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ABSTRACT

The operating assumption for this study was that each of three identity styles [as determined by Berzonsky's (1988) Identity Style Inventory-Revised(ISI-2)] represents a distinct approach to processing self-relevant information. Differences in autobiographical memory recall and rating were predicted for the three styles. Identity style differences were hypothesized to reflect variations in the underlying identity processes leading to predictable differences in autobiographical memory recall.

The study was conducted in two phases. Subjects completed the ISI-2 during the first phase. The ISI-2 was used to differentiate the original sample into three categories of identity style: information-seeking, who remain relatively objective when processing self-relevant information; normative, who maintain their identity regardless of the nature of incoming self-relevant information; and diffused, who use a situationally specific approach to processing self-relevant information. Subjects reflecting a 'pure' style of processing were considered for the second phase of the study.

The second phase of research built upon the first. Subjects began the second phase by selecting from Landy's (1987) list of adjectives, words that are most 'like me' and words most 'not like me'. Subjects were then asked to generate an autobiographical memory for ten of these adjectives. Subjects rated the ten memories on six indices. The indices reflect the degree of self-definition that each memory provided the subject.
Information-seeking subjects reported a significantly higher importance rating for 'I would be different had the event not occurred' than did the other two identity style subjects. Normative and diffused subjects were not significantly different from each other.

Differences in autobiographical memory recall should be modulated by characteristics surrounding the retrieval process. Regardless of identity style, memories which confirm existing self-perceptions (generated in regard to "like me" adjectives) should be rated significantly more self-defining than were memories which brought existing self-perception into question (generated in regard to "not like me" adjectives). The results supported this hypothesis.

These results support the process model of identity articulated by Berzonsky. Different identity styles appear to use different autobiographical memory processes in this sample of young adults.
INTRODUCTION

This research examines autobiographical memory while paying close attention to the inter-relatedness of autobiographical memory recall and identity formation. According to the constructivist paradigm, autobiographical memory is best understood as a process of personal reconstruction as opposed to a reliable recall of personal events (Neimeyer & Metzler, 1991). This study builds onto that constructivist assumption.

Autobiographical memory refers to recalling one's personal life experiences. Robinson (1986) observed that the study of personal life events allows the interested investigator to learn about both the act of remembering and the subject engaged in such an act. Such an investigation begins with a clear definition of what constitutes the boundaries of autobiographical memory. Brewer (1986) defines autobiographical memory as the recollection of a particular episode in which the rememberer is centrally and specifically involved.

An important feature of autobiographical memory recall is the strongly held belief that such a memory is an accurate recollection of the original episode. Here it is instructive to contrast the idea of an autobiographical fact from a personal memory. An autobiographical fact is recall without any associated imagery while a personal memory contains mental imagery corresponding to a specific personal episode (Brewer, 1986).

It would not be hard to convince me that my autobiographical fact was incorrect if my recollection of graduating on May sixth was
challenged. On the other hand, it would be very difficult for me to give up my recollection that graduation day was a sunny and warm occasion should that personal memory be challenged.

Kelly (1955) was one of the first personality theorists to articulate a direct link between autobiographical memory recollection and one's self concept. In Kelly's model a person is only capable of constructing a limited number of bipolar dimensions (e.g., loyal versus disloyal). The person uses these bipolar dimensions (personal constructs) to interpret their day to day interactions in the world. Kelly assumed that personal constructs are unique to a given individual. One's personal constructs change over time and are hierarchically ordered. For Kelly, this self structure provides the only viable mechanism a person has for encoding memories which constitute the framework for a sense of identity.

Identity refers to having a relatively clear and stable sense of who one is and what one stands for. This means the person maintains a sense of familiarity of self throughout the diverse range of thoughts and feelings experienced over time. In addition, one's sense of self must match with the way other people view that person. This latter idea reflects the Eriksonian position that identity is grounded in both self and society.

Identity has its roots in childhood and continues to develop throughout adulthood. Erikson, however, views adolescence as the most significant period for identity development. Erikson (1968) argued that the issue of identity versus identity confusion is the
primary task to be negotiated during adolescence. The task is not so much who we are as much as it is a sense of who we might become. Research has supported this view by demonstrating that identity concerns are particularly prominent for late adolescence individuals. (e.g., Archer, 1982; Marcia, 1980; Meilman, 1979).

Marcia (1976) considers identity from three perspectives. First is the ability to integrate one's own expectations with those of their parents into a relatively congruent sense of self. Second is the development of a sense of identity which allows the person to know one's self as existing within a continuum of past, present, and future. The third perspective of identity is reflected in one's choice of career, values, and beliefs. It is this relatively congruent sense of self, built upon these three perspectives, that provides the underlying coherence distinguishing autobiographical memory from other memory domains.

The following literature review presents the position that autobiographical memory and identity formation are interrelated. This position is predicated on the idea that there are discrete styles of incorporating information regarding one's sense of self (Berzonsky, 1991). The sample chosen to test this position is drawn from Lehigh University's human subject pool. The late adolescent/young adult age range of this sample reflects the section of the life span primarily associated with Erikson's task of identity development.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Autobiographical Memory

For most of the past century psychological conceptions of memory have been based on knowledge acquisition. Hermann Ebbinghaus (1885/1964) is generally regarded as the first empirical psychologist to study memory. His focus on accurate recall pioneered the study of memory process.

Recent theoretical models of memory and memory process have become more dynamic by attempting to reflect more of the true ontology of the human memory. Dynamic modeling has led researchers to re-define hypotheses of what constitutes memory. Most of this modeling is based on information-processing.

When a person processes any information more than superficially they are said to be encoding that information. Encoding is the process of constructing a memory representation in the information-processing model. Encoding is how one builds their memory to represent the information they have been thinking about. This construction process can be something one is aware of doing (as in the use of mnemonics to remember the cranial nerves) or it can be accomplished without our being aware of it (as in the case of impression formation when you meet someone for the first time and are not aware you have formed a judgment about them).

At some later point one might have cause to think about that information again (probably during the next anatomy exam for the mnemonics example). The information is said to be retrieved from
storage (referred to as long-term memory). This retrieval process is an attempt to reconstruct the original information. Sir Frederic Bartlett (1932) described this reconstructive aspect of memory at length in his book Remembering. American psychologists largely ignored the reconstructive aspect of memory until Crovitz and Schiffman (1974) re-introduced this approach to memory.

Crovitz and Schiffman re-introduced Galton's (1879) prompting technique along with its taxonomic orientation to memory research. Building from the Galtonian word display technique, Crovitz and Schiffman framed their task as a search of the subject's personal memories. Subjects were instructed to think of a specific memory associated with each word presented. The primary difference of the revised word association technique was asking for a specific memory. Galton's original use allowed subjects to respond in an open-ended fashion that was not limited to personal memories. Memory research came full circle with Crovitz and Schiffman's modified word display technique for generating memories. Even so, autobiographical memory remains one of the least well developed areas of study within the broad domain of human memory research (Neisser, 1982).

This project seeks to address the nature and function of autobiographical memory. How best can underlying psychological mechanisms be identified and employed to understand autobiographical memory? Klein and Loftus (in press) suggest that several models have emerged out of the cognitive literature on
categorization. This review focuses on the view that the mental representation of one's identity is a summary representation abstracted from experience with multiple exemplars of one's past. Such a view proposes that the degree of self-descriptiveness of a trait can be determined by review of personal memories or by directly accessing knowledge of one's traits in memory. It is assumed that summary representations are directly accessed when they exist. Barclay offers such a model.

Barclay (1986) builds his theory on the identity formation, self-schemata, and self-prototypes literature. His answers lead us to seek the structures of the mind. Through these structures psychologists can organize and understand how one acquires an autobiographical memory system.

**The Constructivist Position Regarding Autobiographical Memory**

The constructivist approach assumes that autobiographical memory is better understood as a process of personal reconstruction implanted in a general developmental context of the emerging self (Neimeyer & Metzler, 1991). von Glassersfeld (1984) describes Giambattista Vico as the first true constructivist. Vico (1744/1968) characterized three constituents of memory: recall of the past (traditional aspect of memory), recall based on interpretation (memory as imagination), and recall as a shift in understanding (memory as invention).

Memory to accurately recall events that have transpired appears to be a uniquely human ability providing the basis for many
humanizing phenomena such as the development of culture. This is part and parcel of the Ebbinghaus tradition in memory research.

The interpretation component of memory illuminates its reconstructive ingredient. Verene (1981) explains the interpretive component of memory as approaching encoded information as if it were outside of ourselves. Memory as imagination emphasizes interpretation over faultless recall as derived from the Greek notion of fancy (image as the appearance of the original sense of the object). Memory as imagination is the decay of sense encodings which humans share with many other animals equipped with higher cortical capacities (Verene, 1981).

Memory as invention demonstrates how the operation of reminiscence contributes to meaning for the individual. To recall an event requires the ability to make sense out of it. Therefore, changing one's way of understanding will influence autobiographical memory recollection (Fitzgerald, 1986; Fivush, 1988).

The nature of autobiographical memory is a topic which concerns cognitive, developmental, personality, and social psychology. Despite differences in conceptualization and methodologies, psychologists from all perspectives share fundamental assumptions regarding autobiographical memory. One such assumption is that recall of past personal events is strongly influenced by the rememberer's present view of one's self and others (Ross & Conway, 1986).

George Kelly (1955) assumed personally meaningful memories
could only be encoded in relation to an existing self-structure. He
described self-structures as bipolar dimensions (e.g., loving versus
unloving). These bipolar dimensions are woven into hierachically
organized, dynamic, and ever-evolving networks. Networks are
unique to the individual and remain dynamic as a function of validation
or invalidation in the person's interactions with the environment.

Kelly's pretext provides a basic link between the processes of
self construction and autobiographical memory recall. The primary
assumption evolving from this position is that identity development
carries important implications for memory recall which concerns the
procurability and implementation of personally meaningful
recollections.

The Nature of Identity

Identity formation is the development of a consistent sense of
one's self. Erikson (1968) suggested that an individual's awareness of
their sense of self, and the consistency of one's view of self, is revised
over time in the context of social reality.

Erikson (1982) is the best known proponent of life-span ego
development. Erikson's theory of ego identity development frames
ego development in a lifespan change process. He argued that
everyone passes through eight developmental stages in route to
maturity and the possible achievement of wisdom. Erikson (1950,
1963) called his theory psychosocial to reflect his belief that people
develop in response to an interaction between psychological,
biological, and social forces.
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Erikson's theory is based on the epigenetic principle. This principle states that complex phenomena cannot be understood by reducing a phenomenon to its most basic level. New characteristics emerge at higher levels of complexity. Due to emergence, such characteristics cannot be explained by earlier levels.

Each stage has its own psychosocial task. These tasks represent a crisis that must be negotiated before one can proceed to the next stage. The task facing the adolescent is to synthesize their past, present, and future into a clear sense of self. This attempt to establish a sense of self is the search for identity.

Erikson coined the term *identity formation* as one of two opposing tendencies the individual must struggle between at the fifth stage of the model. The adolescent must answer four basic questions to resolve this stage of development: Who am I? What do I want? What are my values? What do I believe in? In answering such questions the adolescent is able to define and maintain a stable sense of identity.

Since the seventies there have been several studies which demonstrate that adolescence is a period of change in self-definition. One example is Montemayor and Eisen's (1977) examination of the development of self conception.

Montemayor and Eisen documented a sequential change in self concept development from childhood through early adolescence. This change process moved from a concrete to an abstract set of self definitions. Self definitions were measured by analyzing responses to
the question *Who am I?* in samples from early elementary school through senior high school grade levels. The younger samples used personal physical attributes to define themselves while older subjects used occupational roles and ideological concerns to define themselves.

**Identity Categories from Status to Style**

Erikson (1968) suggested that an individual's awareness of their sense of self, and the consistency of one's view of self, is revised over time in the context of social reality. The reflective capacity to know one's self must continually adapt to interactions with the environment for healthy development to proceed throughout the lifespan.

Research, emanating out of Erikson's theory, focusing on adolescent identity crisis and identity resolution is concerned with what changes might occur in an individual's identity status throughout their life span. Erikson (1959) defined identity crisis as a bipolar continuum ranging from identity resolution to role confusion. Therefore a subject might be located in one of any number of possible places on this continuum. Researchers such as Marcia (1964; 1966; 1980), Grotevant and Adams (1984), and Berzonsky (1989; 1990) have provided ways to describe these possible locations on the bipolar identity continuum.

Marcia (1966) provided two primary processes (commitment and exploration) in identity formation which have become the foundation for a rich empirical tradition over the past twenty-five
years. Commitment is the level of stability a person achieves regarding core values and beliefs. Exploration refers to the person's level of crisis in defining their identity commitments. Identity resolution occurs through an interaction of these processes when stable ego commitments develop. This results in an integration and continuity of self. Identity diffusion, resulting in confusion and avoidance, occurs when the individual fails to develop stable ego commitments.

Marcia's (1966) examination of these two primary identity process interactions led to four separate identity statuses. These are achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion. Achieved individuals have a firm system of commitments developed through an active process of identity exploration. Moratorium individuals are in the process of exploring alternative beliefs and have not yet settled on identity commitments. Foreclosed individuals demonstrate firm commitments but have done so without any active identity exploration. These individuals typically adopt a significant other's values as their own. Finally, the diffused individual lacks both a stable sense of identity and any process of exploration.

The past twenty-five years have yielded a continuing body of research in support of Marcia's identity status paradigm as a method for examining individual differences in identity development (Marcia, 1966; 1980; Berzonsky, 1988; 1989a; 1989b; Neimeyer & Rareshide, 1991). The four status's have demonstrated predictable differences along a multitude of intrapersonal and interpersonal measures.
While most research conceptualized the status paradigm as differential products, or outcome variables, Berzonsky (1986; 1987) proffered a process-oriented interpretation. This line of research demonstrated that each status differed in the way they process, structure, and utilize self-relevant information. Berzonsky (1988) builds on Kelly's (1955) person-as-scientist metaphor which views individuals as actively constructing reality as they live in it. Identity is conceptualized as both a self-formulated theory about oneself and an orientation toward self-theorizing. His "identity-as-theorist" view provides three identity styles: Information-seeking (scientific), Normative (dogmatic), and Diffuse (ad hoc).

The informational style seeks out, evaluates and utilizes self-referent information. The normative style draws from the standards of significant others instead of self-referent information. The diffuse/avoidant style procrastinates or employs situation-specific reactions to define a sense of self.

Each of the identity styles represent unique approaches to the processing and assimilation of self-relevant information and should provide predictable differences in autobiographical memory recall and rating. Specifically, it is anticipated that differences in the quality and significance of autobiographical memory will be found in the three categories of identity style.
A Framework for how Autobiographical Memory and Identity Styles are Related

Demonstrating the relationship between identity development and autobiographical memory requires an exploration of the interaction of one's individuality with memory process. Kelly (1955) argued that people develop knowledge about themselves much in the same way that scientists develop knowledge about world. The individual constructs increasingly complex networks of meaning through numerous bi-polar constructs. These constructs direct how interactions with the world are both perceived and stored, and later recollected.

Epstein's (1973) elaboration on Erikson's definition of identity suggests that awareness of this sense of sameness is tantamount to a personal theory about one's self. Epstein argues that self-concept is that which assimilates knowledge while being an object of knowledge. As such, this self-concept is described as "hierarchically organized and internally consistent... unified and differentiated at the same time; self-concept is a self-theory" (p. 407). This position builds directly from Kelly's theory and provides a direct linkage between personal construct theory and Erikson's theory of identity development.

One's personal theory is employed to maintain self-esteem, and organize daily experiences such that they correspond to schemes the individual can accept. Epstein argues that self theories embody the assumptions, concepts, and principles about the self that an individual
acquires over time. Further, Epstein sees the personal theory as a structure which functions to problem-solve and integrate information in different situations.

Self-schemata are "cognitive generalizations about the self, derived from past experience, that organize and guide the processing of self-referenced information contained in the individual's social experiences" (Markus, 1977 p. 64). Self-schemata offer two classes of cognitive representation. The first is information extracted from specific episodic events. The second is global information derived from repeated exposure to recurring events. Markus argues that self-schemata are constructions based on past information. These constructions become conscious while the individual seeks to categorize self-referenced material being generated in the present. Employing the constructivist position, this constructive process is more accurately described as a reconstruction of past events in order to reflect congruence with one's present style of processing information.

Barclay's (1986) model of autobiographical memory is built through schematization. "Schematization is the process through which generalizable action structures are acquired" (p. 88). This process is employed to both represent the outcomes of action, and to act as a regulator for future acts (Neisser, 1976). Authors such as Barclay (1986), Neisser (1976), Piaget and Inhelder (1973) postulate that the contents of one's thoughts are determined by an ongoing interaction between personal behavior and mental activity. Given
repeated exposure to similar types of activity, common features are noticed. These related features then 'become' the focus of the individual's mental effort. Barclay presents this as the path from which the information derived from daily activities 'become' represented cognitively. From this process of schematization, autobiographical material is organized into conceptual schemes. These schemes are comprised of everyday, self-referenced information which are categorically stored (Barclay, 1986). Meaning and purpose can be gained through understanding the autobiographical process used to shape our life story.

Brewer (1986) defines autobiographical memory as information related to the self. Autobiographical memory is a complex mental structure that includes conscious awareness through time, and knowledge about one's own behavior through time. While Brewer articulates five subsets of autobiographical memory, this research is only concerned with his construct of a personal memory. Brewer's description of a personal memory is a mental image corresponding to a specific episode in the rememberer's life.

Statement of the Problem

The proposed study is designed to investigate the relationship between identity formation and autobiographical memory retrieval, rating, and usage. The first factor under consideration is identity style as determined by Berzonsky's (1988) Identity Style Inventory-Revised. This study is based on the assumption that each of the three identity styles represents a distinct approach to processing self-
relevant information. These differences are hypothesized to reflect variations in the underlying identity processes leading to predictable differences in autobiographical memory recall.

Differences in autobiographical memory recall should be modulated by characteristics surrounding the retrieval process. Memories which confirm existing self-perceptions should be more easily accessed than memories which bring existing self-perception into question. In order to test this prediction subjects were asked to generate both self-confirming and self-disconfirming descriptive adjectives from a predetermined set. This comparison between 'like me' and 'not like me' adjectives constituted the second factor of this study.

The study took place in two phases. Two hundred and sixty subjects completed Berzonsky's (1988) Identity Style Inventory-Revised (ISI-2) during the first phase. The ISI-2 was used to differentiate the original sample into three categories of identity style; information-seeking, normative, and diffused.

The second phase of research built upon the first. Twenty subjects were selected from each of the categories of identity style. Subjects began the second phase by categorizing Landy's (1987) list of adjectives. The words were rated to provide the experimenter with the words most 'like me' and words most 'not like me' to each subject's sense of self.

Subjects were asked to recall the most salient memory that comes to mind in response to each prompt word. After all the
memories had been generated, subjects rated each memory using five indices. The indices reflect the degree of self-definition that each memory provides the subject. These indices include vividness of imagery; vividness of emotion; degree to which the memory is characteristic of the things I think about; degree of revelation of self to an outside observer; and, would I be different if this event had not occurred. This study was designed to examine how the three style types would differ in their memory ratings along these five indices. A sixth index measuring 'how long ago did this memory occur' was constructed such that it could not be statistically analyzed clearly.

**Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1.** The main effect for identity styles demonstrates a relationship between subjects using specific identity styles and differences in how they process self-relevant information. A main effect for identity styles was anticipated for the five continuous dependent measures. It was also anticipated that subjects using specific identity styles would differ in the degree of self-definition they acknowledged in rating autobiographical material.

**Hypothesis 2.** The main effect for prompt type demonstrates a predisposition to rate ‘like me’ events as more self-relevant than ‘not like me’ events irrespective of identity style. A main effect for prompt type was anticipated for the five continuous dependent measures.

**Hypothesis 3.** Subject ratings of autobiographical memory material was expected to demonstrate an interaction between
specific identity styles and the type of prompt used to generate the personal memories. An identity style x prompt type interaction was anticipated for the five continuous dependent variables measuring the relative importance of the self-defining material. Three styles of processing self-relevant information were expected to produce different ratings of memory material across both prompt types. These differences reflect the unique approach each style uses to processing self-relevant information.
METHOD

Phase 1: Pre-test

Subjects. Two hundred and sixty subjects were randomly drawn from the Lehigh University subject pool. One hundred and seventy-four (79 male and 95 female) of these subjects completed the pre-test. Subjects received credit towards their psychology class grade for participating in this study.

Procedure. Subjects completed a paper and pencil inventory conducted in a large group format (as part of a package of surveys distributed to the entire Lehigh University Subject Pool). Approximately thirty per cent of the original two hundred and sixty subject sample failed to return their completed surveys. A written debriefing was given to subjects upon completion of the first phase. The written debriefing explained that this session was a preliminary stage of the study and that subjects might be asked to return for a second session.

Measure. The Berzonsky (1988) Identity Style Inventory-Revised (ISI-2) is a thirty-nine item paper and pencil scale (see Appendix A). The ISI-2 is built on the assumption that there are three primary ways individuals process self-relevant experiences and personal information. These styles of processing can best be understood as social-cognitive strategies used for personal decision-
making and problem-solving. The ISI-2 operationalizes three self-
exploration styles and a measure of commitment. Subjects were
categorized according to the style of self-exploration they identified
as "most like me" on the ISI-2. Subjects reflecting a 'pure' style of
processing were considered for the second phase of the study. A
pure style type was construed to be one half standard deviation above
the mean for that style while remaining within a half deviation of the
mean for the other two style types.

Three identity scales [information-oriented (Info), diffusion-
oriented (Diff), and normative-oriented (Norm)] and a commitment
scale (Comm) yield four separate scores for this instrument. Internal
consistency of the original scales was assessed by administering the
inventory to 155 college students. Cronbach's alphas were: Norm
(X=24.13, SD=5.53) = .52; Info (X=27.12, SD=5.10) = .53;
Diff (X=18.02, SD=5.36) = .59; and Comm (X=48.74, SD=9.51) = .77.
Test-retest reliability's were reported over a five week period (N=62)
as: Norm = .86; Info = .86; Diff = .78; and Comm = .84.

Berzonsky (personal correspondence) suggested that one of
the items originally selected to assess normative characteristics was
actually loading on the information-seeking factor in his most recent
factor analysis of the instrument. Therefore, I re-established norms
for the ISI-2 based on my study's initial sample. This sample
produced the following normative data: Norm (X=25.38, SD=4.096);
Info (X=35.337, SD=5.27); Diff (X=26.54, SD=6.01); and
Comm (X=35.12, SD=6.52).
Phase 2: Memory procedure

Subjects. During the first phase subjects completed the ISI-2. Subjects were first categorized as using a 'pure' style of identity processing if they scored one standard deviation above the mean for that style and remained within a full standard deviation of the mean for the other two styles. More than twenty 'pure types' were identified for both the information-seeking group and the diffused group, however, this criteria failed to generate enough normative subjects.

A second criteria of scoring one half deviation above the mean for one style while remaining within one half deviation of the mean for the other two style types still failed to produce enough normative subjects. When the criteria was changed to allow 'transitional' subjects we were able to generate enough normative subjects. Transitional subjects were defined as scoring one half deviation above the mean on two styles.

Thirty-two females and twenty-eight males, who were the best examples of the three styles, were selected for the memory procedure. I was unable to contact five subjects. One of these subjects was from the diffused group, one was from the information-seek group, and three were from the normative group. One diffused style subject was eliminated because she was not able to generate memories for the 'not like me' prompt words. The final total number of subjects for this second phase was fifty-three. Both the information-seeking (12 female and 6 male) and the diffused (9
female and 9 male) cells contained eighteen 'pure type' subjects. The normative (8 female and 9 male) cell contained seventeen subjects. Ten of these normative subjects were 'pure types', six normative subjects were generated using the half deviation criteria, and the last three normative subjects were 'transitional types'.

**Measures and procedure.** Subjects selected for the second session were asked to return for a second half hour session where they first read fifty adjectives selected from Landy's (1987) list of personality trait adjectives in order to identify six adjectives most 'like me' and six adjectives most 'not like me'.

Landy's (1987) list of personality trait adjective pairs were based on Anderson's (1968) original list of five hundred fifty-five words. Anderson's list provides a wide range of personality characteristics with established normative ratings of likeableness and meaningfulness. Anderson's ratings were used to select forty-six words that were highly meaningful. Landy added four additional trait adjectives. Examples of the adjective list include traits such as gentle, shy, and cooperative (see Appendix B for the complete list).

Anticipating subjects would experience difficulty generating memories (especially to the 'not like me' cues), subjects were asked to select the six adjectives 'most like me' and the six adjectives 'most not like me' from Landy's list. This was done to ensure that the subject would be able to retrieve five memories from each level of cueing. The experimenter presented these adjectives as memory
cues until ten memories were generated. The procedure was a laboratory-induced form of autobiographical memory retrieval in which subjects retrieved personal memories associated to cue words presented by the experimenter. Half of the memories were generated from five cue words described as 'like me' and the remaining memories were generated from five cue words described as 'not like me'.

Prior to presenting the prompts, the investigator ensured that the subject understood that they would not be asked to reveal the personal memories at any time during the procedure. Personal memories were defined as personally relevant events in which the subject was centrally involved. The experimenter talked through an example to demonstrate how the memory procedure would occur and contrasted three examples of what would not be a personal memory with one example of what was an appropriate personal memory. In order to help them remember the memory later, subjects were asked to write down a word, or brief phrase after retrieving each memory. Subjects were given a prompt word and then were asked to generate a personal memory. The experimenter alternated between giving 'like me' and 'not like me' prompts. This process was repeated until all ten prompts had been presented.

This research has operationalized Brewer's personal memory to define autobiographical memory. An autobiographical memory is a single retrieved event in time, in which the rememberer is the central character. The degree of relevance such a retrieved event may hold
for the individual is measured by the vividness of imagery and affect associated with the memory.

Four additional measures of the retrieved memories were included to detect the expected differences in style of identity processing of self-relevant information: the degree to which this memory is typical of the type of things the subject thinks about, the degree to which this memory would define the subject to an outside observer, the impact of the event on the subject's present sense of self, and the age of the event's occurrence.

Subjects rated their memories for the following six items: how vivid are the images associated with the memory; how vivid were the emotions associated with the memory; how much is this memory characteristic of things I think about; how well would someone know me if they had witnessed this event; would I be different if this event had not occurred; and, how long ago did this memory occur (see Appendix C). The first five indices were rated on a five point likert type scale. The sixth index (how long ago did this memory occur) was rated by checking a category box (day, week, month, last six months, year, two years, more than two years).

Subjects were debriefed orally upon completion of the memory task and any questions they may have had were answered. Each subject received a written debriefing as they departed from their session.
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to test ratings of autobiographical memories for predicted differences among subjects varying in identity styles. Predictions were based on the constructivist model.

A 3x2 factorial mixed design was used to test ratings of autobiographical memories for predicted differences among subjects varying in identity styles. The first factor was the subject's style of identity (information-seeking, normative, or diffused) and the second was type of prompt ('like me' versus 'not like me') used to trigger autobiographical recall. Separate 3x2 analysis of variances (ANOVAs) were used to test five dependent measures of the importance of retrieved autobiographical memories (see Table 1).
Table 1

F Table for Five Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure</th>
<th>Main Effect ID Style</th>
<th>Main Effect Prompt Type</th>
<th>Interaction Effect ID Style X Prompt Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think About</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = 1.83</td>
<td>F (1, 50) = 72.63***</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Vividness</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .26</td>
<td>F (1, 50) = 20.40***</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .28</td>
<td>F (1, 50) = 13.37***</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Know Me</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .52</td>
<td>F (1, 50) = 93.90***</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d be Different</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = 5.65**</td>
<td>F (1, 50) = 9.75**</td>
<td>F (2, 50) = .10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 3 x 2 ANOVAs show significant differences for main effects at p < .01

*** 3 x 2 ANOVAs show significant differences for main effects at p < .001
Mean Ratings by Prompt Type

'Like me' prompts were expected to produce memories more readily than 'not like me' prompts for all three groups. It was anticipated that some subjects would not be able to recall memories for the 'not like me' prompts. This was the case for one subject, who's data was not used in the analysis.

Using the constructivist model, the assumption used was that memories generated from the 'like me' prompts should be rated higher on the dependent measures of importance than the memories generated from the 'not like me' prompts. This hypothesis was supported for the five dependent measures selected to rate memory importance (see Table 2).

Table 2

Autobiographical Memory Mean Ratings by Prompt Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure</th>
<th>Like me prompt</th>
<th>Not like me prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>s.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I'd be different</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Emotional vividness</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Imagery</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Think about</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Would Know me</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3 x 2 ANOVAs show significant differences between prompt means at p < .003
Identity Style Differences in Autobiographical Memory Ratings

Depending on which identity style was used when retrieving memories, subjects were expected to demonstrate differences in ratings of autobiographical memory significance. The 3 x 2 repeated measures ANOVAs conducted for the five autobiographical memory measures yielded a significant identity style main effect to the question: 'would you be different if this event had not occurred' (see Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autobiographical Memory Mean Ratings by Identity Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Be Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Vividness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think About</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Know Me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3 x 2 ANOVAs show significant differences between identity style means at p < .01

I would be different The ANOVA testing the question 'would you be different if this event had not occurred' yielded a significant
main effect for identity style as well as a main effect for prompt type.

The source of the main effect for identity style appeared to be between the information-seeking subjects and a combination of the other two identity groups. Post hoc Scheffe's tests for significance confirmed that individually, the normative subjects $F(2, 50) = .635$, $p < .05$ and the diffused subjects $F(2, 50) = .556$, $p < .05$ were both significantly different from the information-seeking subjects, but the two groups were not significantly different from each other.

This dependent measure addresses the subjective sense of self and that sense of self's role in the reconstruction process of autobiographical memory recall (Neimeyer & Metzler, 1991). The objective approach of information-seeking subjects resulted in their higher ratings of the significance on this measure. The "dogmatic" approach of the normative subjects and the "ad hoc" approach of the diffused subjects may demonstrate two pathways to an essentially equivalent result on this measure. More research is needed to adequately describe any real differences between the normative and diffused subjects.

**Age of memories** Subjects were asked to date their memories by making a check next to one of seven age of memory designations: one day, one week, one month, less than six months, one year, two years, more than two years.

Looking at Table 4, it appears that information-seeking subjects were more likely to retrieve events that occurred within the previous twenty-four hours than were the other two identity styles.
They were also less likely to retrieve memories occurring more than two years ago (see Table 4).

Table 4

Distribution of Memories: Age of Autobiographical Memory by Identity Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Info-Seeking</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Diffused</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>27 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
<td>43 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>36 (20%)</td>
<td>21 (12%)</td>
<td>34 (19%)</td>
<td>91 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>34 (19%)</td>
<td>27 (16%)</td>
<td>39 (22%)</td>
<td>100 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Months</td>
<td>22 (12%)</td>
<td>39 (23%)</td>
<td>36 (20%)</td>
<td>97 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>24 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (13%)</td>
<td>24 (13%)</td>
<td>70 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>23 (13%)</td>
<td>23 (14%)</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
<td>59 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Two Years</td>
<td>14 (8%)</td>
<td>31 (18%)</td>
<td>25 (14%)</td>
<td>70 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>180 (100%)</td>
<td>170 (100%)</td>
<td>180 (100%)</td>
<td>530 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, fewer of the normative subjects' memories fell in the one day or one week categories. A greater frequency of their memories fell in the two years category and the more than two years category (see Table 4). It appears in Table 4 that the normative subjects retrieved the greatest overall percentage of remote memories (45% of their memories dated as occurring one year, two years, or more than two years ago).

The diffused group produced a pattern similar to the normative group pattern (see Table 4) except for the most remote memories (34% of the diffused memories dated as occurring one year, two years, or more than two years ago).
Each subject contributed ten observations to the total distribution in Table 4, therefore, a chi-square test of significance for these frequencies was not appropriate. An ANOVA could not be conducted on the age of the recalled memories because of the categorical nature of the data.

**Identity Style by Prompt Type Interactions: Autobiographical Memory Ratings**

Although predicted, none of the five 3 x 2 repeated measures ANOVAs produced significant identity style by prompt type interaction effects (see Appendix E for the complete table of means).

**Emotional Vividness and Imagery Associated with Memories**

Both the separate 3 x 2 ANOVAs conducted to examine the emotional vividness and the degree of imagery failed to yield main effects for identity style. While subjects in the three groups did not differ, the overall mean vividness and imagery ratings were relatively high. These results were important because they demonstrated that all subjects were generating appropriate autobiographical material as defined by Brewer (1986). Furthermore, the mean ratings for these dependent measures indicate that all subjects were generating relevant autobiographical material to both 'like me' and 'not like me' prompts while clearly demonstrating a main effect for prompt type.
DISCUSSION

The results of this study supported the hypothesis that there is a difference in the way subjects process self-relevant information based on their identity style. Further, the results supported the idea that subjects using specific identity styles will differ according to how self-defining they rate their autobiographical memories.

A significant main effect for identity styles was found between the information-seeking and both the diffused and the normative subjects in response to the question 'Would you be different if this event had not occurred'. This result demonstrates that information-seeking subjects rated their autobiographical memories as more self-defining than did subjects using either the diffused or normative identity styles. This result supports Berzonsky's discussion of style differences in the processing of self-relevant information. The information-seeking subjects are expected to rate their important autobiographical memories as more self-defining than would subjects using one of the other two identity styles.

The information-seeking style is hypothesized to remain relatively objective in processing self-relevant information. The normative style takes a diametrically polar approach to incoming information. This style is believed to maintain identity regardless of the nature of incoming self-relevant information. The diffused style is considered to be an "ad hoc" approach to self-relevant information leading to ephemeral constructions to situationally-specific interactions.
The here and now construction of the information-seeking style of identity is predicated on the immediate processing of incoming self relevant information. This here and now focus to identity style processing resulted in the recall of relatively recent autobiographical events for the information-seeking subjects. In looking at Table 4, it appears that information-seeking subjects were more likely to retrieve events that occurred recently while the normative subjects were more likely to retrieve remote events. The preservation of existing self-constructions is the normative style subject's goal in dealing with self-relevant information. Normative subjects maintain present self-definitions by searching for identity confirming personal memories in response to prompt words. The resulting frequency of retrieved events was the most remote for normative subjects. Diffused subjects demonstrated a frequency pattern that was similar to the normative subjects' pattern. The diffused identity style uses a perceived demand approach to processing self-relevant information.

Subjects were asked to identify the age of their memories by selecting a category designation such as 'one day' or 'one week'. Asking for multiple memories which were then slotted into age categories made it difficult to statistically analyze these data. Future studies could correct this design flaw using standard time markers such as 'twenty minutes ago' (Crovitz & Schiffman, 1974), or in terms of calendar dates such as 'June 1, 1991' (Robinson, 1976). Additionally, Fitzgerald & Lawrence (1984) used equal intervals on a logarithmic time scale to organize the reported age of memories. All
three of these dating techniques allow for a simple analysis of the data.

The results of this study also supported the hypothesis that subjects will have a tendency to rate 'like me' events as more self-relevant than 'not like me' events irrespective of identity style. A main effect for the type of prompt was found all five continuous dependent measures. The 'like me' prompts were rated more highly than the 'not like me' prompts. This result supports Kelly's (1955) personal construct theory that predicts such a bi-polar result for these two prompt types.

This study did not produce any results to support the hypothesis predicting identity style by prompt type interaction effect. A possible explanation for this result may also shed light on why the normative and diffused styles did not produce significantly different outcomes on this study's dependent measures.

This study did not provide evidence of any differences between normative versus diffused styles of processing. This result was not predicted but may be due to the modified selection process used to generate a normative subject pool. Future studies using this paradigm might find greater evidence for style differences by employing a more stringent subject selection process. The original selection criteria was not used to select the normative group in this study, because changes in the criteria were necessary in order to generate twenty normative subjects. Specifically, it was necessary to lower the criteria for selection of pure processing types from one
full deviation above the mean to one half deviation above the mean and also allow 'transitional' style types to be included in the normative group.

The difficulty in identifying normative subjects may be at least in part due to procedural aspects of this study. Subjects were allowed to take the identity style questionnaire home to complete with the instructions to return the completed questionnaire within a three week period. This resulted in losing 30 percent of the original pool before beginning the selection of pure style types. The best exemplars of each style were selected for the memory procedure, but the limited number that fell into the pure normative category meant that ten of the normative subjects were selected using different criteria than was used to select the information-seeking and diffused subjects. Using different selection criteria for some of the normative subjects makes it difficult to interpret that group's performance in relation to the other two groups. Still, this study provides evidence in support of a constructivist theory of identity development's impact on autobiographical memory.

In summary, every person is unique with a personal way of thinking, feeling, and reacting to the world around them. But personal differences are not random. Berzonsky (1988) provides a process conceptualization of identity development which assumes that all normal people beyond the late adolescent stage of life have the capacity to use any of the three identity styles. This capacity is believed to interact with contextual and situational demands providing
a dynamic mechanism for how people process self-relevant information. Given a particular space in time and circumstance, identity style appears to impact autobiographical recall in predictable ways.
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Appendix A

Identity Style Instrument-Revised

Subject Name: ____________________________  Today's Date: ____________

INSTRUCTIONS:
You will find thirty-nine statements about beliefs, attitudes, and/or ways of dealing with issues. Read each carefully, then use it to describe yourself. Circle the number which indicates the extent to which you think the statement represents you. There are no right or wrong answers. For instance, if the statement is very much like you, mark a five (5), if it is not like you at all, mark a one (1). Please use the 1 to 5 point scale to indicate the degree to which you think each statement is uncharacteristic (1) or characteristic (5) of yourself.

1. Regarding religious beliefs, I know basically what I believe and don't believe.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

2. I've spent a great deal of time thinking seriously about what I should do with my life.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

3. I'm not really sure what I'm doing in school; I guess things will work themselves out.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

4. I've more-or-less always operated according to the values with which I was brought up.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

5. I've spent a good deal of time reading and talking to others about religious ideas.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

6. When I discuss an issue with someone, I try to assume their point of view and see the problem from their perspective.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

7. I know what I want to do with my future.

not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me
8. It doesn't pay to worry about values in advance; I decide things as they happen.

   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

9. I'm not really sure what I believe about religion.

   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

10. I've always had purpose in my life; I was brought up to know what to strive for.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

11. I'm not sure which values I really hold.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

12. I have some consistent political views; I have a definite stand on where the government and country should be headed.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

13. Many times by not concerning myself with personal problems, they work themselves out.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me


    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

15. I'm really into my major; its the academic area that is right for me.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

16. I've spent a lot of time reading and trying to make some sense out of political issues.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

17. I'm not really thinking about my future now; it's still a long way off.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me

18. I've spent a lot of time and talked to a lot of people trying to develop a set of values that make sense to me.

    not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5  very much like me
19. Regarding religion, I've always known what I believe and don't believe; I never really had any serious doubts.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

20. I'm not sure what I should major in (or change to).

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

21. I've known since high school that I was going to college and what I was going to major in.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

22. I have a definite set of values that I use in order to make personal decisions.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

23. I think it's better to have a firm set of beliefs than to be open-minded.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

24. When I have to make a decision, I try to wait as long as possible in order to see what will happen.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

25. When I have a personal problem, I try to analyze the situation in order to understand it.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

26. I find it's best to seek out advice from a professional (e.g., clergy, doctor, lawyer) when I have problems.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

27. It's best for me not to take life too seriously; I just try to enjoy it.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me

28. I think it's better to have fixed values, than to consider alternative value systems.

   not at all like me  1 2 3 4 5 very much like me
29. I try not to think about or deal with problems as long as I can.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

30. I find that personal problems often turn out to be interesting challenges.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

31. I try to avoid personal situations that will require me to think a lot and deal with them on my own.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

32. Once I know the correct way to handle a problem, I prefer to stick with it.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

33. When I have to make a decision, I like to spend a lot of time thinking about my options.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

34. I prefer to deal with situations where I can rely on social norms and standards.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

35. I like to have the responsibility for handling problems in my life that require me to think on my own.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

36. Sometimes I refuse to believe a problem will happen, and things manage to work themselves out.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

37. When making important decisions I like to have as much information as possible.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

38. When I know a situation is going to cause me stress, I try to avoid it.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me

39. To live a complete life, I think people need to get emotionally involved and commit themselves to specific values and ideals.
   not at all like me  1  2  3  4  5 very much like me
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Appendix B

Personality Adjective List

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are fifty personality adjectives. Please select six adjectives from the list that describe aspects of your personality. Indicate those words by circling 'L' for like me under the corresponding adjective. Then select six adjectives which are not descriptions of aspects of your personality. Indicate those words by circling 'N' for not like me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUTHFUL</th>
<th>UNRELIABLE</th>
<th>OUTGOING</th>
<th>THOUGHTFUL</th>
<th>UNFRIENDLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNTRUTHFUL</th>
<th>PUNCTUAL</th>
<th>INCOMPETENT</th>
<th>GENEROUS</th>
<th>UNSKILLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULAR</th>
<th>UNINTELLIGENT</th>
<th>DECISIVE</th>
<th>COWARDLY</th>
<th>OBEIDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROADMINDED</th>
<th>TIDY</th>
<th>INTELLIGENT</th>
<th>DEPENDENT</th>
<th>DISOBEDIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRIENDLY</th>
<th>UNPUNCTUAL</th>
<th>GENTLE</th>
<th>FORCEFUL</th>
<th>UNTRUSTWORTHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUBBORN</th>
<th>THOUGHTLESS</th>
<th>INDECISIVE</th>
<th>COURAGEOUS</th>
<th>MODEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHY</th>
<th>RELIABLE</th>
<th>SELFISH</th>
<th>UNTIDY</th>
<th>SKILLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNPOPULAR</th>
<th>KIND</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>BOASTFUL</th>
<th>ATTRACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLERANT</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>HOSTILE</th>
<th>THRIFTY</th>
<th>NARROW-MINDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOPERATIVE</th>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>WASTEFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTOLERANT</th>
<th>TRUSTWORTHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Memory Ratings

Name __________________________ Date ____________

The following questionnaire is designed to measure the level of importance you place on the memories you have recalled during this session. Six items appear below. Please answer them openly and honestly. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

Memory ____:
1. This memory is a good example of the type of things that I spend time thinking about.

   1 2 3 4 5
   not much time a lot of time

2. The emotions I experienced in this memory are vague.

   1 2 3 4 5
   vague emotions vivid emotions

3. How vivid are the images in this memory?

   1 2 3 4 5
   this event is very vague I am re-living the event

4. If someone had observed this event they would know a lot about who I am as a person.

   1 2 3 4 5
   would not know me would know me

5. Would you be different if this event had not happened to you?

   1 2 3 4 5
   about the same person very different

6. About how long ago did this memory occur?

   within the last 24 hours ______ within the last year ______
   within the last week ______ within the last 2 years ______
   within the last month ______ more than two years ago ______
   within the last 6 months _____
Appendix D

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MEMORY PROCEDURE

Greet the subject. Say to him or her: 'You are free to withdraw from this study at any time.' Have the subject read and sign the informed consent. Answer any questions the subject has about what will happen.

Now direct the subject to examine the adjective list and select six traits like me. The subject will simultaneously select six traits that are not like me.

Tell the subject that this is a memory study. 'You are to remember a personal memory that corresponds to a particular episode in your life.' Explain that the selected words serve as prompts for the memory procedure.

Clarify the different things you do not want the subject to recall. Give an example. The prompt word is amusing. Our task is to think of a personal memory. 'Here are examples of what I do not want you to recall.' The first case is simply remembering a personal fact such as I was amusing at my friend's house. The second case would be to recall that I was amusing in seventh grade, but not tie that recollection to a specific moment. The last example would be simply to think about the word amusing without recalling a personal event at all.

Here is an example of what I would like you to recall: I remember the day in math class when I was amusing to the rest of the class. After recalling that afternoon in math class, I jot down a couple of words to help me remember the event later. I will rate each memory on one of these memory evaluation sheets after recalling all of the memories. Notice I can recall the event, rate it on the sheet, and I never have to reveal anything about the content of my memory.

Be sure the subject is clear about the memory procedure. Begin providing the prompts. Start with the first word the subject selected on the adjective sheet. The goal is to have the subject recall ten memories. In some cases the subject will not recall ten memories. Alternate between the like me and not like me prompting until the goal is reached or the subject has considered each prompt word.

Have the subject rate the memories after completing the recall task.

Wind down the session with a review of what occurred and why. The subject recalled memories and then rated those memories in order for us to determine how important autobiographical memories are in their daily life. The purpose of this investigation is to study how people differ in their ratings of personal memories.
Appendix E

Identity Style by Prompt Type Means Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Information-Seeking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Diffused</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Not Like Me</td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Not Like Me</td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Not Like Me</td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Not Like Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
<td>mean s.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think About</td>
<td>3.8 .13</td>
<td>2.3 .17</td>
<td>3.2 .18</td>
<td>2.4 .20</td>
<td>3.3 .16</td>
<td>2.3 .15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Vividness</td>
<td>4.0 .15</td>
<td>3.4 .13</td>
<td>3.6 .17</td>
<td>3.4 .15</td>
<td>3.7 .15</td>
<td>3.2 .15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>3.9 .17</td>
<td>3.1 .14</td>
<td>3.5 .14</td>
<td>3.3 .18</td>
<td>3.5 .16</td>
<td>3.3 .17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Know Me</td>
<td>4.1 .78</td>
<td>2.3 .18</td>
<td>3.7 .17</td>
<td>2.4 .23</td>
<td>3.7 .14</td>
<td>2.3 .20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd be Different</td>
<td>3.0 .22</td>
<td>2.4 .19</td>
<td>2.1 .20</td>
<td>2.0 .15</td>
<td>2.3 .17</td>
<td>2.0 .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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