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A man is born, lives and dies in a society. Throughout his life, he goes on making interactions and forming relationships with others. During these interaction processes, some persons emerge as popular, some remain neglected, whereas, some become isolates. Popularity is a scarce resource and is available to only a small minority of people. Since long the researchers have been interested in knowing the relationship between social status and cognitive or social psychological characteristics. In his thorough review Hartup (1970) points out that no aspect of children's social behaviour has received more attention than peer acceptance or popularity. However, the technique to measure the peer acceptance in a social group i.e. the Sociometric Test, was pioneered by Moreno (1934), who first used it to measure peer acceptance in a school setting. Sociometry not only measures the popularity/isolation status, but also provides a rich source of data from which inferences can be made about a wide variety of social psychological processes which include friendship, interpersonal power, social exchange and interpersonal attraction.

Before giving a comprehensive review of literature, let us have a glance on the methodological innovations of sociometric investigation. Originally social choice data were examined in the form of 'sociograms' which are the
graphic representations of who chooses whom within a group. Soon sociograms were followed by mathematical representations, which were less cumbersome than the drawing of sociograms. Katz (1950) punched card technique, or the scalogram technique, originally developed for Guttman's (1950) scalogram analysis, are examples of early innovations.

However, sociometric data are most easily and perhaps most often arrayed as chooser (rows) by chosen (Columns) matrices. This arrangement was first of all suggested by Forsyth and Katz (1946). It enables the application of matrix algebra to identify various complex structural properties of groups. Besides, it simplifies the counting of choices received by any one individual. Methodological literature has been increased with the advanced computer age. The articles detailing and comparing the application of more complex matrix operations to sociometric analysis is increasing in number. Among the techniques available are direct graph theory (e.g., Flament, 1963, Harary, Norman and Cartwright, 1965), factor analysis of choice matrices (e.g., Macrae, 1960), multidimensional scaling (e.g. Reynolds, 1976), economic or input output models (Hubell, 1965, Roistacher, 1974) etc.
The basic sociometric technique was generated between 1918 and 1923. It was followed by important researches on the part of the other investigators. Newstetter, Feldstein and Newcomb (1938) applied sociometric technique to a boys' camp and some other group situations with particular attention to longitudinal studies of stability of relationship. Using sociometry, Jenings (1943) studied relationship among girls in a state training school. She identified stars and isolates and identified their personality characteristics with the help of case studies. Hunt and Solomon (1942) found several significant correlations between personality traits and group status.

The review of literature on sociometry reveals that the identification of various variables to be related to sociometric acceptability has been the chief concern of researchers. Intelligence is one of the variables, most frequently related to sociometric status. Heber (1956) reported a study in which the groups representing three levels (namely high, average and low) of intelligence were compared in terms of their sociometric status. The results showed that children of high intelligence were markedly higher in sociometric status than the children of low intelligence. This finding is in agreement with what was earlier reported by Grossman and Wrighter (1948) and Bonney (1946).
Socio-economic status is another variable which has been related to sociometric status of children. Early studies by Sower (1948), Backer and Loomis (1948), Campell (1964), St. John (1970) and St. John and Lewis (1975) have shown that the children coming from higher socio-economic status and background have developed more positive other concepts than those belonging to a lower socioeconomic background. However, the studies conducted by Zuker and Barnett (1977) and Burzynski (1980) are representatives of the approaches which envisage that relationship between socioeconomic status, far from being simple and direct, is moderated by a large number of environmental and experimental factors.

Researches have been reported in which relationship between sociometric choice and observed acceptance of children belonging to different racial groups has been explored. Gottmann (1977) found that while there was no relationship between sociometric choice and observed acceptance in a group of 3-5 years old, the relationship between sociometric rejection and negative interaction was moderately positive (r = .30). Porter (1971) using a projective measure of sociometric acceptance found that except for one group of White children rejecting Blacks in sociometric choice; White 5 year olds selected Blacks most frequently as playmates.
A study conducted by Joseph Hraba and Geoffrey Grant (1970) examined the racial preferences of Black children in an interracial setting. It was found that the majority of the black children preferred the black dolls; like the blacks the majority of the White children preferred the dolls of their own race.

Structural characteristics of family is yet another factor related to popularity. The review of literature reveals that structural characteristics of family have significant effects on the popularity-isolation of people. Oden and Asher's (1977) findings have shown that the social skill dimension of popularity acquired by the children of differing birth order accounts for their popularity. This study is further supported and confirmed by the investigation carried out by Miller and Maruyama (1976). They found that later-born children to be more popular than early-born children. In an analysis of traits associated with popularity it was reported that positive interpersonal skills are responsible for the popularity of the later-born children. The first-born children are likely to dominate, coerce, and exploit younger siblings which subsequently influence their popularity adversely but later-born grow tolerance, accommodation, and therefore, enjoy more popular status than their older brothers and sisters.
The impact of parents' attitude on the children's socio-metric choices has also been the concern of social psychologists. An important study to determine the impact of parental values and attitudes was conducted by Cohen (1977). The results showed that the peer group homogeneity, friendship patterns and interpersonal choices are significantly influenced by parental attitudes.

Not only the parental values, but teachers values also have strong effect upon the popularity. In a study carried out by Gerard, Jackson and Conolly (1975), it was found out that popularity was strongly affected by the teacher's values. The study was conducted in multi-ethnic classrooms in which there was large number of White children. Teachers were asked to rate the children's academic motivation and from this teachers' bias scores were obtained. A biased teacher was one who underestimated the academic motivation of a child belonging to minority group, as compared to the child's actual performance, and overestimated the academic motivation of white children. The teachers who expressed this bias were compared to those who did not underestimate the ability of the minority children or overestimated the ability of white children. An examination of the friendship nomination received by children in those two types of classrooms revealed that the "more biased a teacher was toward minority children,
the fewer friendship choices those children received from Whites.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS:

For those persons working with groups, it is becoming important not only to determine the sociometric relationships existing within the groups, but also to have some knowledge of the personality characteristics which are frequently associated with social selection and rejection. Northway and Wigdor (1944) carried out a study where Rorschach was employed to investigate the personality patterns of sociometrically selected groups. In their population of eighth grade children, it was found that low sociometric status was usually associated with recessive, schizoid, psychoneurotic patterns and inefficiently aggressive behavior.

A similar study by Dahlke (1953) reveals that personality adjustment is related to the interaction and choice status in the school. Poorly adjusted children would rate low as compared to those who are better adjusted. Studies by Baron (1949), Bonney (1943), Hardy (1937), Bronfenbrenner (1947), Kühlen and Bretsch (1947), and Northway (1947) have indicated the relationship between high social status and the more positive personality characteristics. Underchosen individuals, in these investigations, have frequently been
found to possess personality patterns which imply the presence of emotional problems of a possibly serious order. Baron (1953) undertook a study to bring out contribution of personal social characteristics to classroom social status and also the impact of such status upon the individual. The findings of the study were that high status girls seldom indicate the presence of adverse emotionality or a sense of inordinate environmental demands. They compare themselves favourably with their peers, feel secure in status, enjoy group activities, display "systematic" behaviour infrequently and appear to have established satisfactory home and school relationships. Girls of average social status reveal some degree of over-sensitiveness and a sense of environmental pressure. Girls of low social status frequently indicate the presence of adverse emotionality, a sense of excessive environmental demands and they compare unfavourably with peers.

Mills (1952) studied personality characteristics of the most popular and least popular college students. On the samples of 21 most popular and 21 least popular students, the MMPI, Rorschach and TAT were administered. The results indicated that the two groups were significantly different in their personality patterns. The MMPI results showed that the most popular were:
a) less deviant or eccentric in responding (F), b) more defensive (k), c) less psychosthenic (PT), d) less schizophrenic (SC), e) less manic (Ma). The Rorschach interpretation showed that popular students had matured form level and the unpopular had significantly poorer form level. On the TAT, the popular students gave themes involving the more tender emotion of congeniality, tranquility, offering aid to the parent and showing contentment with a partner of opposite sex. When hostility was aroused, the populars tended to give it a direct expression.

Pemann Solomon (1952) administered Six Personality Variable Inventory on a group of sociometrically divided subjects. The results revealed that the sociometric status were related to the ratings on such variables as, generous-stingy, affectionate-cold, enthusiastic-apathetic, but not on the variables like submission-domination, shy-bold, stubborn-yielding, etc.

Another study was conducted by Borg and Tupes (1958) to investigate the relationship between personality characteristics and leadership performances in different task situations. Subjects of different sociometric status were asked to perform different tasks. Judges were asked to rate personality traits of the subjects on the basis of their observations of subjects' performance on the task. The
results showed that the sociometric leaders were rated high on assertiveness, orderliness, extraversion and social maturity, while subjects low in sociometric status were rated high on neuroticism, social immaturity and lack of energy. Kirchoff (1974) demonstrated that sociometric populars with positive-other concepts were more forthright, self-disciplined, sensitive, conforming, conscientious and spontaneous than those low on sociometric test and with negative-other concept.

The results of the study of DeGreda et al. (1966), where friendly and unfriendly couples were drawn on the basis of sociometric measurements, showed that friendly pairs were more similar, perceived themselves as more similar, and in their case perceived similarity was higher than the objective similarity.

Nayar (1962) wanted to find personality characteristics of various sociometric groups like populars, 'non-leaders' and isolates. His results revealed that leaders (populars) possessed maximum sociometric choices, 'non-leaders' maximum rejections and the isolates ranged between six percent positive and six percent negative choices. Analysis of subjects' responses revealed that in scholastic aptitude leaders were superior to non-leaders and isolates. Academic leaders were less ascendent and more submissive, while extra-curricular
leaders were more ascendent and less submissive. On TAT, leaders gave variety of themes and built up rich stories, obviously superior to non-leaders.

Gaur (1967) undertook a study of personality profiles of isolates identified on the basis of sociometric analysis. He used 499 girls and 551 boys as subjects. Results revealed that the girl isolates were introverts and day dreamers, and were afraid of anticipated limitations. The boy isolates were reported to be dull, maladjusted, apprehensive, and suggesting no imaginative themes.

Sharma (1970) conducted a study to find out the most important factors to be associated with the sociometrically identified groups like populars, neglectees and isolates. The results revealed that a number of factors such as socio-economic status, social skills and personality are positively related to the popularity and isolation. Higher socio-economic status in terms of parents' income and education was related with popularity and lower socio-economic status was related to isolation. Skilfulness was also found to be an important determinant of popularity. Populars were high on skills like making pen-friends, arranging exhibitions, debating, athletic capabilities, etc. As far as personality traits are concerned, it is reported that: there is lot of similarity in the
personality characteristics of unaccepted pupils, whereas those of accepted and unaccepted are dissimilar. Populars are generally aggressive and overt, assertive, courageous and vigorous, confident and they play superiority roles; unaccepted pupils are submissive, non-confident, coward, weak, selfish and non-co-operative.

Wani (1980) in a study found that the sociometric popularity is related to social context. It was found that generally leadership roles are assumed by the populars – the subjects chosen as chums were more receptive, warm, placid, uninhibited and tolerant. Extra-curricular leaders were aggressive, lively, free thinking and resourceful and academic leaders were more intelligent, a little cool, rule bound, shy and shrewd.

Wani (1982) undertook another study to verify whether personality characteristics, generally found associated with persons belonging to different sociometric categories in one cultural group are also applicable to corresponding sociometric categories found in different cultural groups. The expectation that sociometric populars in one culture may be different in their personality traits from their counterparts in another culture, was based on the assumption that each culture, according to its philosophy of life, existential
situations, types of roles required for fulfilling the primary and secondary needs, considers certain personality characteristics of higher esteem than others. There was much empirical evidence to support the contention that people likely to emerge as popular are those who are characterized by the traits which are considered socially desirable by the members of the group who nominate them for different sociometric categories.

**PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS:**

The standards of physical attractiveness vary from culture to culture and from one time period to another. When we see pictures of the "beautiful people" from another time or place, we tend to laugh more often than to feel awestruck. Nevertheless, within a particular culture at a particular time, there is fairly good agreement as to just who should be classified as beautiful women or handsome men (Berscheid and Walster, 1974a). Researchers have investigated the impact of physical attractiveness on social interaction. Recent researches demonstrate that an individual's physical attractiveness does affect other's reaction to him. Specifically, it influences first impressions of peers (Miller, 1970; Dion et.al., 1972) and heterosexual attraction (Walster, 1966; Berscheid et al., 1971). Physically attractive individuals
typically receive more favourable evaluations than their less attractive counterparts. For example, in the Dion et al. (1972) study, subjects inferred that attractive persons possessed more socially desirable personality traits than unattractive individuals, e.g., the former were seen as friendlier, warmer, more stable and more sincere. Study of Dion and Allen Berscheid (1974) indicate that young children's physical attractiveness is related both to popularity in their peer groups and to peer's perception of their social behaviour. Mills and Aronson (1965) have directly demonstrated that physical attractiveness is a usable source in social influence. The results of the studies conducted by McWhiter (1959), Moss (1969), and Byrner (1971), in different test situations, revealed that attractiveness had a positive influence on interpersonal attraction.

A recent study of physical attractiveness and popularity in different interpersonal situations has been reported by Maddux (1980), who separated a group of 196 subjects on the basis of sociometric analyses. The choice criteria were: to enjoy together, to work together, to play together, and to talk to each other. The study revealed that on all these criteria physically most attractive subjects received more choices than physically less attractive.
The review of literature on sociometric choices reveals that a very important aspect, i.e. the process of interpersonal perception has been badly ignored. It is the process by which man comes to know and think about other persons, their inner states, qualities and characteristics. In other words person perception means "impression formation". The term perception is taken sometimes as "apperception and cognition". It is also termed as social perception, person cognition and interpersonal perception. But many French writers have perhaps used the best term i.e. "la Connaissance d'untrui" which in English means "knowledge of others". Yet one more good term is "social cognition" given by Kaminski (1959, 1963). Whatever the label, it can not be denied that interpersonal perception has got an important place in the process of interpersonal relationships. Our perceptions of other persons set the stage for our later interactions with them. Since the purpose of the present study is to find out the relevance of evaluation of the traits in self and other's perception of populars neglectees and isolates, it was essential to review the literature on person perception.

Historically, the study of person perception began with the work on recognition of emotions more than a hundred years ago, when Charles Darwin published "The Expression of the
Emotions in Man and Animals" (1872). Darwin's writing stimulated a number of psychologists to look further into this matter. Much of the experimental work in person perception up to the 1930 deals with this problem. After that time, attention was focused on the ability to know others' qualities and on the processes leading to such knowledge and the subject of recognition of emotions lay quiescent for some 15 years. Then in 1950, articles on recognition of emotion began to appear again along with works on other aspects of person perception. Since the present study is concerned with the biased components and trait evaluation in self and other perception, the survey of literature on person perception would be restricted to these particular areas.

**THE PROCESSES OF KNOWING OTHERS:**

Perceptual, cognitive and affective processes all appear to play a part when we form an impression of another person. These processes can also be called as the input, mental, and output processes. In the process of person perception the very first step is the cue selection (input) process. Out of all the information available about the other person, the perceiver seems to notice only a part of it. The second step is the combining of these informations. In other words the perceiver construes the information selected in such a way as to infer general traits and variety of other personal
characteristics. This is followed by the third phase in which implications are drawn as to what additional qualities or characteristics the other person might be expected to possess.

1. **CUE SELECTION (INPUT):**

Many researchers became interested in knowing the major cues, information, and concepts that people use in forming an impression or in thinking about others.

What an individual notices about his fellowmen varies, of course, with the culture. As Hallowell (1951) pointed out, the Ojibway male apparently notices first whether or not a women is a totemic sister (and sexually taboo). We may perceive a person's general dress first, or his seeming directness, or his warmth or aloofness. One's culture and the demands of the situation play an important role in focusing one's attention on certain aspects.

a) **Effect of the Appearance:**

Appearance plays an important role in person perception by establishing the identity of the other person and enabling the perceiver to categorize him in terms of age, sex, perhaps social class and a variety of other characteristics. Stone (1962) reported that most people assume that an individual
expresses himself through his appearance, thereby providing valuable information about his values, tastes and attitudes; he may, perhaps, reveal some of his personality traits, such as carefulness or fastidiousness, and betray his moods - for example, whether he is gaily or sombrely dressed.

Specific features of persons appearance may be used as clues to personal qualities. Secord and his colleagues (1958) have investigated the part played by physiognomic characteristics. Their work indicates that two distinct aspects of the face are important: (a) the structural or physiognomic aspect (for example, length of face, height of brow) and (b) the expressive features brought about by the contractions of the facial musculature (for example, type of smile). Their studies also reveal that subjects show considerable agreement in attributing personality traits to faces with particular physiognomic characteristics, although some individual and group differences exist.

Some studies have investigated the particular physiognomic cues utilized for inferring personality traits. Secord and Muthard (1955) had subjects rate photographs of young women on physiognomic and personality characteristics and from the ratings they were able to identify those attributes of appearance responsible for the impressions. For example,
woman who has narrow eyes, a relaxed mouth with thick lips and lots of lipstick were seen as more sexually attractive, passionate and feminite than woman with thin, straight lips, a compressed mouth and wearing little lipstick; moral character was associated with bright eyes. Similarly Secord, Dukes, and Bevan (1954) demonstrated that men with a dark complexion, coarse oily skin, heavy eyebrows and a straight mouth were perceived as hostile, quick tempered, shy, boorish and conceited. A pleasant expression, regular features and neat appearance are positively correlated with judgements of intelligence (Cook, 1939).

The effect on impression formation of other aspects of appearance, such as build, has received little attention, despite the interest of Psychiatrists, such as Kretschmer (1936) and psychologists like Sheldon (1940, 1942) who have shown the relationship between body build, personality and mental illness. Secord and Backman (1964) point out that body build is an important cue to personality impressions, though the impression may not be valid.

People can arrive at some evaluation of another person from almost any data (Asch, 1946). This has been shown in various studies using a great variety of cues, such as actual person, photographs, voice recordings, trait information,
posture (Ekman, 1964), schematic representations of persons (Rosenberg and Langer, 1965), and paths described by a person (Taiguri, 1960a).

As Brunswik (1956) and Heider (1958) have made clear, cues are interchangeable and a great variety of them can lead one to attribute to another certain traits or dispositions. It is the attributed distal, covert "dispositional" qualities (Heider's term) of the other that serve to guide one's behavior toward him, and it is with these the perceiver is ultimately concerned. Jones and Davis (1965) have given a very helpful treatment of the process of attributing dispositions from acts. Some dispositions and states are more important variables in interaction than others; cues to these may draw special attention. Among the aspects of another to which a person particularly attends to are his intentions, especially when the action is directed towards the beholder. Indeed, there is a general tendency to see others as 'origins' and 'responsible agents' of actions (Heider, 1958a; Pepitone, 1958).

People's feeling toward and reactions to criticism and deprivation vary dramatically according to whether the other person is seen as having 'intended', or as having been responsible for the negative action. This suggests that people may be very alert to and watchful for cues of this aspect of the
other (Hastorf, 1964; Jones and de Charms, 1958; Strickland, 1958; Strickland, Jones and Smith, 1960; Thibaut and Riecken, 1955). Two other aspects that seem strongly to attract the beholder's attention are a person's good-bad qualities (Heider, 1958b; Osgood, 1953) and his relative 'power' (Pepitone, 1958). The attributes of the other person to which attention is given depend on the motivitional state of the judge (Berlew and Williams, 1964).

b) **Effect of contextual factors:**

The beholder has two external sources of information about the states, feelings, attributes, and intentions of the others: (i) the object person, and (ii) the situation or context of the object. Usually a person is seen in a context, and the perceiver utilizes cues from both the person and the situation. Indeed, it is by using the 'combination' of information available from both these sources that we arrive very often at judgements that are sufficiently correct to form the basis of smooth interaction with our social environment (Taiguri, 1954).

Contextual factors affect the perception of a social stimulus in much the same way as 'field' variable affect the perception of physical stimuli; the meaning of a stimulus varies with the situation. Asch (1946) suggested that the
meaning of a trait depends upon the other traits a person is thought to possess. Strich and Secord (1956) showed how the perception of physiognomic attribute is affected by the other physiognomic attributes the person is seen to possess. Cline (1956) using line drawings, showed that the interpretation of a facial expression was affected by the expression on a second face adjacent to it. Levy (1960) reported a contrast effect in person perception. Target photographs presented in the context of two other photographs were rated in the opposite manner to the contextual photographs if the contextual photographs gave rise to common judgements. Holmes and Berkowitz (1961) reported a similar effect in judgements of pleasantness. A pleasant person seems more pleasant after seeing an unpleasant person.

c) The effect of order of presentation:

The layman's notion that first impression are important has been supported by experimental evidence. Asch (1946) presented subjects with a list of discrete traits. A second group of subjects were presented with the same list in reverse order. The two lists gave rise to different impressions presumably because adjectives presented earlier in the series had a greater effect than those presented later. Other experiments using trait lists got similar results (Anderson and Barrios, 1961; Anderson and Hubert, 1963; Anderson and
Norman, 1964; and Anderson, 1965).

Asch suggested that the initial words in a list modify the meaning of later words. For example, the term 'cunning' will give the word 'clever' a meaning which is similar to word 'shrewd'. Methodological difficulties have hindered experimental examination of this idea. However, Anderson and Lampell (1965) report that the meaning of a personality trait in the context of two other traits was not affected by the context if the subject was instructed to rate the trait itself. If they were told to regard the three traits as belonging to the same person, the meaning of the test trait was displaced towards the contextual traits (Wyer and Watson, 1969).

An alternative explanation of the primacy effect given by Anderson and Hubert (1963) suggests that instead of a shift in meaning, later items merely carry less weight than the initial items and less attention is paid to them possibly because of overloading of the subjects information-processing capacity. A study by Anderson (1965) provides some support for the idea that subjects use an averaging process. Traindis and Fishbein (1963) suggest that a summation model is more appropriate. Lovie and Davies (1970) discuss the application of Bayes Theorem to the problem of combining information about persons. Luchins (1957a) obtained a marked primacy
effect by using two blocks of information which described a teenage boy. One block described him behaving in an extraverted manner, the other in an introverted manner. Despite the strong evidence in favor of primacy effects, slight alterations in the experimental conditions would completely remove them. Luchins (1957b) showed that they could be reduced either by warning the subject not to make snap judgements, or by interpolating a similar warning or an unrelated task, such as an arithmetic test, between the two blocks of information. The interpolated tasks were the most effective; probably because they decreased the likelihood of the two blocks being perceived as a total unit. This interpretation is supported by the work of Asch (1946).

In conclusion, it appears that people use a large variety of cues to make inferences about the states of mind and personal qualities of other persons.

2. **COMBINING IMPRESSIONS:**

All the information available about the other person is combined by the perceiver in various ways to achieve a unified and organized impression. So, the second step in the process of person perception is the combining of the informations. In other words, the perceiver construes the information selected in such a way as to infer general traits and a variety of other personal characteristics.
In all cognitive complex processes, there is a tendency to 'maximize balance' and to 'avoid dissonance of elements' (Asch, 1952; Bramel, 1963; Pepitone and Hayden, 1955; Secord, Beckman and Eachus, 1961+). The other person is viewed as more homogeneously good or bad than he can be shown to be when his characteristics are independently measured. Information integration theory (Anderson, 1974) offers an approach for understanding how people combine stimulus information when making judgements and decisions. The theory seeks to determine the nature of the integration rule (e.g., adding, averaging, multiplying) employed by people in various response domains. The target person is thought of as a configuration of highly integrated characteristics (traits, emotions, etc).

In short, it seems that people seek to combine the inferences drawn from a large variety of cues to accomplish a unified and organized impression. This leads to the interpretative and extended inferences which are very much influenced by the judge's personality traits and self perception.

a) The effect of personality traits and motive of judge:

There is a large number of studies on the relationships between person perception and the personality of the judge. Since Murray's (1933) early experiment on the effects of fear arousal upon children's perceptions of photographs, a
considerable number of attempts have been made to demonstrate that people tend to attribute (project) their own repressed feelings and socially undesirable characteristics to other people.

Authoritarianism is a trait that has received considerable attention (Jones, 1954; Scodel and Friedman, 1956; Crockett and Meidinger, 1956; Kates, 1959 and Lipetz, 1960). Authoritarians tend to see other people as similar to themselves and hence rate stimulus person higher on authoritarianism, power and leadership than do non-authoritarians (Kates, 1959). They also appear to use evaluative responses more readily and to make more extreme evaluative responses than do non-authoritarians (Warr and Sims, 1965). High status persons are usually seen in a more favourable light by authoritarians than by non-authoritarians (Jones, 1954) but authoritarians show more generalized fear, suspicion, and moralistic condemnation of strangers (Desoto, Kuethe and Wunderlich, 1960). The impressions formed by authoritarians tend to be more resistant to change than those formed by non-authoritarians (Steiner and Johnson, 1963). In general, they appear to be less sensitive in their perception of other people, although this possibility has been questioned by Schulberg (1961). When forming impressions, authoritarians
make more use of external characteristics and cues, such as social class, than do non-authoritarians (Wilkins and deCharms, 1962).

The tendency to see others as like oneself is true of individuals other than authoritarians. Fensterheim and Tresselt (1953) showed that subjects tend to attribute values dissimilar to their own to people they dislike, but attribute values similar to their own to people they like. There is a tendency for people to assume that others are similar to themselves. Attempts to measure 'assumed similarity' have had limited success because of methodological shortcomings of the sort that have hindered the development of a satisfactory measure of accuracy (Cronbach, 1958 and Cline, 1964). Benedeth and Hill (1960) have argued that the centrality of a trait attributed to another person varies with the strength of the same trait in the perceiver. They reported that their subjects sociability scores on a questionnaire were significantly related to the impressions they formed of people who were said to be sociable and unsociable.

Neuroticism is an important personality characteristic that may be related to impression formation. Rabin (1962) found greater differences between maladjusted subjects, and normal subjects in their judgement of others. Shrauger and
Altrochi (1964) suggested a curvilinear relationship between adjustment and differentiation, with differentiation increasing from a low level among extremely defensive people (repressors) to a maximum among people with normal insight into self and others, and it decreases to a low level among people with severe personality disturbances, that is, disrupted defences. Altrocchi (1961) found that among a group of normals, repressors differentiated less than did sensitizers.

b) **Self-perception:**

Self-perception holds an important place in determining the perception of others. People differ in their self-image and this causes differences in their perception of other people. People may perceive others in such a way as to protect or enhance their concept of themselves (Peterson, 1974).

Self-perception theory (Beng, 1972; Kelly, 1967) asserts that in knowing ourselves, we are essentially in the same positions as any outside observer of ourselves and must infer our emotions, attitudes and abilities from the way we behave. This recent version of self-perception theory is similar to many earlier theories of interpersonal perception notably those of Hader (1958a), James (1890), Hyle (1949) and Skinner (1971).
Powel Lewick (1983) in a study has shown that the more desirable the self rating on a dimension the more central that dimension is in perceiving others.

David (1980) in a study has found that subjects descriptions of their own personalities correlate well with descriptions contributed by their peers, especially on traits high in social desirability.

Self is involved in processes of forming impressions of others and even very small situational changes in self-image are capable of producing related specific changes in images of other people (Powel Lewick, 1983). Self schemata may be crucial in formulating descriptions and evaluations about other people (Kuiper and Rogers, 1979; Markus and Smith, 1980; Kuiper, 1981).

Self-perception, self-esteem, self-acceptance, self-valuations and self-regard have often been used interchangeably. However, certain conceptual nuances may have been obliterated in such gross classifications. An important distinction may be drawn between self-esteem and self-acceptance. On the majority of tests purporting to measure self-esteem, persons who attribute to themselves a high percentage of positive traits and a low percentage of negative traits are considered
to be high in self-esteem (Marlowe, 1964). However, as Rogers (1959) has pointed out, the person who is high in self-acceptance is willing to accept both positive and negative attributes into his self-conception. Horland, Janis and Kelly (1953) and Crowne and Marlowe (1964) have suggested, for example, that the person low in self-regard may have a strong need for social approval. It also seems plausible that the low self-regarding person may have a very inconsistent and diffuse self-picture. He may essentially be ensnared between the feeling that he may be inferior and the intense desire to excel. The result may be a highly vacillating approach to social interaction.

3. **EVALUATION OF THE TARGET (OUTPUT):**

a) **Differentiation in the output:**

   The traits and other concepts used to describe and conceptualize other people constitute the perceivers interpersonal cognitive system which is the part of his general cognitive system. Subjects with highly differentiated cognitive system appear to be more aware of positive and negative attributes in the same person (Crockett, 1965). They are able to integrate conflicting information better than the subjects with less differentiated system (Nidorf and Crockett, 1965; and Mayo and Crockett, 1964).
A cognitive system can be described in terms of its degree of differentiation and organization. Integration of conflicting information and the degree to which fine distinctions are made about others are, therefore, two important aspects of the output of person perceptions which led to the discovery of certain cognitive styles.

Individual's cognitive processes are independent of the nature of object involved. Collin and Rosenberg (1956) showed that persons able to integrate a series of political, religious and economic terms into broader categories also tended to relate personality traits even if they were incongruous.

The degree of differentiation in person perception has been variously measured. The most common operational definition is the variance of a person's judgement of a group of object on a particular attribute. No consistent results exist on cognitive complexity so defined and its relation to personality, possibly because high scores can be obtained both by making fine distinctions over the entire range of an attribute and by using many extreme ratings (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964).

Other measures of differentiation define it more specifically as the number of independent dimensions used
in characterizing or classifying others (Bieri, 1961). Some empirical correlates of differentiation have been reported. Bieri (1955) found that there are reliable differences in cognitive complexity so defined, on the one hand, and cognitive complexity and abstraction qualities in conceiving other persons, on the other hand. He reported that differentiation varied inversely with the tendency to assumed similarity and directly with the measure accuracy in his study. The more abstract individuals seem better able to integrate somewhat conflicting traits attributed to a person (Harvey, Hunt and Schroder, 1961; Harvey and Schroder, 1963; Mayo and Crockett, 1964).

People differ in "theories" they "have" about human nature and personality. Such notions, often implicit, influence the type of qualities and cues they particularly note in others as well as the inferential process involved. There is considerable evidence, for instance, that individuals differ consistently in the traits they use and in the weight they give to traits in their perception and thoughts about others (Rommetveit, 1960). Some people tend to describe other persons in terms of external, surface and physical traits, others in terms of inner and psychological traits (Bieri, 1961; Sarbin, 1954; Wolin, 1956).
b) **Sex differences in the output:**

Whenever investigators have analysed their data separately for male and female judges, they have observed differences. Among children, females describe adult figures in a less differentiated and more favourable manner than do males (Kohn and Fiedler, 1961). In describing others, boys focus on aggression, nonconformity, and attributes relevant to physical recreation, while girls refer more to nurturant behaviour, happiness, physical appearance, and social skills (Campbell and Radke-Yarrow, 1956; Dornbusch et al., 1965; Hastorf, 1962).

Women have a greater tendency toward stereotyping than men, seem to be less analytical and more intuitive, and use more psychological (as opposed to physical) terms than men (Gollin, 1958; Sarbin, 1954; Wolin, 1955). Other studies of sex differences support these findings (Beach and Wertheimer, 1961; Secord and Muthard, 1955; Shapiro and Tagiuri, 1959; Wertheimer, 1960). Exline (1963) has reported that women, more than men, seem to focus visually on those with whom they interact, perhaps relying more than men on visual cues. When the option exists, women seek more information about others than men do (Midorf and Crockett, 1964).

In short investigators have observed sex differences in person perception.
c) Social interaction and impression formation:

The existence of a definite psychological relationship between one person and another is likely to affect the impressions formed. For example, one's interpersonal relationship that is likely to have a great effect is the degree of liking. Liking exerts a considerable influence on the traits we assign to other people (Lott, Lott, Reed and Crow, 1970 and Fensterheim and Tresselt, 1953). Subjects tend to assign fewer favourable traits to people they dislike (Pastore, 1960a, 1960b) and liking helps to determine the frequency with which we interact with the other person, and this in turn determines the variety of behaviour we encounter. Tagiuri (1953) drew attention to the need to uncover the determinants of liking and disliking in groups.

In addition, the particular words chosen to describe well-liked, neutral and disliked actual persons differ significantly (Lott, Lott, Reed and Crow, 1970). Lott and Lott, (1970) found that children drew pictures of their peers which varied significantly both in detail and in size of head relative to body depending upon whether the peer drawn was liked, disliked or was regarded neutrally, and that other samples of children chose to look at pictures of highly liked peers more than they did at pictures of less liked ones. In still
another study (Lott, Lott and Walsh, 1970), adult students learned to associate nonsense syllables with the names of well-known public figures, or peers, with reliably different numbers of errors depending on their degree of attraction to the person.

d) **Errors in evaluation:**

In the process of rating personality attributes, several "judgemental effects" affect the process. The best known of these is the 'halo-effect', a term coined by Thorndike (1920). It had been noted as early as 1907 by Wells who found that judges tended to rate subjects on several traits in terms of a general impression of goodness or badness (the "halo") and that this introduced a spuriously high correlation into their ratings. With great ingenuity, later investigators have worked out procedures for minimizing the effect of the halo. These investigators were more interested in rating methods than in judgemental phenomena. Yet the effect itself has become interesting in its own right (Rommetveit, 1960; Rugg, 1921a, 1921b), reflect as it does a tendency on the part of the subject to "package" the myriad impressions he receive from another person. Halo seems to increase with increase acquaintance (Symonds, 1925, 1931).
A somewhat related tendency towards packaging information was described by Newcomb (1931). Guilford (1936) called it the 'logical error'. It was noted that judges have certain conceptions as to what traits go with what other traits. Thus, if one rates a person high on aggressiveness, one may be disposed to rate him high, rather than low, in energy. This 'error', of course, has become the subject of much direct research by psychologists interested in formation of impressions (for example, Asch, 1946).

Above mentioned general cognitive tendencies can be viewed as properties of the typical 'implicit personality theory'. In the area of person perception, the psychological frame work of inferences that links one trait to another has generally been referred to as a 'lay' or implicit theory of personality. The original work on 'implicit theories' and 'cognitive structure' was reported by Asch (1946), although he did not use these terms. He attempted to demonstrate that, in the course of establishing an impression, some personal qualities have more influence than others. The idea of an implicit or 'lay' theory of personality was put forward by Bruner and Tagiuri (1954) and then by Cronbach (1955), Hirschberg and Jennings (1980), Rosenberg and Sedlock (1972). After the publication of Brunner and Tagiuri's (1954) seminal
article "The Perception of People", a great deal of research has been devoted to the study of implicit personality theory in particular (Schneider, 1973), and to study the implicit psychology more generally (Wegner and Vallacher, 1972).

'Leniency effect' is the tendency to rate others (and also oneself) high on favorable traits and low on unfavorable ones. Such a judgemental tendency markedly affects trait-attribution studies, such as the investigation of trait projection by Sears (1936). The tendency toward leniency might well reduce the likelihood that one would project one's own undesirable characteristics on others.

Another well-known tendency is stereotyping, the general inclination to place a person in categories according to some easily and quickly identifiable characteristics such as age, sex, ethnic membership, nationality, or occupation, and then to attribute to him qualities believed to be typical of members of that category. Stereotyping does not necessarily lead to inaccuracy; sometimes it leads to more 'accurate' inferences about others than does detailed information about each individual person (Crow, 1957; Gage, 1952; Soskin, 1959).

'Assumed similarity' (first reported by Hanks, 1936) — the inclination under certain circumstances to attribute to others responses one would give oneself, a form of projection—
generates high accuracy scores for judges who happen to be similar to the persons judged. This confounds accuracy, as an ability, with fortuitous actual similarity between the other person and the judge (Bender and Hastorf, 1950, 1953; Winslow, 1937). Kelley and Fiske (1951) conclude that the modest correlation between criterion (test responses) and judgements found in the studies of interpersonal judgements were largely due to a match between the judges and the object person's "favourability" set toward the items.

**Accuracy of Person-Perception:**

Accuracy in perceiving conveyed impressions is also important to impression-management formulations (e.g., Baumeister, 1982; Goffman, 1959; Jones, 1964; Schelenker, 1980, 1985), which posit that people are often concerned about the impressions they are conveying to others. People who are individually accurate might know, for example, that they are popular, but they will not necessarily know which specific persons like them the most and, therefore, they may not be dyadically accurate. In contrast, those who are dyadically accurate can distinguish their friends from their enemies, but they may not necessarily know how they are regarded by a group as a whole. The attainment of individual accuracy might be important to people deciding whether to pursue or maintain membership in various formal or informal
groups whereas the achievement of dyadic accuracy might be useful to people deciding which particular relationship to pursue. In a recent study by De Paulo et al. (1987), subjects were accurate to a significant degree about the impressions they conveyed to their partners.

While concluding the review of literature, it may be observed that although the two areas i.e., sociometry and person perception have been studied extensively, no attempt has been made to link the two areas. The relationship between these two aspects is expected to be helpful in answering the question as to why certain persons are populars, while others are isolates or neglectees.