who was this punishment administered by, and for what reasons? How did you compare?

Q. We all feel that we, at one time or another, have been picked on and we often feel sorry for ourselves; but who do you recall that appeared to be picked on and felt more sorry for themselves than what is normal? Compare yourself with that person.
Q. Who do you consider to be a moody person? Do you consider yourself moody, in comparison? How, or why not?

Q. In any family or group situation, moods affect others. Was the rest of the family influenced by your moods? How?

Q. Who could you make unhappy with your moods? Did you go out of your way to cause anyone unhappiness?

Q. When you got into a particular mood, whom did you pick on or react to and why?

Q. Thinking of all your friends, who was the most popular with the other kids? (What made them popular? How did you compare?)

Q. Who was the most easygoing with the other kids? What made him appear easygoing? How do you compare?

Q. Many of us like to be by ourselves, but some prefer it more than others. Who do you remember as liking to be by himself? (Compare yourself with that person.)

Q. In every group there is a person that goes out of his way to please others and tries to do things that make other people happy.
Do you know such a person? What can you remember that would give you this impression? (Compare yourself.)

Q. Think of a person that is always critical of others—someone that says that other people are not right or are not good. I am thinking of an over-critical person. Compare yourself with that person.

Q. An attribute that some people have is their consideration to others. Think of someone that you consider in this vein and then compare yourself with that person.

Q. Selfishness is a trait that most of us have to some extent. Who do you know that you would consider to be selfish, a person that wants everything for himself? What do you think makes him selfish? (Compare yourself to this person.)

Q. Many people easily get their feelings hurt, and are considered to be sensitive. Think about a sensitive person that you know and describe him in terms of this feeling. (Compare yourself with him.)

Q. Who always wants his own way, and demands his own way? Describe these demands. (Compare yourself with this person.)
Q. Who do you know that gets his own way, seems to be the most independent, or does things when he feels like doing them? Describe. (Compare yourself.)

Q. Some of us are considered to have quite a temper. Tell me about someone that gets mad easily. (Compare yourself.)

Q. A sense of humor is most important. Tell me about someone that you consider to have a good sense of humor—one that laughs a lot. How do you rate in humor, compared with this person?

Q. Who do you know that enjoys making other people laugh? Describe. (How do you compare yourself?)

Q. Think of a person who likes to "yak" it up more than other people, or jokes more than other people. What puts him in this category, as far as you are concerned? (Compare yourself to him.)

Q. Think about a "kid" who is a pleasure to have around and describe him. Do you think you were a pleasure to have around? Be specific, e.g., why, how, and where.
Q. There are all degrees of sweetness, niceness and charm. Who do you know that has the most charm and is the sweetest or nicest toward people? Tell me about him. (Compare yourself.)

Q. Tell me who you consider as the easiest to get along with, and what makes him easy to get along with. Do you think you are easy to get along with?

Q. Athletics plays an important part in most of our lives. Who do you consider to be the most athletic or good in sports? (Compare yourself.)

Q. I am looking for someone who you consider to be strong. Tell me what makes that person strong. Do you consider yourself strong in comparison?

Q. Who do you think is the best looking person, either male or female, that you know? Describe this person. Compare yourself and tell me how you are similar or dissimilar.

Q. Idealistic qualities mean different things to different people. Who do you consider to be idealistic? What does idealistic mean to you? Would you consider yourself idealistic? How?
Q. Many people like to possess "materialistic" things. To whom is this important? What type of things does this person possess? Are you "materialistic?" How?

Q. There are different standards of right and wrong, and yet there are some people that always seem to know what is right and wrong, and will always tell you what course to follow. Do you know such a person? Give me an illustration. Do you consider yourself to have a good standard of right and wrong? Tell me about it.

**Parental Figures**

I am going to ask you a number of questions about your parents. Try to answer them to the best of your ability.

Q. What is the current age of your father? (If deceased, note the age of subject when parent died.)

Q. Who did you consider to be your father's favorite child? (Not necessarily based on actuality but on your perceptions of the relationship.) Why would you consider that child to be his favorite? Describe a situation(s) that makes you feel that this child was your father's favorite. Who do you think is his favorite now?
Q. All parents have certain ambitions for their children. What was your father's ambition for his children? Did he ever sit down and talk to you about the future for you and his other children? What was your father's relationship to the children, either individually or as a total effect? Describe.

Q. Which sibling was most like your father? In what ways was he like your father? If possible, describe what made you feel that this was so.

Q. Tell me your mother's current age.

Who did you think or consider to be your mother's favorite child when growing up? Why do you consider this person to be your mother's favorite? What position did you hold in comparison? Who do you think is your mother's favorite child now?

Q. Did your mother have any pointed ambitions for her children, and did she direct you toward your future goals?

Q. What was your mother's relationship to the children of the family? Describe.

Q. Which sibling was most like your mother? Tell me how you came to this conclusion, or show a situation(s) that happened to make you feel this way.
Q. What was the nature of your parents' relationship? In other words, how did they react to one another, socially and on a personal basis. Describe.

Additional Parental or Adult Figures

Many of us are reared by our parents, and yet we look upon other people as parental figures. This may include aunts, uncles, grandparents, teachers, principals, neighbors—some authority that we personally went to for advice or security. Thinking back to your childhood...

Q. What person stayed in your memory as a parental figure? What made you choose that person or persons? Describe your relationship to them. (If you didn't have any, what do you think was a reason for this relationship or closeness not to occur in your life?)

Q. Do you still, if you had a parental surrogate figure, keep in contact with them now?

Q. Thinking of these people, tell me how they substituted for your parents in a particular situation. In other words, for a person(s) other than your parent to give you this feeling, he (they) must have filled some needs. What were these needs?
Q. Did you belong to clubs as a child? Did you ever participate in these clubs as part of a group, or as an individual? What did you do in these clubs? How did you behave with your group? Is there anything about the club that stands out in your memory?

Q. In your peer group, what type of persons are you attracted to? What makes them attractive to you, or what did you have in common?

**Personal Actions-Reactions-Roles**

We realize that we all act differently in different situations, and I am looking for an indication of how you behave or perceive yourself in a specific class or situation.

Q. How did you react in "class" (e.g., aggressive, defensive, antagonistic, etc.)?

Q. What kind of a student did you want to be?

What kind of a student did the teacher expect you to be?

How do these differ in your estimation?

Q. When meeting a new girl for the first time, there is a certain image that you want to portray in order to give the new girl a
certain impression of you. What do you wish to convey about
yourself, and how do you go about doing this? In what type
situations would you prefer to meet her and why? How do you
want her to perceive you, and how do you want her to
remember you?

Q. Describe how you put yourself into various situations.
Elaborate in incidents or by illustration of you in specific
interactions.

Q. What are your ideals (standards) for you and your behavior
with others?

Q. What type or kinds of things would you like to do with your
life?

Q. What are the kind of things in your life that you see as being
very important to you?

Q. What type of work would you like to be doing ten years from
now?

Q. How did you decide to go into your various occupations or
professions?
Q. How do you see yourself as a (fill in vocation)?

Q. How do you act with others in the role of (vocation or avocation)?

Q. What do you perceive are others' demands and expectations of you? (If any, be specific as to where and when others place these demands upon you?)

Q. Do you differentiate between work and an occupation? If so, how?

Q. What is the image or attitudes that you have about yourself at this point in your life? (Describe or illustrate by instances if possible.)

Q. When you meet a new fellow for the first time, whether he is a peer or on a different level, how do you react to that person? Give examples. What type of an impression do you want to create about yourself, and what type of an attitude to you have toward this new acquaintance?

Q. Some things we are today is based upon something we have from the past, such as attitudes, conceptions, experiences, etc. What do you perceive are the most important relation-
ships or happenings that have made you the type of person that you are today?

Q. What kind of work do you see yourself as doing? Why?

What kind of work can you see yourself as not doing?
Why?

Q. How important is work to you?

Q. What do you expect out of your work?

Q. If you have a personal legacy to leave behind, how would you like to be remembered? How will you be remembered?

Q. What are the things that you do not attribute to yourself that others might? In other words, many peoples' analysis of you in a situation may or may not be the way you actually perceive yourself. How are their expectations different than what you are?

Q. Can you give me some "recollections" about yourself? Describe in details what you did, (others did, if any) where, when, why it (each one) happened.

Q. You may often find that you dream, and in many cases where work is boring, we daydream. Tell me what your
current dreams are, and what is your part in the dreams.
What is your reaction to your dream when you awaken?

Q. Do you have a recurrent dream(s)? (What are they? Describe.)
Were you in your dreams?

Q. There are childhood dreams that stick out in your mind. Tell me if you can recall any of them, and your reaction to them.

Q. Do you daydream? What do you imagine yourself doing, or being? Do you have a favorite daydream? What are your fantasies in terms of yourself? Describe how you are involved in your fantasies. What do you do and how does that compare with the way you are in reality?

Q. What type of games did you play as a youngster? What type of games did you play along, and in a group? Did you initiate the play situations? Were you a follower or a leader in these games? Explain.

Q. Describe yourself in body size, stature, and looks, etc. as a child; and, if you wish, this can cover a number of periods in growing up.

Q. Compare yourself or describe how you see yourself today.
Q. How do you like to imagine yourself as looking at the present?

Q. How do you have to appear to others in your occupation, recreation, church, and other groups? (In terms of their expectations of you.)

Q. Describe what types of standards you have set (for yourself) in terms of: yourself, your work, your wife, your future, and your life, and whatever else you feel is important to you.

Q. In terms of those things that directly effect the way you see yourself, what are the things you fear most?

Q. Compare your childhood fears to your present ones.

Q. Tell me about your childhood ambitions. What did you think you were going to be when you grew up?

Q. Tell me about your present ambitions.

Q. If I were to give you three wishes, what would they be (have been) as a youngster? What would they be now?

Q. Tell me about the most outstanding person or persons you know. What, in your mind, makes them seem outstanding? Compare them to yourself.
Q. Describe your personal assets, those things that make you, you. How have you made use of these assets in your everyday life?

Q. There are many things that we do when we don't really want to do them. What do you do that is expected to you, that you don't really want to do? Describe.

Q. What are your most important attitudes or beliefs about yourself? Compare these with the way that you see yourself?

At this point I am going to summarize quickly many of the points that we have already covered. What I am attempting to do is to recap some of the points, and you can condense your answers if you wish, or you may want to elaborate further on some of the answers that you gave to my previous questions, since you now have had time possibly to think more about the questions that were presented to you.

Q. Tell me about the pressures that you felt within the family, and tell me about the family atmosphere and their moods.

Q. How did the family attempt to educate you, and also cover the habits, practices, ideas, or values that they instilled in you or passed on to you? How did others influence you in terms of those things you just mentioned?
Q. Give me a general impression of you, growing up.

Q. Give me a general impression of you, in relation to others—both growing up and as an adult.

Q. With whom did you confide, and why did you pick that particular person?

Q. Did you ever keep personal notes about anything that has ever happened to you; e.g., a diary, notes, or letters. If these were kept, why did you keep them?

Q. Looking over the years, what do you see as typical of yourself and consistent with the way you see yourself?

Q. What were your impressions of self-frustrations and how have you tried to overcome or cope with them?

Q. Your parents or siblings may consider certain things extremely important, and yet you may not. What is important to them that is not important to you; or what is important to you that is not important to them; and how did you go about achieving your desired results?

Q. What are some of the responsibilities that you have undertaken?
Q. What are some of the responsibilities that you are required to fulfill?

Q. Have you ever, or do you assume responsibility for others? How?

Q. Some of us stray from the path taken as a youth. If this applies to you, when have you begun to see a reconciliation or a reconnection with your roots? In other words, have you seen a reconnection from where you began to where you are now?

Q. In terms of your concepts of self and standards for self, how do you define yourself in terms of good, bad, right, or wrong?

Q. Has marriage or prospects of marriage altered those things that you feel are important about yourself, or those things that you strive for?

Q. If something happens to prevent you from being a professional in your field, what else would you be?

Q. What would you not be, under any circumstances? Why?

Q. You are made up of or hold certain concepts that make you an individual, or that make you, you. Of all the things you are,
which are the most important percepts or concepts you hold about yourself?

Q. How do you feel about the way you see yourself, in terms of your ideals?

Q. What are the values of those things by which you gauge or judge how close you come to your ideals?

Q. In what types of situations do you not show people what you are like; e.g., if you are an overly sensitive person, in what situations do you not show this? Explain what you do.

Q. When people demand certain performances from you, how do you overcome or comply with these demands? Why would you do this?

Q. To what extent do you do things that are not really like you? Why? How do you feel in performing these expectations?

Q. To what extent do you do things that you really don't want to do, in terms of your concepts of self (e.g., feign interest in a vocation, or act like a leader, or a mediator, or a boss, or dependable when you don't perceive yourself with this quality)?
Q. What are those things that you imagine yourself doing that you haven't been able to do or don't see yourself as doing in real life (e.g., imaginary roles)?

Post Interview

Q. Do you have any additional things you wish to state in reference to yourself, the things you do or the way you are?
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