INTRODUCTION

I. The study of person – perception.

Research in person perception is one of the principal areas of inquiry in contemporary social psychology and psychology of personality. The term 'person-perception' is often used interchangeably with the terms "Social" perception" and "interpersonal perception" (Dornbusch et al. 1965; 434). Tagiuri and Petrullo (1958), Warr and Knapper (1968), Hatorf et al (1970) and Cook (1971) prefer to use the term "person perception". Jaspars (1965), Toch and Smith (1968) favour the term "Social perception". Bieri et al (1966) prefer the term "Social judgment." Smith (1966) has used the expression "Sensitivity to people." Cronbach (1955) and Gage and Cronbach (1955), speak of "understanding others. Stewart (1956) and Katz (1963) prefer to use the term empathy. Laing et al (1966) have used the expression of interpersonal perception. Expression of various terms which can be used "interchangeably" points out that no attempts have been made to distinguish between terms (if differentiation is possible) or to select one expression (if no differentiation is possible) from several terms.

"Person perception" should be restricted to the perception of personality characteristics of one or several persons by a judge. The term social perception may be used
only when dealing with the perception of "Social environment." Perception of personality characteristic would include perception of attitudes, traits, intelligence emotions, etc., of the other person. Perception of social environment would broadly speaking, include perception of membership groups, reference groups, labour management relations, violence, local-self government systems etc., 'Interpersonal perception' should be applied to those studies where two subjects, interchangeably become the judge of each other. Most of the studies on judgmental accuracy in person-perception are of this type. As the present investigation is concerned with judgmental accuracy in person-perception, it is labelled as the study in interpersonal perception. Throughout the thesis, the term person perception is used to refer to interpersonal perception.

The present investigation is concerned with the study of person perception and not with social perception. Certain studies on person perception deal with the processes of impression formation, while other studies deal with the personality correlates of accuracy in person perception. The term "accuracy" is defined as the agreement between A's prediction concerning B's behaviour on a particular Psychological tool and B's actual behaviour on the same tool. The studies dealing with impression-formation are concerned with the investigation of 'implicit personality theory', 'cognitive
complexity' etc, while the studies dealing with judgmental accuracy are usually concerned with the investigation of personality and situational variables in relation to person perception accuracy. The present investigation, intends to study the impact of some personality and situational variables on person-perception accuracy and is not concerned with the study of impression formation. Among the personality variables, the following are included:

1. Assumed similarity,  
2. Manifest anxiety,  
3. Theoretical value,  
4. Economic value,  
5. Esthetic value,  
6. Social value,  
7. Political value,  
8. Religious value and  
9. Sex.

Among the situational variables, the following two ones are included:

1. Best friendship duration,  
2. Real similarity between two friends.

Such an arbitrary classification of variables is based on suggestions from Bieri et al. (1966). Apart from the investigation of relationship between above variables and person perception accuracy, the issue concerning the nature (generality Vs. specificity) of person perception ability would also be considered.
II. Review of literature:

(A) Books.

This section deals with the general review of books on person perception and related interests, to show different approaches undertaken to study the present field of investigation.

Stewart (1956) and Katz (1963) emphasize the study of empathy from "understanding" point of view, rather than "explaining" point of view. For Katz (1963), explaining consists of an exercise in logic, whereas understanding involves an appreciation of quality. For Stewart (1958), empathy is both, the process of intuition and the basis of dynamic inference. Both the books are psychoanalytically oriented and less empirical in approach.

Tagiuri and Petrullo (Eds: 1958) are concerned with the study of processes in person perception and also with the investigation of the relation between perception and interpersonal action. The deemphasize the study of personality correlates of person perception and favour the analytic treatment of scores on "Understanding others". Theirs is an interdisciplinary approach.

Warr and Knapper (1968), besides emphasizing the study of processes in person perception, also are concerned with the
study of personality correlates of person perception accuracy scores. They have used semantic Differential technique very frequently in their studies on person perception, for exploring and testing of several hypotheses. Frequent use of only one technique sets limit to the possibility of generalisation of their results.

Jaspars (1965) is concerned with the study "implicit personality theory" as related to social perception. His favourite technique is R.C.R.T. (Role construct Repertory test), which measures cognitive complexity. Jaspars (1965) has reported no significant correlations between neuroticism, intelligence and cognitive complexity. It should be noted, that R.C.R.T. has been earlier criticised by Gardner and Schoen (1962) as being "too indirect" and "too much influenced by verbal fluency".

Restle (1961)'s essay has attempted to give an integrated and coherent if grossly incomplete, account of some problems in psychology of judgment and choice. The arguments have been conducted within elementary probability theory, and a serious attempt has been made to keep various applications consistent and connected with one other.... in a sense, the aim has been to construct a quantitative statements. The author is not sure whether this programme can, even in principle be carried through... (ibid.219-220).
Bieri et al (1966) conceptualise the process of judging others, in terms derived from orthodox communication theory and utilise notions like input, output, coding, decoding etc., to explain some facets of clinical and social judgment. Such concepts themselves might fruitfully be applied to social relationship and judgment, though it is clear that many of such operational indices cannot be used in the very different field of person perception, without considerable modification.

Laing et al (1966) are concerned with the investigation of "understanding" between husband-wife relationship, by using a technique called I P M (Interpersonal Perception method). I P M is designed to measure and provide understanding of the interpretations, or conjunctions and disjunctions of two individuals in respect of a range of key issues with which they may be concerned in the context of their dyadic relationship (ibid : 38). Their book further deals with the resulting changes in interpersonal perceptions, between disturbed husband and wife, as a result of psychotherapy. Apart from dealing with "agreement" and "understanding" between a dyad, they also investigate "the feeling of being understood." and "the realization of being understood" by judges.

Smith (1966) primary concern is to improve sensitivity to people. His essay deals with a survey of training techniques and their effectiveness - in terms of improvement in sensitively to people.
Toch and Smith (Eds: 1968) deal with several aspects of social perception, and mention specifically several applications of social perception studies. According to them, not only our perceptions determine our actions, but that the relationship is reciprocal" (ibid: 199)

Hastorf et al (1970) and Cook (1971) provide general review of literature on person perception and suggest several methods to improve the studies on person perception. Cook also proposes a general model for studying accuracy of person perception.

(B) Articles

This section deals with the review of articles, related to personality and situational correlates of judgmental accuracy.

Bruner and Tagiuri (1954), Taft (1955) Bronfenbrenner (1958) Tagiuri (1968), Hochberg (1968) and Tajfel (1968), have reviewed the contemporary topic, in their general review on the present investigation. Only the articles relevant to the present investigation are reviewed herein, to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Shruager (1964) has reported that evidence repeatedly shows that sex differences are crucial in this area and must be taken into account in research and theory. Jaspers (1965)
reported no sex difference in cognitive complexity. Owen and Pederson (1969) also submitted evidence in favour of no sex difference with respect to meta-perspective. de Leon et al (1969) reported existence of sex-discrepancy in their study.

Shore (1958) obtained significant interactions between scores on manifest anxiety scale and induced muscular tension. Lonjenecker (1962) has reported that anxiety should be considered as a drive. He found that in stress situation, the high anxiety groups performed significantly less well than the low anxiety groups. Owen and Pederson (1969) reported no difference in terms of anxiety and accuracy and rejected the hypothesis that high-anxiety subjects were less accurate. Westcott (1966) has concluded that success on intuitive tasks tends to be negatively correlated with MAS.

Bruner and Tagiuri (1954) have stated that experience is generally assumed to be a correlate of ability to judge others accurately. According to them, little systematic testing is available to prove or disprove the point. Ten different studies reviewed in Smith (1966) indicate contrary evidence to the expectation that training in psychology would improve sensitivity to people. In fact, the formal training, in most cases, decreased the trainees' accuracy in judging others. The investigator has not come across any study showing the effect of different periods of informal contacts upon sensitivity to people.
Vernon (1933) doubted the existence of a completely general intuitive ability. Cartwright and French (1939) indicated that the judges may be good in certain areas, and not so good in others. Bronfenbrenner et al (1958) pointed out that two abilities, i.e., sensitivity to the generalized other and an interpersonal sensitivity were found to be largely independent. Elstein and Richards (1960) report contrary to evidence of Bronfenbrenner et al (1958). Gage (1953) reports two types of accuracy, referred to as "accuracy in perceiving manifest stimulus value" and accuracy in taking the role of the other. Both types of accuracy are internally consistent, but negatively related to each other.

Mullins and Force (1962) interpret their results as a demonstration of a generalized ability of rating accuracy. Doise and Zavalloni (1970) conclude that categorization style may be regarded as a generalized tendency. The generality to judge others is examined by Cook (1971). Allport (1961) states that "We should not expect a judge of people to be uniformly successful in estimating every quality of every person, [but at the same time we should not expect him to succeed only in judging one quality of every person] but at the same time we should not expect him to succeed only in judging one quality in all people or perhaps all qualities in only one person. The truth will be somewhere between these extremes." (P.510)
Schulberg (1961) has expressed the view that the tendency to assume that other people are similar to oneself is not a stable personality characteristic as judged from one instrument to another.

Lovie and Davis (1970) employed Bayesian model to study the way in which estimates of age were revised as further information was presented. Jones (1969) trying to investigate the perceptual and physiological correlates of accuracy in interpersonal perception concluded that the autonomic indices did not differentiate between good and poor judges. Different methods for deriving judgmental accuracy scores proposed by Cronbach, Bronfenbrenner et al, Cline and Richards, Boyd, Stritch and by several others have been compared by Christensen (1968). According to him, these methods are not equivalent in terms of the accuracy scores they generate.

Three latest sources (Pareek: 1966, 1971 and ICSSR 1972) surveying psychological researches in India do not mention any item relevant to the field of person-perception in the 'content' or the subject-index. Rath (1971) has mentioned several studies though very few in number, which may be classified under the heading of social perception. None of these studies utilise sophisticated measurement procedures for assessment of judgmental accuracy, as their primary concern is to study an attitude or an image toward some aspect of social environment. In India, Gon (India) has studied developmental aspects of interpersonal perception, though most of her work is conducted in Canada.
III. Applications:

Person-perception procedures and social perception procedures have found their applications in the field of marketing research (Haile, 1950), guidance and improving teachers' behaviour (Gage, 1951, 1955 and 1963). Chowdhry and Newcomb (1952) and Bell and Hall (1954) have used such procedures for the study of leaders. Haile (1955) has used role perception procedures in the study of labour management relations. Bronfenbrenner et al (1958) have utilised such procedures for identifying social talent. Entire part-III of Toch and Smith (1968) is devoted to the issue of application of social perception studies. Laing et al (1966) have cited Schelling (1960)'s study which is concerned with the study of understanding of international relationship. Hatch (1962) has attempted an evaluation of a forced choice differential accuracy approach to the measurement of supervisory empathy. Major part of their work is concerned, with the appraisal of understanding between husband - wife and also with the study of resulting changes in the interpersonal perceptions between disturbed husband and wife, as a result of psychotherapy. Cook (1971) has suggested the use of such procedures in every-day life judgment, judgments in the laboratory, professional judgments etc, and also for diagnostic purposes by psychiatrists and by guidance counsellors.
Smith (1966)'s entire book is concerned with the application of such procedures to study the effect of training, designed to improve "sensitively" to people.

To say anything about the applications of person perception research in India would be too early.

IV. Basic definitions:

The definitions of several important concepts, used in the present investigation are offered below:

1. **Person-perception** refers to the perception of the stimulus person's behaviour on several tests—(containing different areas of behaviour and requiring different style of responses) by a judge. As the present investigation is concerned with person perception of the judge and the stimulus person interchangeably, it has been labelled as person-perception of interpersonal type or interpersonal perception. As mentioned earlier, throughout the investigation, the term person-perception has been used for convenience, to refer to person-perception of interpersonal type.

2. **Direct-perspective** refers to the self-report of the judge on psychological-tools. (shortly referred to as DP)
(3) **Meta-perspective** refers to the judge's report concerning the stimulus-person's behaviour on psychological tools. (Shortly referred to as MP.)

(4) **Person-perception accuracy or judgmental accuracy** refers to the agreement between MP of the judge and DP of the stimulus person. (Shortly referred to as Acc.)

(5) **'Real-Similarity'** refers to the agreement between DP of both, the judge and the stimulus-person. (Shortly referred to as RS)

(6) **'Assumed-similarity'** refers to the agreement between both, MP and DP of the same person. (Shortly referred to as AS).

**V. Methodology:**

Most of the studies on person perception and the related topic, conducted prior to 1955 followed a typical pattern, in the sense that a judge was asked to predict the stimulus-person's responses to the items in some psychological test. The judgmental accuracy of the judge was assessed by considering the gross deviation of the judge's prediction from the stimulus person's responses. Hastorf and Bender (1952) and Bender and Hastorf (1953) criticised the gross deviation - approach and suggested that the judgmental accuracy score, thus derived, is loaded with assumed similarity or projection by the judge. They suggested to substract assumed similarity
score from the raw-empathy score (the judgmental accuracy score derived, considering the gross deviation approach) to obtain, the refined empathy score. Their approach is criticised by Gage and Cronbach (1955), who point out that judgmental accuracy score over all items is warranted assumed similarly (WAS - the case where the judge's self description is similar to the stimulus person's self description and his own prediction) plus warranted assumed dissimilarity, (WAD - the case where the stimulus person's self description is in agreement with the judge's prediction, but where the judge's self description is not identical with the stimulus person's self description). According to them assumed similarity score is warranted assumed similarity (WAS) score plus unwarranted assumed similarity (UAS - score the case where, DP of the judges tallies with his own MP for the stimulus person, but where his MP does not tally with DP of the stimulus person). In the Bender-Hastorf scheme, the judgemental accuracy score is equal to WAD minus UAS, which shows that their measure of judgmental accuracy is not independent of assumed similarity and real similarity.

Cronbach's (1955, 1958) analysis of processes of affecting scores on "Understanding others" and "assumed similarity" has led to the disentanglement of several components of global judgmental accuracy scores. Compared to Hastorf and Bender (1952), his proposals allow a mathematically sophisticated and
differentiated analytic treatment of the assumed similarity problem raised by Hastorf and Bender. He isolated five components of sensitivity.

1. **Elevation component** refers to the habitual tendency of a perceiver to rate at low or high level.

2. **Differential Elevation component** refers to the habitual tendency of a perceiver to spread or not to spread his ratings.

3. **Assumed Similarity component** refers to the issue of whether a perceiver assumes or does not assume that the person he is judging is like him.

4. **Stereotype component** refers to the understanding of group behaviour by a judge.

5. **Differential accuracy component** refers to the judge's ability to predict differences, among stimulus persons for each trait.

The immediate effort of Cronbach's (1955) article was "to render invalid or uninterpretable most of the previous research in this area, since it was not possible to determine, how "accurate" judges achieved their scores in the absence of the raw data on which the published reports are based." (Hastorf et al, 1970 : P. 32). Cronbach's suggestions for analytical treatment, however did not imply that it was meaningless to study personality correlates of judgmental accuracy, as he has merely provided a mathematical foundation for the analysis of judgmental accuracy scores.
Most of the studies, dealing with personality correlates of judgmental accuracy, did not report consistent results as has been stated earlier. Such studies utilise, to use Bender-Hastorf terminology raw-empathy score. Cronbach has argued that due to gross deviation approach to measure judgmental accuracy, inconsistencies and even contradictions existed with respect to personality correlates of person-perception accuracy scores. Differential accuracy score, as suggested by Cronbach is probably closest to what a sophisticated reader of the research literature in this area would regard as a "true" accuracy score because the various "response bias" components (elevation, differential elevation and stereotype accuracy) have been eliminated (Hastorf et al, 1970 p, 32). Theoretically therefore, consistent results could be expected, while investigating the personality correlates of differential accuracy scores. The actual results are contrary to expectations. Sechrest and Jackson (1961) reported no correlation between differential accuracy - scores and a wide variety of personality measures: MMPI\* Scales, Socio-metric ratings, repertory grid and Rorschach scores. Their conclusion was supported by Shrauger and Altrochhi (1964). Crow and Hammond (1957) reported that differential accuracy among judges was not general across rating-tasks and that stereotype accuracy was found to be more stable than the former one. Tägiuri (1968) has commented that "some theoretical proposals more extensive than those made in the mid- and late 1950's in the writings
of Cronbach, Gage and Bronfenbrenner are expected to be made to provide better understanding of the problem. (p.433).

Someone may conclude, on the basis of above discussion that it is useless to study the personality correlates of judgmental accuracy of whatever type and that the studies emphasising processes in person-perception should be favoured.

On the contrary someone else may argue that the analytical treatment of judgmental accuracy scores is artificial in the sense that the impressions are mostly global, in nature and that mathematically there may be several components of accuracy. Most of the studies, dealing with personality correlates of judgmental accuracy have used only two-variables, considering one as the independent variable and the other as the dependent variable. Inconsistencies in the results may be due to heterogeneity in the populations or due to differences in judgmental accuracy measuring procedures. Another possibility is that several samples of person perception ability are required to be taken into consideration, rather than just one. If several measures of accuracy do not significantly correlate with each other, it may be due to the fact that several statistically independent tests possessing prima-facie validity i.e. the tests purporting to measure judgmental accuracy are called far. If such an approach is utilised, inconsistencies and even contradictions may be accounted for,
If consistent results are obtained.

Instead of considering several measures of 'empathy' as related to the variable of judgmental accuracy, it is possible to treat the former as several aspects or facets of a particular concept under investigation, where these measures are considered as conceptually and operationally related to each other. No assumption concerning statistical dependence among several measures of judgmental accuracy is made. Such an approach would require some sort of aggregate or composite score based on such measures. Considering only one among several measures of judgmental accuracy and trying to find out the size of relationship with respect to some personality variable, the results obtained might be misleading due to the fact the subjects' position of a particular measure may not give a reliable estimate of their standing with respect to a particular concept under investigation. Consider the following example, where $V_1$, $V_2$, and $V_3$ are three measures of conceptually related variables and $V_4$ is the dependent variable. Only 3 subjects' scores are considered (the values in the bracket refer to the subjects rank).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>$V_1$</th>
<th>$V_2$</th>
<th>$V_3$</th>
<th>$V_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70 (3)</td>
<td>30 (2)</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>30 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>70 (3)</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen that if only $V_3$ and $V_4$ are considered, the relationship is perfect, in the sense that there is complete agreement among the ranks. The results would be different if $V_1$ and $V_4$ or $V_2$ and $V_4$ are considered. This would account for inconsistencies and even contradictions in different studies, concerning the magnitude and direction of relationship between two variables. If however, the subjects are ranked according their aggregate score on $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$ a more reliable estimate of the subjects standing on "independent variables" may be obtained. The size of relationship between aggregate measure based on $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$ with $V_4$ would be a better estimate of association between two variables.

Conceptually related variables, if found to be statistically independent of each other, should not be considered conceptually so, as the size of relationship is the function of at least five factors, i.e.

1. Probability of type-I error,
2. Tail type of the test,
3. Standard deviation,
4. The amount of deviation from $H_0$ and the
5. Size of the sample.

The lack of association between two variables ought to be considered in the light of the factors stated, before concluding that conceptually and psychologically related variables are 'Statistically independent' and so, could not be grouped.
The arguments advanced in the thesis show clearly that bi-factor approach may not be very relevant in sizing up the relationship. For this reason, multifactor approach is utilised in the present investigation.

Concerning the superiority of multifactor approach over unifactor approach Warr and Knapper (1968) offer three reasons:

1. The former approach can provide complex results, which are more likely to interest students and colleagues than are the findings from a single variable study.

2. Since the real life situations are characterised by the simultaneous operation of several factors and the investigation which looks at a number of these at once is manifestly closer to day-to-day activities than a study which examines only a single variable.

3. Studying several groups of influence in one study enables us to learn more and further helps us in examining different types of relationship existing among variables.

The present investigation has utilized, just such an approach. Totally five instruments purporting to measure person perception ability have been utilised. Each measure is so designed to be 'situationally different' from the other.
Each measure samples different areas of behaviour and requires the use of different categories of responses i.e.

1. Two-categories response (Yes-No)
2. Ranking
3. Rating.
4. Partially free association, and
5. Forced choice.

The major purpose of the investigation is to demonstrate that multifactor approach is superior to unifactor approach, as far as the problem of judgmental accuracy in person-perception is concerned.

It is expected that the consistent results could be obtained with report to personality correlates of judgmental accuracy, while utilising multifactor approach. Secondly, common-sense hypothesis also are expected to be confirmed with the application of multifactor approach. Several important hypotheses related to personality and situational correlates of judgmental accuracy and some others related to superiority of multifactor approach over unifactor approach are presented below:
VI. Hypotheses:

(A) Related to Personality variables:

1. Among the six values considered the theoretical value, the economic value and the social value would discriminate between good judges and poor judges. The remaining values would show no significant impact on the variable of judgmental accuracy.

2. Manifest anxiety would be negatively related to judgmental accuracy.

3. The female judges would be better in judgmental accuracy scores than the male judges.

4. The poor judges would have more assumed similarity compared to good judges, on the whole.

(B) Related to situational variables:

5. Longer the period of best friendship involvement, better would be the judgmental accuracy.

6. The good judges of their friends would have more real similarity with the stimulus - persons than their counterparts.

(C) Related to multifactor approach:

7. Grouped or combined results of all five measures on RS, AS and ACC would provide better insight concerning the relationship among them, compared to bi-factor results.
8. The role of sex and the friendship duration with respect to judgmental accuracy, real similarity and assumed similarity would be more clearly demonstrated, when these measures are grouped, than otherwise.

(D) Related to the nature of judgmental accuracy:

9. The Judgmental ability is not a general one, but requires several specific abilities to provide a reliable measure of judgmental accuracy.

First six hypotheses would be tested against each measure of judgmental accuracy, separately and also with all the five measures of accuracy combined.

VII. Basic assumptions made in testing the hypotheses are presented below:

(1) Our experiences of other people are structured.
(2) Our experiences of other people have stability.
(3) Our experiences of other persons are meaningful.

(Hastorf et al 1970 P. 12-14)

The chapter to follow, outlines the plan and the set of procedures followed during the investigation.